

Commissioners:

James Bull
James Daire
Chuck Gitzen
Julie Kimble
Michelle Kruzal
Michelle Pribyl
Peter Sparby



**Planning Commission
Agenda**
Wednesday, May 1, 2019
6:30pm

Address:
2660 Civic Center Dr.
Roseville, MN 55113

Phone:
651-792-7080

Website:
www.cityofroseville.com/pc

1. Call To Order
2. Roll Call
3. Approval Of Agenda
4. Review Of Minutes

Documents:

[APRIL 3, 2019 MINUTES.PDF](#)

5. Communications And Recognitions

5.A. From The Public:

Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this agenda.

5.B. From The Commission Or Staff:

Information about assorted business not already on this agenda.

6. Public Hearing

6.A. Consideration Of An Interim Use Pursuant To Section 1009 Of The City Code To Allow Outdoor Storage Of Semi-Trailers, Small Utility Trailers And Dumpsters At 2211 County Road C2 (PF19-002)

Documents:

[6A REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS.PDF](#)

6.B. Consideration Of A Conditional Use Pursuant To Table 1006-1 And Section 1009 Of The City Code To Allow A Motor Freight Terminal At 2340 Rose Place (PF19-006)

Documents:

[6B REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS.PDF](#)

6.C. Request For Approval To Rezone Property From Low Density Residential-1 (LDR-1) To Low Density Residential-2 (LDR-2) And Approval Of The 6-Lot Midland Legacy Estate Preliminary Plat For Development Of 6 Twinhome Dwelling Units Including An Outlot That May Lead To 2 Additional Twinhome Lots In A Future Plat (PF19-003)

Documents:

[6C REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS.PDF](#)

6.D. Request By CommonBond Communities For Consideration Of A Comprehensive Land

Ues Plan Map Change, Zoning Map Change And Conditional Use At 165 Owasso
Boulevard And 3011, 3029 And 3033 Rice Street (PF19-004)

Documents:

[6D REPORT AND ATTACHMENTS.PDF](#)

7. Adjourn



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, April 3, 2019 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Acting Chair Bull called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission
3 meeting at approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Planning
4 Commission.
5
- 6 **2. Roll Call**
7 At the request of Acting Chair Bull, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
8
- 9 **Members Present:** Acting Chair James Bull; and Commissioners Chuck Gitzen, Julie
10 Kimble, Michelle Kruzel, Michelle Pribyl, and Peter Sparby
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** Commissioner James Daire.
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director
15 Janice Gundlach and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd
16
- 17 **3. Approve Agenda**
18
- 19 **MOTION**
20 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Sparby, to approve the agenda as**
21 **presented.**
22
- 23 **Ayes: 6**
24 **Nays: 0**
25 **Motion carried.**
26
- 27 **4. Introduction of Community Development Director, Janice Gundlach**
28 City Planner Paschke introduced Community Development Director Gundlach.
29
- 30 Ms. Gundlach reviewed her work and education history with the Planning Commission.
31
- 32 **5. Organizational Business**
33 **a. Swear-In New Commissioners, Michelle Kruzel and Michelle Pribyl**
34 Acting Chair Bull indicated the order of business is to swear the two new
35 Commissioners in to their positions. Commissioners Kruzel and Pribyl read the
36 Oath of Office.
37
- 38 **b. Elect Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair**
39 Acting Chair Bull indicated the Commission needs to elect the Chair and Vice-
40 Chair of the Planning Commission for 2019. He asked for nominations for the
41 Chair.
42

43 Acting Chair Bull added his name for Chair of the Planning Commission.

44
45 No one else made a nomination. Acting Chair Bull closed the nominations and
46 the Commission voted to elect Commissioner Bull as Chair of the Planning
47 Commission. A vote was taken and passed unanimously.

48
49 Acting Chair Bull asked for nominations for Vice-Chair of the Planning
50 Commission.

51
52 Commissioner Gitzen indicated he would be interested in Vice-Chair.

53
54 No one else made a nomination. Acting Chair Bull closed the nominations and
55 the Commission voted to elect Commissioner Gitzen as Vice-Chair of the
56 Planning Commission. A vote was taken and passed unanimously.

57
58 **c. Appoint Variance Board Members**
59 Chair Bull indicated there are three members plus and an alternate on the Variance
60 Board.

61
62 Mr. Paschke stated Commissioner Daire indicated he would like to continue on
63 the Variance Board so there are three other open positions.

64
65 Commissioner Sparby stated he would like to serve as a voting member of the
66 Board this year.

67
68 Commissioners Kimble and Gitzen indicated they would like to be removed from
69 the Board.

70
71 Commissioners Kruzel and Pribyl both indicated interest to be on the Board.

72
73 Commissioner Pribyl indicated she would be the alternate.

74
75 Chair Bull stated the Variance Board members will be Commissioners Daire,
76 Sparby, Kruzel with Pribyl being alternative.

77
78 **d. Appoint Ethics Commission Representative**
79 Chair Bull stated he would still be interested in being on the Ethics Commission.
80 No one else volunteered.

81
82 **6. Review of Minutes**

83
84 **a. February 6, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**

85
86 **MOTION**
87 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Sparby, to approve the February**
88 **6, 2019 meeting minutes.**

89

90 **Ayes: 6**
91 **Nays: 0**
92 **Motion carried.**

93
94 **7. Communications and Recognitions:**

- 95
96 **a. From the Public:** *Public comment pertaining to general land use issues not on this*
97 *agenda, including the 2040 Comprehensive Plan Update.*

98
99 Mr. Peter Heppner, 3030 Woodbridge Street indicated he was a new resident to
100 Roseville and was at the meeting to address a potential proposal that is in the
101 preliminary stages by Common Bond Communities to rezone several properties along
102 Rice and South Wausau. As a new resident of this neighborhood his house is directly
103 adjacent to the proposed rezoned area. He stated some of his concerns were sent via
104 email on how devastating the rezoning would be for the neighborhood if it were to
105 continue.

106
107 Mr. Heppner stated if the rezoning were to go through, he believed it would cause
108 damage to the neighborhood. Many people who have lived in the neighborhood for a
109 long time have expressed to him that those residents are intending to leave should the
110 properties be rezoned. Also, as a personal note, his wife and himself would not have
111 purchased the property had he known that a building of the type proposed, which is a
112 three-story affordable elderly care building, would be in their backyard. The building
113 would cause damage to the local resources, and damage to the plantings in his yard if
114 a parking lot were to be built behind his house. He stated his family's ability to enjoy
115 their backyard would be damaged and he also believed this did not align with the City
116 Code.

117
118 Mr. Heppner believed this property would be a harmful intrusion on the
119 neighborhood and would cause damage. He stated he went to the open house meeting
120 and as he was talking to the architect it came to his attention that the architects were
121 not aware of the neighborhood and have no idea what the neighborhood is like or
122 what native trees are in the neighborhood. The architects have not considered the
123 property itself beyond an initial glance. He overheard one of the architects talking to
124 a Common Bond employee stating he was very glad the company did not show the
125 residents any height renders of the building because the residents would all be very
126 upset due to not matching the scale of the neighborhood, does not match any of the
127 corners surrounding it and it does not match the houses. The architect also told him
128 directly that although the lights from the parking lot would not cause problems, the
129 brightly lit windows overlooking the yard would be very annoying.

130
131 Mr. Heppner thought it was a major issue that all of the properties in question belong
132 to a single individual who has approached these people to build this project. He
133 believed the owners intention is to increase the property value in order to sell and get
134 a return on their investment. He thought this building has no place in a neighborhood
135 like his and exactly the type of intrusion that zoning is intended to prevent. He urged

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, April 3, 2019

Page 4

136 the Planning Commission to decline the proposal to rezone the properties should it be
137 submitted.

138
139 Mr. Heppner stated he gathered signatures from fifty of his neighbors who are against
140 this.

141
142 Chair Bull asked how Mr. Heppner's information best be addressed.

143
144 Ms. Gundlach indicated Mr. Heppner can give her the information and she can submit
145 it as public record once an application is made. She stated at this time an application
146 has not been formally submitted.

147
148 Chair Bull appreciated Mr. Heppner coming forward and expressing his concerns for
149 the neighborhood.

150
151 Ms. Heather Anderson, 3034 Woodbridge Street stated her family has been in
152 Roseville for twenty-seven years. She agreed with everything Mr. Heppner said. She
153 did reach out to the City and received some information from Mr. Paschke, and he
154 told her for the past five years (2015 to 2018), there have not been any changes from
155 Low Density to High Density and there was a denial of request on County Road B.
156 She stated that this is not something Roseville tends to do if a Low-Density
157 neighborhood. The neighborhood is very concerned about this proposed project. She
158 noted there are no plans for buffers such as fencing and there is concern about
159 drainage from the property as well. The neighborhood did not think it was the right
160 place to build a three-story building.

161
162 Mr. John Cook, 3021 Woodbridge Street stated the traffic south of Wausau is already
163 bad and a three-story building will increase the traffic on that road. At the meeting
164 the owners indicated one of the reasons why a three-story building was being
165 proposed was because of mass transit and local for a bus to get in and out of there.
166 He stated there used to be a DX Station on the corner and he wondered if anyone has
167 done a soil sampling and if there is any contamination in the ground.

168
169 Mr. John Squires, 3029 Woodbridge, stated he built his house in 1962. He stated at
170 the time it was a nice, quiet and rural neighborhood and his family grew up there. He
171 stated if there is going to be a three-story building it will cut out all of the natural
172 sunlight that comes into his home now. He stated he was against this. Building a
173 building there of that size in a residential area is not right. He thought a building
174 should be built on open land without a lot of houses around.

175
176 Mr. Lloyd Willbright, 3022 Woodbridge Street stated he has been out of town for a
177 while but received a call indicating the project was going to be discussed at this
178 meeting. He stated he did not know all that is going on yet but what he heard enough
179 from his neighbors to know that he did not agree with such a building in that location.

180

181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227

- 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.*

Commissioner Kimble stated it was unfortunate the Commission did not get to roast Chair Murphy on his way out. She thought for the record the Commission should thank him for his service on the Commission and commend him for the years he has been on the Commission.

Chair Bull agreed. He stated Commissioner Murphy did provide a lot of valuable input and helped him when he came on the Commission. He appreciated all of Commissioner Murphy's service and input he has given over the years.

Chair Bull stated the Ethics training will be held on Wednesday, April 10, 2019 at 6:30 p.m. for all Commissioners and Department Heads in the City. In addition to that there is a new Commissioners meeting at 5:30 p.m. and a meeting for any new Chair's and Vice-Chair's at 5:30 p.m. as well. He noted there will be a light dinner at 6:00 p.m. He stated one thing that will be different with the Ethics training this year is because of the number of questions that have come up regarding conflict of interest and also of the open meeting law, the Ethics training is also going to have some information on those two topics to make sure everyone is clear on what the rules are for those.

8. Public Hearing

- a. Consider Request By City of Roseville Of A Zoning Map Change (Rezoning) Of The Southwest Corner Of 211 North McCarron's Boulevard (PF18-016)**

Chair Bull opened the public hearing for PF18-016 at approximately 7:03 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council on April 22, 2019.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated April 3, 2019.

Public Comment

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

Chair Bull closed the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

Member Gitzen thought this request follows what was passed at the last meeting and addresses some of the concerns of rezoning it to this zoning compared to what it was. He noted the Commission was concerned about what could go in that area and this will alleviate all the concerns. He stated he would support the proposal.

228 Chair Bull stated he was at the City Council meeting when this was being discussed
229 and the Council was discussing changing this to LDR-2 Zoning and the Council’s
230 desire was to have it LDR-1 since it was not conforming but since the timeframe had
231 elapsed for consideration it became automatically approved into LDR-2 so this is
232 taking it back into LDR-1 as where it would have been directed to go.

233
234 Commissioner Kimble stated she was in support of this.

235
236 Commissioner Sparby stated he was also in support. It sounds like the development
237 would meet the LDR-1 standard and that is the intention of the City Council and what
238 was considered at the last Planning Commission meeting.

239
240 Commissioner Pribyl stated she was also in support of this, it makes sense to have it
241 LDR-1 because there is other LDR-1 Zoned property around it.

242
243 Commissioner Kruzal stated she would also support this because it fits in with the
244 criteria and what the City Council wants.

245
246 **MOTION**
247 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Gitzen, to approve the property**
248 **be rezoned from an Official Map classification of Low Density Residential-2**
249 **(LDR-2) District to Low Density Residential-1 (LDR-1) District (PF18-016).**

250
251 **Ayes: 6**
252 **Nays: 0**
253 **Motion carried.**

254
255 **9. Adjourn**

256
257 **MOTION**
258 **Member Sparby, seconded by Member Pribyl, to adjourn the meeting at 7:11**
259 **p.m.**

260
261 **Ayes: 6**
262 **Nays: 0**
263 **Motion carried.**

264
265



REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Agenda Date: 05/01/19

Agenda Item: 6a

Prepared By

Agenda Section
Public Hearings

Department Approval

Item Description: Consideration of an Interim Use pursuant to §1009 of the City Code to allow outdoor storage of semi-trailers, small utility trailers, and dumpsters at 2211 County Road C2 (PF19-002).

1 APPLICATION INFORMATION

- 2 Applicant: Voyd Trailer of Minnesota, LLC.
- 3 Location: 2211 County Road C2
- 4 Property Owner: 1926 Grand Avenue, LLC
- 5 Application Submission: March 20, 2019; deemed complete 04/14/19
- 6 City Action Deadline: 06/13/19; extended to July 18, 2019
- 7 Planning File History: PF15-017 – IU for outdoor trailer storage

8 LEVEL OF DISCRETION IN DECISION MAKING: Actions taken on an Interim Use (IU) proposal
9 is legislative in nature; the City has broad discretion in making land use decisions based on
10 advancing the health, safety, and general welfare of the community

11 REQUEST

12 Voyd Trailer of Minnesota (dba Big Blue Box) in cooperation with 1926 Grand Avenue, LLC
13 (property owner) has applied for a renewal of the 2015 approved IU to utilize the property for
14 continued staging and storing of semi-trailers. Due to outstanding compliance and use issues, the
15 2015 approval (Attachment C) also included additional conditions for SRC Concrete (2217
16 County Road C2) and Twin Cities Truck Sales (2205 County Road C2).

17 The proposal by Voyd Trailer seeks to store and stage up to 44 trailers, some loaded with non-
18 hazardous material and others empty. Trailers are stored short-term, awaiting assignment or
19 awaiting to be unloaded and are to be parked around the periphery of the site. The Voyd Trailer
20 proposal also seeks to include periodic storage of refuse dumpsters (up to 12 ranging in size from
21 3 to 40 yards) and contractor trailers for Collins Electric (1 to 3 small utility trailers) in the front
22 portion of the lot adjacent to County Road C2 and the gated site entry. The Voyd Trailer
23 proposal does not propose any site or building improvements or maintenance. It is anticipated
24 there would not be any on-site employment or office space associated with this IU request. A
25 detailed narrative and trailer parking/storage plan is included with this report as Attachment D.

26 **PREVIOUSLY APPROVED IU REVIEW**

27 The property previously received an approved IU pertaining to three known uses: Big Blue Box,
28 SRC Concrete, and Twin Cities Truck Sales. Below is a review of these sites and conformance
29 to the stated conditions of approval:

30 **2211 County Road C2 – Big Blue Box trailer storage**

- 31 1. *A trailer storage and staging plan shall be submitted to the City that addresses the*
32 *following conditions:*
- 33 a. *Trailers parked/stored on the west parcel shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet from*
34 *all property lines.*
 - 35 b. *Trailers can be parked/stored back-to-back.*
 - 36 c. *All trailers must have a minimum 5-foot separation between each trailer.*
 - 37 d. *No trailers will be allowed along the east fence, as this area shall be used as the main*
38 *access and most likely drive lane to/from County Road C2.*
 - 39 e. *Fire lanes shall be provided at a minimum of 30 feet in width and approved (final*
40 *width and number) by the Fire Marshal to provide adequate access in case of a fire.*
 - 41 f. *There shall be no outdoor storage of anything except trailers.*
 - 42 g. *Shipping containers, cabs, or other storage is not permitted.*
 - 43 h. *No hazardous or dangerous materials shall be stored in the trailers. No materials*
44 *that are likely to attract vermin or other pests shall be stored in the trailers.*
 - 45 i. *All trailers shall be locked and secured.*

46 The Planning Division and Fire Chief worked with Big Blue Box on an acceptable trailer storage
47 plan that met the above conditions and the site was deemed compliant to all conditions in 2015.
48 However, recently Planning staff became aware of the dumpster storage and requested it be
49 included in the renewal IU if the intention was to continue this use.

50 **2217 County Road C2 - SRC Concrete contractor yard**

- 51 2. *The 2217 property (SRC) must install an 8-foot opaque screen fence, which shall*
52 *extend from the front of the building west to the fence on the western property and*
53 *from the rear of the building to the 2211 building (north of the fuel canopy). This*
54 *fence is required in order to screen the storage and activities in the interior.*
- 55 3. *All equipment and construction items, seasonal or other, of SRC must be stored*
56 *on an all- weather surface.*
- 57 4. *All loose materials, such as gravel, sand, or other product of SRC, must be placed*
58 *in storage compartments.*
- 59 5. *The large gravel pile, generally in the middle of the SRC property (2211 County*
60 *Road C2) and adjacent to the west property line, must be removed by June 1,*
61 *2016.*

62 In the months after the approved IU, Planning staff discussed with representatives of SRC
63 Concrete what was necessary to achieve compliance with the IU conditions. Follow-up
64 inspections confirmed the gravel pile had been removed and it appeared loose materials were
65 being appropriately addressed. What had not yet been completed was the screen fence. Planning
66 staff had conversations with SRC on the need for the screen fence, which was eventually
67 installed. However, the fence is a chain-link fence with metal slats. Such a fence is not
68 permitted in Roseville. A recent inspection revealed the fence issue has not been resolved.
69 Additionally, there appears to be an increase in outdoor storage of equipment and materials,
70 which may or may not be on an approved surface.

71 **2205-2229 County Road C2 - Twin Cities Trailer Sales**

72 6. *Semi-tractor sales and leasing shall be conducted only in the southeast corner parking*
73 *lot and along the east side of quonset hut back to the fuel canopy. The City Planner will*
74 *work with the tenant on a maximum number allowed and the orderly parking of the*
75 *semi-trucks on the premises.*

76 7. *If the fuel canopy is removed, its area can be used for service vehicle staging, but only*
77 *on an approved all-weather surface.*

78 Planning Division worked with the Twin Cities Trucking on appropriately parking the semi-
79 trucks for sale and, generally speaking the tenant has complied with the approved plan. The
80 second condition has not come to fruition, as the fuel canopy remains.

81 It should be noted, beginning in 2016 Planning staff activities increased significantly and
82 periodic inspections for compliance curtailed, mainly due to compliance on all items except the
83 screen fence.

84 **REVIEW OF INTERIM USE**

85 An applicant seeking approval of an INTERIM USE is required to hold an open house meeting to
86 inform the surrounding property owners and other interested individuals of the proposal, to
87 answer questions, and to solicit feedback. The open house for this application was held on
88 February 8, 2019; no citizens attended, however, the property owner did receive an email
89 concerning the renewal for trailer storage, which is provided as Attachment E.

90 To arrive at its recommendation, Planning staff considers the relevant code section, input
91 gathered at the open house, and comments from DRC members. In this case the Code Section is
92 1009.03: The purpose statement for this section states: *Certain land uses might not be consistent*
93 *with the land uses designated in the Comprehensive Land Use Plan, and they might also fail to*
94 *meet all of the zoning standards established for the district within which they are proposed;*
95 *some such land uses may, however, be acceptable or even beneficial if reviewed and*
96 *provisionally approved for a limited period of time. The purpose of the interim use review*
97 *process is to allow the approval of interim uses on a case-by-case basis; approved interim uses*
98 *shall have a definite end date and may be subject to specific conditions considered reasonable*
99 *and/or necessary for the protection of the public health, safety, and general welfare.*

100 Section 1009.03D of the City Code specifies that three specific findings must be made in order to
101 approve a proposed INTERIM USE (IU):

102 a. *The proposed use will not impose additional costs on the public if it is necessary for the*
103 *public to take the property in the future.* This is generally intended to ensure that a particular
104 interim use will not make the site costly to clean up if the City were to acquire the property
105 for some purpose in the future. In this case, the Planning Division understands the trailers
106 are loaded with various items ranging from scrap metal to Cirrus airplane components. Such
107 freight items being staged for delivery or shipping pose limited environmental risk to the City
108 if it were to acquire the site, so Planning Division staff believes the IU would not have
109 significant negative effects on the land unless the applicant began to store contents or cargo
110 that posed environmental risks. That said, there is a financial burden tied to the removal of
111 approximately 44 container trailers and up to 12 dumpsters, should the City be required to
112 remove them.

113 b. *The proposed use will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public*
114 *facilities.* Storage and staging of semi-trailers is viewed by the Planning Division to generate
115 limited impacts to the area, especially on the roadways. This area includes warehousing,
116 distribution, and motor freight transfer which is generally industrial. These uses (similar to
117 that proposed) tend not to generate traffic impacts in this area since the trailers sit unmoved
118 for much of the time. As such, the Division believes the proposed IU would not constitute an
119 excessive burden on streets, parks, or other facilities, especially given the location.

120 c. *The proposed use will not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood or otherwise harm*
121 *the public health, safety, and general welfare.* The Planning Division and City staff believe
122 the short-term, proposed trailer storage would not be injurious to the surrounding
123 neighborhood, especially since the site would generate limited noise, does not deal with
124 chemicals, and would have limited vehicle movements on County Road C2 and Long Lake
125 Road. The proposal, however, could pose potential harm to public health should trailers
126 contain items that could possibly leak hazardous materials and become an environmental
127 concern. The applicant has assured the City they have no intention of having hazardous
128 contents or cargo within the trailers and City staff support this response.

129 Regarding Twin Cities Truck Sales and SRC Concrete, all current facets of these businesses are
130 permitted under the Industrial zoning district (contractor yard, motor vehicle repair, and motor
131 vehicle leasing and sales) and staff concludes their inclusion in the IU is unnecessary and
132 inappropriate. With respect to any issues or violations, staff will manage these using existing
133 standards and policies enforced by Code Enforcement staff. That said, the Code Enforcement
134 and Planning Divisions have been apprised of inoperable semi-tractors and vehicle parts being
135 stored adjacent to Partridge Road and not properly screened. The Code Enforcement Division
136 has notified the property owner and tenant on the need to remedy the situation. It is worth noting
137 the Fire Chief has reviewed and approved the site layout plan, for which staff will enforce.

138 **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

139 With many of the conditions achieved, Planning Division staff has reviewed this renewal request
140 differently than the initial IU of 2015. First, staff is not including those uses permitted and
141 regulated under the Zoning Code as this would supersede our regulatory power. Second, staff is
142 not opposed to the Collins utility trailers or up to 12 dumpsters being stored periodically on the
143 premises. Lastly, staff has developed conditions to ensure appropriate and applicable emergency
144 service safety.

145 With that said, the Planning Division recommends approval of a three year IU to allow outdoor
146 storage of semi-trailers, small utility trailers, and empty dumpsters, at 2211 County Road C2,
147 subject to the following conditions:

- 148 1. Trailer and dumpster storage and staging shall be implemented consistent with the submitted
149 plan dated 4/23/19.
- 150 2. Trailers shall be parked/stored along the periphery of the property and there shall be a
151 minimum 10 foot setback from the west, north, and east property line.
- 152 3. All trailers must have a minimum 5-foot separation between each trailer.
- 153 4. The center area shall remain free of trailers or dumpsters and be used as the access and fire
154 lane.
- 155 5. Shipping containers, cabs, or other storage is not permitted.
- 156 6. No hazardous or dangerous materials shall be stored in the trailers. No materials that are
157 likely to attract vermin or other pests shall be stored in the trailers.
- 158 7. All trailers shall be locked and secured.
- 159 8. The site shall be allowed up to three small contractor utility trailers.
- 160 9. The site shall be allowed up to 12 dumpsters ranging in size from 3 to 40 yards.

161 **SUGGESTED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

162 By motion, recommend approval of the INTERIM USE allowing outdoor storage of semi-truck
163 trailers and empty dumpsters at 2211 County Road C2, based on the comments and findings
164 noted herein, and the recommendation of this staff report.

165 **ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

- 166 **a.** Pass a motion to table the item for future action. An action to table must be tied to the need
167 for clarity, analysis, and/or information necessary to make a recommendation on the request.
- 168 **b.** Pass a motion recommending denial of the proposal. A motion to deny must include findings
169 of fact germane to the request.

Report prepared by: Thomas Paschke, City Planner 651-792-7074 | thomas.paschke@cityofroseville.com

- Attachments:
- A. Location map
 - B. Aerial map
 - C. 2015 IU
 - D. Email
 - E. Plans/narrative


Attachment A for Planning File 19-002



Site Location

Data Sources
* Ramsey County GIS Base Map (4/3/2019)
For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:
City of Roseville, Community Development Department,
2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

Disclaimer
This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7085. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.03, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.



Attachment B for Planning File 19-002



Prepared by:
Community Development Department
Printed: April 25, 2019



Site Location


Data Sources

- * Ramsey County GIS Base Map (4/3/2019)
- * Aerial Data: Sanborn (4/2017)


For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:
City of Roseville, Community Development Department,
2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

Disclaimer

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7085. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.02, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.



Location Map



**EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Roseville, County of Ramsey, Minnesota, was held on the 28th day of September 2015 at 6:00 p.m.

The following Members were present: Willmus, Etten, McGehee, Laliberte and Mayor Roe;
and the following Members were absent: None.

Council Member McGehee introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**RESOLUTION NO. 11259
A RESOLUTION APPROVING A TEMPORARY OUTDOOR STORAGE OF SEMI-
TRUCK TRAILERS, CONTRACTOR YARD, AND SEMI-TRUCK SALES AND
SERVICE AS AN INTERIM USE AT 2211-2217 COUNTY ROAD C2
(PF15-017)**

WHEREAS, 1926 Grand Avenue, LLC (Roseville Properties) has applied for approval of the proposed temporary outdoor storage of semi-truck trailers, contractor yard, and semi-truck sales and service as an INTERIM USE of the property at 2211-2217 County Road C2; and

WHEREAS, the property at 2211-2217 County Road C2 is legally described as:

PIN: 05-29-23-13-0006, 05-29-23-13-0007, and 05-29-23-13-0008

Requires Legal Description

WHEREAS, the Roseville Planning Commission held the public hearing regarding the proposed INTERIM USE on September 2, 2015, voting 5-0 to recommend approval of the use based on testimony offered at the public hearing as well as the information and analysis provided with the staff report prepared for said public hearing; and

WHEREAS, the Roseville City Council has determined that approval of the proposed INTERIM USE will not result in adverse impacts to the surrounding properties based on the following findings:

- a. The proposed INTERIM USE would not be expected to have significant negative effects on the land because the trailers, whether empty or including non-hazardous content (City understands that many of the semi-trailers are currently loaded with clothes, furniture, and other items, which are the property of Goodwill Industries) can easily be removed from the premises, and the use is anticipated to have minimal vehicular activity as the site will be used mainly for storage. There is, however, a financial burden tied to the removal of approximately 75 semi-trailers, should the City be required to remove them. If the applicant

began to store trailers that contained other cargo, there could be additional environmental risks; and

- b. The proposed INTERIM USE does not constitute an excessive burden on streets, parks, or other facilities because this area includes warehousing, distribution, and motor freight transfer which is generally industrial. These uses (similar to that proposed) tend not to generate traffic impacts in this area since the trailers sit unmoved for much of the time. As such, the proposed IU would not constitute an excessive burden on streets, parks, or other facilities, especially given the location; and
- c. The proposed INTERIM USE, in the short term, would not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood, especially since the site would generate limited noise, does not deal with chemicals, and would have limited vehicle movements on County Road C2 and Long Lake Road. Short-term storage of trailers (3 years or less) would not harm the public health, safety, or general welfare of the area, but the proposal does have two issues that could potentially harm public health: 1) if the trailers were to contain items that had the potential to leak hazardous materials that could become an environmental concern; 2) the Fire Marshal has indicated that the current trailer storage configuration is a fire hazard and that it would be very difficult for the fire department to extinguish a fire if one occurred in the interior. The Fire Marshal has indicated that in order to reduce the fire danger, the IU should include the requirement of a trailer parking plan that provides for the stacking of no more than 2 trailers back-to-back, requires a minimum separation between trailers of 5 feet, and has fire access lanes. It is also important that the trailers remain locked and secured so that they do not become a magnet for crime.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Roseville City Council, to APPROVE the proposed INTERIM USE for temporary outdoor storage of semi-truck trailers and associated uses at 2211-2217 County Road C2 in accordance with Section §1009.03 of the Roseville City Code, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. A trailer storage and staging plan shall be submitted to the City that addresses the following conditions:
 - a. Trailers parked/stored on the west parcel shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet from all property lines.
 - b. Trailers can be parked/stored back-to-back.
 - c. All trailers must have a minimum 5-foot separation between each trailer.
 - d. No trailers will be allowed along the east fence, as this area shall be used as the main access and most likely drive lane to/from County Road C2.
 - e. Fire lanes shall be provided at a minimum of 30 feet in width and approved (final width and number) by the Fire Marshal to provide adequate access in case of a fire.
 - f. There shall be no outdoor storage of anything except trailers.
 - g. Shipping containers, cabs, or other storage is not permitted.

- h. No hazardous or dangerous materials shall be stored in the trailers. No materials that are likely to attract vermin or other pests shall be stored in the trailers.
 - i. All trailers shall be locked and secured.
2. The 2217 property (SRC) must install an 8-foot opaque screen fence, which shall extend from the front of the building west to the fence on the western property and from the rear of the building to the 2211 building (north of the fuel canopy). This fence is required in order to screen the storage and activities in the interior.
 3. All equipment and construction items, seasonal or other, of SRC must be stored on an all-weather surface.
 4. All loose materials, such as gravel, sand, or other product of SRC, must be placed in storage compartments.
 5. The large gravel pile, generally in the middle of the SRC property (2211 County Road C2) and adjacent to the west property line, must be removed by June 1, 2016.
 6. Semi-tractor sales and leasing shall be conducted only in the southeast corner parking lot and along the east side of quonset hut back to the fuel canopy. The City Planner will work with the tenant on a maximum number allowed and the orderly parking of the semi-trucks on the premises.
 7. If the fuel canopy is removed, its area can be used for service vehicle staging, but only on an approved all-weather surface.
 8. Grass shall be maintained per City Code, weeds and shrubs shall be removed from the lot.
 9. This IU approval shall expire at 11:59 pm on September 30, 2018; a 3 years IU term.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, by the Roseville City Council that representatives of the property owner and the applicant shall sign the form attached to this resolution to acknowledge that each has received, reviewed, and understood the terms and conditions of the approval and agrees to abide by said terms and conditions prior to commencement of the drive-through activity.

The motion for the adoption of the foregoing resolution was duly seconded by Council Member Etten and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor Willmus, Etten, McGehee, Laliberte and Mayor Roe; and None voted against.

WHEREUPON said resolution was declared duly passed and adopted.

*Resolution approving limited production and processing as an interim use at 2211-2217 County Road C2
(PF15-017)*

I, the undersigned, do hereby acknowledge that I have received, reviewed, and understand the attached and foregoing extract of minutes of a regular meeting of the Roseville City Council held on the 28th day of September 2015 and that I agree to abide by the terms and conditions of the approval as they apply to the temporary outdoor storage of semi-truck trailers and associated uses at 2211-2217 County Road C2.

Representative of 1926 Grand Avenue, LLC (Roseville Properties)

Chad D. Comers Chief Manager
printed name and title

Chad D. Comers
signature

12-7-15
date

From: Chad Commers <chad.commers@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Interim Use Permit for 221 CR C2 West
Date: February 8, 2019 at 7:18:47 PM EST
To: Shannon Marie Cunningham <shanneee@yahoo.com>
Cc: Cary Cunningham <cary_cunningham@yahoo.com>

Thank you for your comments Shannon.

We are actively marketing the property for sale and looking for development options. So while we understand why this is not the best end use, and why we hope to redevelop it in the future, there are a few reasons we need some more time.

First, is really its geographical location. As this property sits tucked back on the west side of 35, it is less desirable than the properties in the Twin Lakes area for potential redevelopments. Now that those sites with greater visibility have now been sold, listed or redeveloped the limitation on supply will increase demand for those looking at our site for a new building to locate their business.

Second, I would like to point out that there are a number of challenges with this particular site that are unique to it. One example is the power lines and the easement that goes beneath them. This creates a very limiting factor for potential development which limited the pool of potential users, because the size and shape of the building which is available is not a traditional rectangle. So right now we have found a few businesses, whose owners and employees can run a sustainable business on the site. The trailers being there may not everyone's ideal use, but it does create an opportunity for income for those working in that business and I think that is an important consideration to those families.

Third, I think it's important to mention that we have continued to invest in this site by recently acquiring the site to the north so that we increase our marketability to potential users and counteract some of the issues with the power lines and easements. I want to point this out, because I want to make it clear that we are not resting on our current position, but instead we are actively working on improving upon it though further investments in Roseville.

Finally, we have made sure to build in flexibility with our tenant so that in the event a potential user comes along, we can capitalize on it in a short timeline. This is designed to prevent the exact situation where the trailers would inhibit any potential redevelopment.

Hopefully, I have conveyed our challenges and goals well enough so that you can at least understand the reasoning behind our request.

Have a great weekend,

Chad Commers
612-801-0463
chad.commers@gmail.com

On Feb 7, 2019, at 10:28 AM, Shannon Marie Cunningham <shanneee@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Commers,

I am writing to express opposition to the request from 1926 Grand Ave, LLC and Voyd Trailer of MN, LLC to renew their existing Interim Use permit for 5 years to continue to store semi-trailers and storage containers on the premises. While I recognize that this property is currently, and has been for some time, under an IU for this same purpose, this property has been left undeveloped for some time. As a resident of this area of the city, I am becoming increasingly frustrated with this for the following reasons:

- The storage of the containers and trailers is an eyesore
- The continued use of these properties for storage of containers and trailers is a deterrent to sale or redevelopment of the property
- While minimal, there is no condition on the storage that prevents the containers and trailers from being moved in and out of the site on a frequent basis
- There is currently a high level of semi-trailer/storage container storage in the Northwest part of Roseville

Because of these reasons, I am opposed to a 5 year IU in this area.

Thank you,

Shannon M. Cunningham



565 1st Street SW
New Brighton, MN 55112
651-639-1300 phone & fax

City of Roseville
Community Development
2660 Civic Center Dr.
Roseville, MN 55113

1/15/19

Re: Renewal of Interim Use Permit – 2211 C2

This is a written narrative to point out the continued land use of the lot located at 2211 County Road C2. Voyd Trailer of MN, LLC sublets the space to clients for the parking and storage of loaded and empty trailers.

Voyd Trailer of MN, LLC is a MN Company is leasing the space from 1926 Grand Ave, LLC. The land is sub-let to store semi-trailers between jobs. Some units are empty and waiting for direction to be loaded. Some units are loaded with non-hazardous freight of all kinds. Trailers are stored short term prior to going to the next assignment. Or the trailers are waiting for an off load appointment. There is a constant turn-around of product. Trailers are moved between 5 am though 6 pm. The lot is usually closed for the night. The land is fenced all around and gated. There are no utilities on the site.

Voyd Trailer of MN, LLC maintains the land, fill and grade as needed, snow plowing and removal and general clean up. The lot is inspected regularly by Voyd Trailer.


Please contact Bill Kirkpatrick, Charlie, Longbella, or Mary Secor with any questions or concerns.

We are respectfully asking to renew the Interim Use Permit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Secor
Voyd Trailer of MN, LLC

mary@bigblueboxes.com



From: Chad Commers <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2019 5:36 PM
To: Janice Gundlach <Janice.Gundlach@cityofroseville.com>
Cc: Mark Sullivan <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 2211 Co. Rd C2

Janice,

Thank you for your call and questions.

I do want to take a moment to address the timing with the IUP. As the City may or may not be aware, we did have the site on the market throughout last year. We felt close on a number of deals for sales to corporate entities for new buildings which would have been redevelopments of the entire site. However, in the end those users each found a different site in the area. The timing of these negotiations coincided with the timing leading up to, and around the IUP expiration, which led us to believe it would have been a smooth handoff to the new owners for their plans and the optimal re-development. Once these fell apart, it was the holidays which cause further delays. In the end, time really just ran away from us which is the main cause for this to be as late as it is. We hope the City can accept our apologies for this. Going forward we will take greater diligence in assuring this does not happen again.

Nevertheless, this application for an extension of the IUP is necessary because as I noted in the narrative, there are still sites in Roseville which remain undeveloped. These sites are better locations, more easily developable, and offer more visibility. Until users have occupied these sites, there is going to be less interest in our site with its challenges of power lines and irregular shape. For these reasons, and the others noted throughout the application, we ask the City extend the IUP for another few years so we can find the right user who will create value and bring jobs.

Kindest regards,

Chad Commers
[REDACTED]



REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Agenda Date: 05/01/19

Agenda Item: 6b

Prepared By

Agenda Section
Public Hearings

Department Approval

Item Description: Consideration of a Conditional Use pursuant to Table 1006-1 and §1009 of the City Code to allow a motor freight terminal at 2340 Rose Place (PF19-006).

1 **APPLICATION INFORMATION**

- 2 Applicant: RJ Marco Construction, Inc.
- 3 Location: 2340 Rose Place
- 4 Property Owner: B & R Properties, LLC (Barole Trucking)
- 5 Application Submission: 04/05/19; deemed complete 04/11/19
- 6 City Action Deadline: 06/04/19
- 7 Planning File History: None

8 **LEVEL OF DISCRETION IN DECISION MAKING:** Actions taken on a Conditional Use request are
9 quasi-judicial; the City’s role is to determine the facts associated with the request and weigh
10 those facts against the legal standards in State Statutes and City Code.

11 **PROPOSAL**

12 The property at 2340 Rose Place has a current Zoning classification of Industrial District and lies
13 within Planning District 11. The site is located at the end of the street on a cul-de-sac with API
14 Group and Old Dutch to the west and Minnesota Commercial Railway NuStar Energy (tank
15 farm) to the east. North of the property across the Burlington Northern Railway line is the
16 Gateway West development. All directly adjacent land is zoned Industrial.

17 The 6.3 acre site was originally constructed in 1975 and last occupied by the Milsolv
18 Corporation. Barole Trucking has purchased the property with the intent to redevelop into an
19 intermodal logistics and transportation facility (intermodal motor freight terminal) and their main
20 headquarters. A motor freight terminal requires a Conditional Use (CU) under the Roseville
21 Zoning Code.

22 Barole’s redevelopment plan consists of a new 26,500 square foot building with a two-story
23 office area and includes shop/service space as well as storage/warehousing space. The site will
24 include employee and customer parking, as well as trailered containers parked/stored around the
25 periphery of the site. Additional details (plans and narrative) of the project can be found in
26 Attachment C.

27 **STAFF ANALYSIS**

28 Motor freight terminal is defined in §1001.10 of the Zoning Code as: *A building or area in which*
29 *freight is brought by motor truck is assembled and/or stored for routing in intrastate or interstate*

30 *shipping by motor truck.* The Planning Division also interprets a motor freight terminal as having a
31 number of ancillary/accessory uses such as the repair, maintenance, and outdoor storage of semi-
32 trailers and semi-trucks. Based on Barole’s proposed use of the property, Planning Division staff
33 determined their use to be a motor freight terminal, requiring an approved CU.

34 §1009.02.C sets forth the general Standards and Criteria the Planning Division, Planning
35 Commission, and City Council must use to make findings in support of or in opposition to the
36 request. Planning Division staff have reviewed the appropriate plans and information that
37 pertains to the CU criteria and have the following analysis/findings for Planning Commission
38 consideration:

39 1. *The proposed use is not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan:* The use of the property for
40 the development of a motor freight terminal is a conditional use, which is required to meet
41 specific criteria in §1009.02.D.37 of the City Code. Although not specifically identified or
42 noted in the 2030 Roseville Comprehensive Plan, the use is supported within the General
43 Land Use and Employment Area Goals and Policies sections.

44 **General Land Use Goals and Policies**

45 **Goal 1: Maintain and improve Roseville as an attractive place to live, work, and play by**
46 **promoting sustainable land-use patterns, land-use changes, and new developments that**
47 **contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the community’s vitality and sense**
48 **of identity.**

49 Policy 1.4: Maintain orderly transitions between different land uses in accordance with
50 the general land-use guidance of the Comprehensive Plan by establishing or
51 strengthening development design standards.

52 Policy 1.5: Promote well-planned and coordinated development.

53 **Goal 3: Identify underutilized, deteriorated, or blighted properties and guide them**
54 **toward revitalization, reinvestment, or redevelopment consistent with community goals**
55 **and good planning and development principles.**

56 Policy 3.2: Promote redevelopment that reduces blight, expands the tax base, enhances
57 the mix of land uses in the community, and achieves other community objectives.

58 **Employment Area Goals and Policies**

59 **Goal 11: Achieve a healthy balance between commercial and employment land uses to**
60 **maintain a sound and diversified economic base and living-wage jobs.**

61 Policy 11.1: Promote and support the redevelopment of physically and economically
62 obsolete or underutilized property.

63 Policy 11.2: Restrict and control open storage uses in commercial and industrial areas.

64 Policy 11.3: Encourage the development of multistory office and light-industrial uses to
65 use land efficiently, expand the property tax base, and create jobs.

66 Policy 11.4: Use official controls to ensure all office, industrial, and business park
67 developments consist of high-quality design, efficient parking strategies, and appropriate
68 site landscaping.



69

- 70 2. *The proposed use is not in conflict with any Regulating Maps or other adopted plans:* The
71 subject property does not have a regulating plan, nor are there any small area plans or other
72 plans that guide future development.
- 73 3. *The proposed use is not in conflict with any City Code requirements:* The CU for the use as a
74 motor freight terminal does include specific criteria that need to be met. The Planning
75 Division has reviewed the initial submittal against the CU criteria and the Design Standards
76 of §1006.02 and 1006.06. There are some items in the submitted plans that require
77 modification or clarification, however, the items pertaining directly to the CU are deemed to
78 be compliant. Staff will continue to work with Barole and its representatives regarding
79 achieving full compliance with the final plans.
- 80 4. *The proposed use will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public*
81 *facilities:* Although the use will increase vehicle trips on Rose Place, specifically trucks, this
82 increase will not create any adverse or excessive impacts to parks, other public facilities, and
83 specifically streets, as the road was designed with this type of traffic in mind. Similarly, the
84 office use and others within the building will require public water and sewer, however, these
85 too will not create a burden on the existing infrastructure.
- 86 5. *The proposed use will not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood, will not negatively*
87 *impact traffic or property values, and will not otherwise harm the public health, safety, and*
88 *general welfare:* The proposed use of the property as a motor freight terminal will increase
89 vehicle trips on Rose Place, but will not be injurious to surrounding neighborhoods and will
90 not negatively impact overall traffic in the area, adjacent property values, and will not
91 otherwise harm public health, safety, and general welfare.

92 Additionally §1009.02.D.37 has the following criteria specific to Motor Freight Terminals that
93 must be achieved:

- 94 a. *All outdoor semi-trailer storage shall occur on paved surfaces consistent with the parking*
95 *area requirements of Section 1019.11 of this Title, and shall adhere to the parking area*
96 *setback requirements in the applicable zoning district except that no outdoor semi-trailer*
97 *storage shall be allowed between a principal building and the primary public street as*
98 *determined by City staff. Areas of outdoor semi-trailer storage shall not obstruct required*
99 *drive aisles or parking stalls.* The proposed site improvements require the active vehicle
100 areas to be paved and include curb and gutter, as well as other enhancements. The proposal
101 seeks to park/store tractors, trailered containers, and trailers around the periphery allowing
102 the center to become the active tractor/trailer area – where tractors and trailered containers
103 are maneuvered as they come and go. The Planning Division will require the area in front of
104 the building and adjacent the cul-de-sac to be limited to employee/customer parking and not
105 tractor, trailered container, or trailer storage.
- 106 b. *All trailers shall be parked/stored a minimum of 10 feet from a side- or rear-yard property*
107 *line.* Planning Division staff will require the final plan to include the 10 foot minimum
108 setback for all tractors, trailered containers, and trailers from all property lines.
- 109 c. *Semi-trailers stored adjacent to Office/Business Parks or Regional Business zoned property*
110 *shall provide a 10-foot buffer area complete with screen planting and an opaque wall or*
111 *fence a minimum of 8 feet in height as approved by the Community Development*
112 *Department.* This criteria is not applicable as all adjacent properties are zoned Industrial.


Attachment A for Planning File 19-006





Site Location

Data Sources
* Ramsey County GIS Base Map (4/3/2019)
For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:
City of Roseville, Community Development Department,
2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

Disclaimer
This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7085. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.03, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.



Attachment B for Planning File 19-006




Location Map



Site Location

Data Sources
* Ramsey County GIS Base Map (4/3/2019)
* Aerial Data: Sanborn (4/2017)
For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:
City of Roseville, Community Development Department,
2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

Disclaimer
This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7085. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.02, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.



Thomas Paschke

From: Paul Nolan <pwnolan@rjmarco.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 4:08 PM
To: Thomas Paschke
Subject: 2340 Rose Place Site Utilization

Thomas, please see the narrative below from the President of BarOle Trucking.
Let me know if you need any additional information please.
Thanks,
Paul

From: Ray Olson [mailto:ROlson@BaroleTrucking.com]
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2019 1:41 PM
To: Paul Nolan <pwnolan@rjmarco.com>
Cc: Luke Kotilinek <LKotilinek@BaroleTrucking.com>
Subject: Roseville

Our new Roseville facility will serve as our main headquarters for our Minnesota operations. It will house accounts payable, accounts receivable, Human Resources, Safety dept., customer service, warehousing, and operations. We are a full service intermodal transportation company that was incorporated in 1984. BarOle pulls import and export containers to and from the local rail depots to various customers throughout the Midwest. Containers are pulled from the local rails and staged for delivery. There will be no long term storage of any equipment on site, the equipment is out under contract on a short term timeline. Based on current traffic volumes we see approximately 30-40 yard moves a day for loads that are waiting for delivery windows. Volumes fluctuate based on seasons and availability of power units. A majority of our freight goes directly from the rail to the customers and back.

Thank you,

Ray Olson
President
BarOle Trucking
Direct Line [651-366-6012](tel:651-366-6012)
Fax Line [651-426-6032](tel:651-426-6032)
rolson@baroletrucking.com



ELLERING & ASSOCIATES
10002 FLORENCE CT NE
BURNING WOOD, MN 55449
PH: 763-780-0450

NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION DESCRIPTION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN, SPECIFICATION, OR REPORT WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE: 3/31/19
PRINTED NAME: KRISTINA ELLERING LIC. NO. 42350

2340 ROSE PLACE W
ROSEVILLE, MN
GRADING AND UTILITY PLAN

DESIGNED BY: KJE
APPROVED BY: KJE
DRAWN BY: LWE
JOB NUMBER: 900057E
CAD DATE: 3/31/19
CAD FILE: /SITE_PLAN.DWG

SHEET
C3.0

CONSTRUCTION NOTES:



1. THE EXISTING UTILITIES SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE LOCATIONS ONLY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL DETERMINE THE EXACT LOCATION OF ANY AND SHALL EXISTING UTILITIES BEFORE COMMENCING WORK. THE CONTRACTOR AGREES TO BE FULLY RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGE ARISING OUT OF FAILURE TO EXACTLY LOCATE AND PRESERVE ANY AND ALL EXISTING UTILITIES.
2. BLACK DIRT TO BE STRIPPED, SALVAGED, AND STOCKPILED FROM ALL AREAS TO BE DISTURBED PRIOR TO ANY GRADING.


INFILTRATION BASIN GRADING NOTES:

- NO EXCAVATION/GRADING EQUIPMENT SHALL TRAVEL WITHIN ANY OF THE INFILTRATION BASIN AREAS AT ANY POINT DURING SITE CONSTRUCTION
- EXCAVATOR SHALL USE A TOOTHED BUCKET (NO SMOOTH EDGE BUCKET) WHEN EXCAVATING AND GRADING INFILTRATION BASINS TO REDUCE SOIL SMEARING
- EXCAVATION OF INFILTRATION BASINS SHALL ONLY OCCUR IN DRY SOIL CONDITIONS TO PREVENT UNNECESSARY COMPACTION IMPACTS
- INFILTRATION BASIN INLETS AND ALL SIDE SLOPES SHALL BE STABILIZED WITHIN 24-HOURS OF FINAL GRADING OF ANY INFILTRATION BASIN
- COMPOST/SAND MATERIAL IN BASINS SHALL CONSIST OF 3 PARTS SAND (6") WITH 2 PARTS COMPOST GRADE 2 (4") UNIFORMLY MIXED PRIOR TO PLACEMENT. IT HAS BEEN ASSUMED THAT MIXING 6" OF SAND WITH 4" OF COMPOST WILL RESULT IN A DEPTH AFTER PLACEMENT OF 8" DUE TO COMPRESSION OF THE COMPOST.

LEGEND

EXISTING STORM SEWER	—>>—
EXISTING STORM MANHOLE	⊙
EXISTING SANITARY SEWER	—>—
EXISTING SANITARY MANHOLE	⊙
EXISTING WATER MAIN	— —
EXISTING GATE VALVE	⊗
TELEPHONE PEDESTAL	⊠
TELEPHONE CABLE	—○—
TELEPHONE MANHOLE	⊙
FIBER OPTIC CABLE	—○—
FIBER OPTIC HAND HOLE	⊠
OVERHEAD WIRES	—OHU—
ELECTRICAL BOXES	⊠
GAS MAIN	—GAS—
UTILITY POLE	⊙
GUY OR ANCHOR	⊙
STREET LIGHT	⊙
GUARD POST	⊙
SIGN	⊙
BITUMINOUS CONCRETE	▨





1959 Sloan Place, Suite 100
Maplewood, MN 55117

Phone: (651) 487-3281
Fax: (651) 487-3283
NAI-Architects.com

PRELIMINARY
NOT TO BE USED FOR
CONSTRUCTION PURPOSES



**BAROLE
TRUCKING**

2340 ROSE PLACE WEST
ROSEVILLE, MN

File Name:
W:\2019016_Barole_Roseville\2019016_AR102_FLR_18-0422.dwg
Last Modified:
Apr 22, 2019
Plot Date:
Apr 22, 2019 at 05:15pm
CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS INCLUDING THE DESIGN AND IDEAS
ARE THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF NAI ARCHITECTS, INC. ©


Issues & Revisions:	

Comm. No.: 2019016
Drawn By: SB
Date: 04/22/2019

Sheet Name:
**SECOND
FLOOR
PLAN**


Sheet No.:

A102



1 SECOND FLOOR PLAN
A102 SCALE: 3/32" = 1'-0"





ELFERING & ASSOCIATES
10002 FLORENCE CT NE
BLAINE, MN 55449
PH: 763-780-0450

NO.	DATE	BY	REVISION DESCRIPTION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN, SPECIFICATION, OR REPORT WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.
SIGNATURE _____ DATE: 3/31/19
PRINTED NAME: KRISTINA ELFERING LIC. NO. 42350



2340 ROSE PLACE W
ROSEVILLE, MN
CIRCULATION PLAN

DESIGNED BY: KJE
APPROVED BY: KJE
DRAWN BY: LWE
JOB NUMBER: 900057E
CAD DATE: 3/31/19
CAD FILE: /SITE_PLAN.DWG

SHEET
C4.0

LEGEND


EXISTING STORM SEWER	
EXISTING STORM MANHOLE	
EXISTING SANITARY SEWER	
EXISTING SANITARY MANHOLE	
EXISTING WATER MAIN	
EXISTING GATE VALVE	
TELEPHONE PEDESTAL	
TELEPHONE CABLE	
TELEPHONE MANHOLE	
FIBER OPTIC CABLE	
FIBER OPTIC HAND HOLE	
OVERHEAD WIRES	
ELECTRICAL BOXES	
GAS MAIN	
UTILITY POLE	
GUY OR ANCHOR	
STREET LIGHT	
GUARD POST	
SIGN	
BITUMINOUS	
CONCRETE	




GENERAL NOTES:

- All plant beds to receive **1.5" Rock w/ Weed Barrier**
- Commercial Grade **Vinyl Edger** to be installed where plant beds abut turf.
- Commercial irrigation system to be designed by the landscape contractor
- All planting beds and sod within the property limits shall be irrigated with adequate water coverage (including the courtyard)
- Provide **4' diameter Hardwood Mulch Tree Ring** at all trees located in turf areas.


KEY



2.5" BB Deciduous Tree



6" BB Evergreen Tree




MIDWEST LANDSCAPES
 Est. 1970
 6221 Oakwood Avenue NE
 Otsego, MN 55330
 763-241-1320
 www.midwestlandscapes.com

This Plan and any reproductions are the sole property of Midwest Landscapes, Inc. and may not be used in whole or part for any purpose without the express written consent of Midwest Landscapes, Inc.

Project Title/Location:
LANDSCAPE PRELIMINARY PLAN
2340 Rose Place
Roseville, MN


Prepared For:
RJ Marco Construction
 75 W Viking Dr. #104
 Little Canada, MN 55117

Designer Contact Info:

Aaron Anson
 612.470.9387
 a.anson@midwestlandscapes.com

Designed By: A. Anson	Sheet Number: L1
Checked By:	1 OF 1
Date: 04/04/2019	

Landscape Plan
 Scale 1" = 40'-0"

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

Department Approval

Agenda Section
Public Hearings

Item Description: Request for approval to rezone property from Low Density Residential-1 (LDR-1) to Low Density Residential-2 (LDR-2), and for approval of the 6-lot Midland Legacy Estate preliminary plat for development of 6 twinhome dwelling units including an outlot that may lead to 2 additional twinhome lots in a future plat (**PF19-003**)

APPLICATION INFORMATION

Applicant:	Integrity Land Development		
Location:	2433 County Road B		
Property Owner:	Alphonse Mattera		
Open House Meeting:	March 4, 2019		
Application Submittal:	Rezoning Application Received 3/12/2019 Considered complete 3/14/2019	Preliminary Plat Application Received 3/12/2019 Considered complete 4/10/2019	
City Action Deadline:	5/13/2019, per Minn. Stat. §15.99 Extended to 7/12/2019	8/3/2019, per Minn. Stat. §462.358 subd. 3b	

GENERAL SITE INFORMATION

Land Use Context


	Existing Land Use	Guiding	Zoning
Site	One-family residential, detached	LR	LDR-1
North	One-family residential, detached	LR	LDR-1
West	Apartment building (17 units)	HR	HDR-1
East	One-family residential, detached	LR	LDR-1
South	Golf course	GC	PR

Notable Natural Features: The site has several mature trees and significant slopes.

Planning File History: none

LEVEL OF CITY DISCRETION IN DECISION-MAKING

Action taken on a proposed zoning change is **legislative** in nature; the City has broad discretion in making land use decisions based on advancing the health, safety, and general welfare of the community. Action taken on a plat request is **quasi-judicial**; the City’s role is to determine the facts associated with the request, and weigh them against the legal standards in State Statute and City Code.



1 **BACKGROUND**

2 The applicant proposes to remove the existing house at 2433 County Road B and subdivide the
3 residential property resulting in the six-lot Midland Legacy Estate plat for development of
4 twinhomes, including an outlot that could be platted as two more twinhome lots in the future.
5 The proposed twinhome lots are designed to conform to the requirements of the LDR-2 zoning
6 district, so the proposal includes the necessary application for approval of the rezoning from the
7 LDR-1 district to the LDR-2 district. The proposal also relies on the vacation of a large portion
8 of the County Road B right-of-way easement abutting the property. The proposed preliminary
9 plat is illustrated in Attachment C, along with other development information.

10 When exercising the City’s legislative authority on a rezoning request, the role of the City is to
11 review a proposal for its merits in addition to evaluating the potential impacts to the public
12 health, safety, and general welfare of the community. If a rezoning request is found to be
13 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and is otherwise a desirable proposal, the City may still
14 deny the rezoning request if the proposal fails to promote the public health, safety, and general
15 welfare.

16 When exercising the “quasi-judicial” authority on subdivision and subdivision variance requests,
17 the role of the City is to determine the facts associated with a particular proposal and apply those
18 facts to the legal standards contained in the ordinance and relevant state law. In general, if the
19 facts indicate the application meets the relevant legal standards and will not compromise the
20 public health, safety, and general welfare, then the applicant is likely entitled to the approval.
21 The City is, however, able to add conditions to a subdivision and subdivision variance approval
22 to ensure that potential impacts to parks, schools, roads, storm sewers, and other public
23 infrastructure on and around the subject property are adequately addressed. Subdivisions may
24 also be modified to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare, and to provide for the
25 orderly, economic, and safe development of land, and to promote housing affordability for all
26 levels.

27 **RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENT VACATION**

28 County Road B formerly connected to Minnesota Highway 280 to the west. Several years ago,
29 however, the highway was permanently disconnected County Road B, and Ramsey County
30 turned over to the City that portion of County Road B between Cleveland Avenue and its
31 termination at Highway 280. The applicant is currently working with the owner of the apartment
32 property at 2447 County Road B, the Midland Hills Country Club, and the Roseville Public
33 Works Department to vacate the right-of-way easement area that has become unnecessary. While
34 the request to vacate the right-of-way easement remains unresolved during this discussion of the
35 preliminary plat, it must be resolved before the City Council can approve the final plat.
36 Therefore, if the rezoning and preliminary plat request is approved, the approval should include a
37 condition that the right-of-way easement vacation be completed before an application is
38 submitted for approval of the final plat.

39 If the vacation is approved, the applicant intends to acquire the roughly 70-foot-by-90-foot
40 rectangle in the southwestern corner of the proposed plat from the owner of the apartment
41 property, combine this parcel with the proposed Outlot A, and plat it as the two additional
42 twinhome lots noted earlier in this RPCA. Planning Division staff anticipates that such a process
43 would elicit another preliminary plat with its requisite public hearing, although no Developer
44 Open House meeting would be necessary.

45 **REZONING ANALYSIS**

46 The subject property is guided by the Comprehensive Plan for Low-Density Residential (LR)
47 land uses, which generally allows one- and two-family homes up to eight dwelling units per acre.
48 The proposed LDR-2 District was established to facilitate development consistent with the LR
49 designation by providing:

50 “an environment of one-family dwellings on small lots, two-family and townhouse dwellings,
51 along with related uses such as public services and utilities that serve the residents in the district.
52 The district is established to recognize existing areas with concentrations of two-family and
53 townhouse dwellings, and for application to areas guided for redevelopment at densities up to 8
54 units per acre or with a greater diversity of housing types.” *City Code §1004.09*

55 The LDR-1 and LDR-2 districts were created as the two zoning districts that are compatible with
56 the LR designation in the Comprehensive Plan, so Planning Division staff finds the proposed
57 rezoning to be consistent with this guidance of the Comprehensive Plan. Further, because the
58 requested LDR-2 rezoning would facilitate smaller lots that would naturally constrain the size of
59 homes that can be built on them, they would be consistent with the spirit and intent of the
60 Comprehensive Plan and the LDR-2 zoning district to increase the diversity of housing types and
61 sizes available in the community. The increased density of the proposed LDR-2 lots compared to
62 the HDR-1 district to the west can also be viewed as a reasonable way to transition from the
63 higher-density apartment building to the single-family neighborhood to the north and east of the
64 property. Lastly, as the City Council is preliminarily identifying its priorities for 2019 – 2020,
65 this type of housing has been called out as a priority. While this priority has not been finalized, it
66 is of staff’s opinion this factor should be considered. For these reasons, Planning Division staff
67 finds that the requested rezoning is an appropriate application of the LDR-2 district, and
68 recommends its approval.

69 **PLAT ANALYSIS**

70 Roseville’s Development Review Committee (DRC) met on April 11, and April 18, 2019, to
71 review the proposed subdivision plans. Below are the comments based on the DRC’s review of
72 the application.

73 Proposed Lots

74 The widths and parcel areas of the proposed lots are as follows.

	<i>Minimum LDR-2 Standard</i>	Proposed Lots
Width	<i>30 ft.</i>	33.25 ft. – 35.00 ft
Area	<i>4,800 sq. ft.</i>	6,001 sq. ft. – 6,317 sq. ft.

75 The proposed lots exceed the minimum requirements in all respects.

76 Easements

77 The drainage and utility easements shown at the margins of the site meet or exceed the
78 requirements established in §1103.03 of the Subdivision Code. Because the storm water
79 management plan for the proposed development would avoid drainage paths between the
80 residential structures, however, the City Engineer has recommended the elimination of the
81 drainage and utility easements shown on the internal lot boundaries.

82 Park Dedication

83 The Parks and Recreation Commission reviewed the proposed plat at its April 2, 2019, meeting
84 and recommended a dedication of cash in lieu of parkland. Because the proposed plat represents
85 a net increase of five development lots, the current Park Dedication Fee of \$4,000 would apply to
86 each of those five lots. Therefore, a condition of approval of the preliminary plat should include
87 a condition that the \$20,000 Park Dedication Fee be paid by the applicant before the final plat is
88 released for filing at Ramsey County.

89 Tree Preservation

90 The tree preservation and replacement plan requirements of City Code §1011.04 provide a way
91 to quantify the amount of tree material being removed for a given project and to calculate the
92 potential tree replacement obligation, and the tree preservation plan is included in Attachment C.
93 This is a preliminary calculation, however, based on the presumed development of the proposed
94 lots; a final tree preservation and replacement plan will be required at the time building permit
95 applications are submitted for the new parcels. The submitted tree preservation plan was
96 prepared by Mark Rehder, the forester that provides Roseville’s consulting forestry services, and
97 it shows that the assumed development of the proposed lots would elicit a requirement to plant
98 189 caliper inches (which is equivalent to 63 replacement trees) at the conclusion of the
99 development.

100 Storm Water Management

101 The grading and storm water management plan illustrated in Attachment C addresses the
102 assumed level of development on the proposed lots as required. Like the tree preservation plan,
103 the storm water management plan reviewed with a plat proposal is not intended to be approved
104 with the plat as the final storm water management plan. Instead, the tree preservation and storm
105 water management plans reviewed with a plat proposal are intended to demonstrate that the
106 standard City Code requirements pertaining to tree preservation and storm water management
107 can be met as the proposed project is implemented.

108 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

109 The applicant held the required Developer Open House meeting on March 4, 2019; the
110 developer’s summary of that meeting was mailed to the meeting attendees who provided their
111 address and is included with this RPCA as Attachment D. At the time this RPCA was prepared,
112 Planning Division staff has not received any comments or questions about the proposed plat.

113 **RECOMMENDED ACTION**

114 **By motion, recommend approval of the proposed rezoning and preliminary Midland**
115 **Legacy Estate plat of the residential property at 2433 County Road B**, based on the content
116 of this RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation, with the following
117 conditions:

- 118 a) The requested vacation of the County Road B right-of-way easement shall be
119 completed before an application is submitted for approval of the final plat.
- 120 b) The applicant shall pay the \$20,000 Park Dedication Fee before the approved final
121 plat is released for filing at Ramsey County.
- 122 c) The applicant shall create a homeowners’ association or similar organizational
123 structure to ensure the proper maintenance of the storm water management practices
124 that will be implemented pursuant to an approved storm water management plan.

125 **ALTERNATIVE ACTIONS**

126 **A) Pass a motion to table the item for future action.** An action to table must be based on
127 the need for additional information or further analysis to make a recommendation on the
128 request. Tabling beyond July 12, 2019, may require the applicant's consent to extend the
129 rezoning action deadline pursuant to Minn. Stat. §15.99 to avoid statutory approval.

130 **B) Pass a motion to recommend denial of the request.** A recommendation of denial
131 should be supported by specific findings of fact based on the Planning Commission's
132 review of the application, applicable zoning or subdivision regulations, and the public
133 record.

Attachments: A: Area map
B: Aerial photo

C: Proposed subdivision, grading and
drainage plan, and tree replacement
calculation
D: Developer Open House summary

Prepared by: Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd 651-792-7073 bryan.lloyd@cityofroseville.com

Attachment B for Planning File 19-002



Prepared by:
Community Development Department
Printed: April 26, 2019



Site Location


Data Sources

- * Ramsey County GIS Base Map (4/3/2019)
- * Aerial Data: Sanborn (4/2017)



For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:
City of Roseville, Community Development Department,
2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

Disclaimer

This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7085. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.02, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.



RPCA Attachment C
**MIDLAND
 LEGACY
 ESTATE**



BENCHMARKS

ELEVATIONS BASED ON INFORMATION AS SHOWN ON THE MNDOT GEODETIC WEBSITE. SURVEY DISK BM ROSEVILLE WITH AN ELEVATION OF 952.52 WAS USED TO ESTABLISH VERTICAL CONTROL FOR THIS SURVEY (NAVD 88)

UNDERGROUND UTILITIES NOTES:

THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HAVE BEEN LOCATED FROM FIELD SURVEY INFORMATION AND EXISTING DRAWINGS. THE SURVEYOR MAKES NO GUARANTEE THAT THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN COMPRISE ALL SUCH UTILITIES IN THE AREA, EITHER IN SERVICE OR ABANDONED. THE SURVEYOR FURTHER DOES NOT WARRANT THAT THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN ARE IN THE EXACT LOCATION INDICATED ALTHOUGH HE DOES CERTIFY THAT THEY ARE LOCATED AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE FROM THE INFORMATION AVAILABLE. THIS SURVEY HAS NOT PHYSICALLY LOCATED THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES. GOPHER STATE ONE CALL LOCATE TICKET NUMBER(S) 190740517. SOME MAPS WERE RECEIVED, WHILE OTHER UTILITIES DID NOT RESPOND TO THE LOCATE REQUEST. ADDITIONAL UTILITIES OF WHICH WE ARE UNAWARE MAY EXIST.



- SURVEY NOTES:**
1. BEARINGS ARE BASED ON THE RAMSEY COUNTY COORDINATES NAD 1983
 2. UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN PER GOPHER ONE LOCATES AND AS-BUILT PLANS PROVIDED BY THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT.
 3. THERE MAY BE SOME UNDERGROUND UTILITIES, GAS, ELECTRIC, ETC. NOT SHOWN OR LOCATED.
 4. CONTOURS SHOWN PER LIDAR DATA OBTAINED FROM THE DNR MNTPO WEBSITE. NOT FIELD VERIFIED.

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

(AS SHOWN ON LIBERTY TITLE, INC., AS AGENT FOR OLD REPUBLIC NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY TITLE COMMITMENT NO. 1902-1302-RY DATED FEB. 14TH, 2019)

The north 90 feet of the south 123 feet of the west 110 feet of the east 143 feet and the north 220.66 feet of the south 343.66 feet of the west 180.5 feet of the east 213.5 feet of the East Half of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of Section 8, Township 29 North, Range 23 West.

EASEMENT NOTES:

(AS SHOWN ON LIBERTY TITLE, INC., AS AGENT FOR OLD REPUBLIC NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY TITLE COMMITMENT NO. 1902-1302-RY DATED FEB. 14TH, 2019)

7. ROADWAYS AS SHOWN ON AVAILABLE MAPS (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)
8. EASEMENT PER COC. NO. 1948595 (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)
9. HIGHWAY EASEMENT PER DOC. NO. _____ TURNBACK TO THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE PER DOC. NO. _____ (AS SHOWN ON SURVEY)

PROPOSED HIGHWAY EASEMENT VACATION:

That part of the East Half of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of Section 8, Township 29 North, Range 23 West which lies southerly of the following described line:

Beginning at a point which is 33.00 feet west and 118.00 feet north of the southeast corner of the East Half of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of Section 8, Township 29 North, Range 23 West; thence run northwesterly to a point on the east line of the west 268.50 feet of said East Half of the West Half distant 158.00 feet north of the south line of said Section 8.

and which lies northerly of a line distant 33.00 feet northerly and parallel with the following described line:

COMMENCING at the southeast corner of said West Half of the Southwest Quarter; thence on an assumed bearing of North 00 degrees 35 minutes 45 seconds West along the east line of said West Half a distance of 35.45 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING of the line to be described; thence North 85 degrees 55 minutes 11 seconds West a distance of 6.64 feet; thence westerly 169.86 feet along a tangential curve concave to the south having a radius of 1,145.92 feet and a central angle of 08 degrees 29 minutes 34 seconds; thence South 85 degrees 35 minutes 14 seconds West a distance of 218.59 feet to the east line of the west 268.50 feet of said East Half of the West Half and said line there terminating.



DEVELOPMENT DATA:

AREA OF EXISTING PARCEL = 49,731 SQ.FT.
 AREA OF EXISTING HIGHWAY EASEMENT = 10,800 SQ.FT.
 AREA OF HIGHWAY EASEMENT TO BE VACATED = 6,550 SQ.FT.
 AREA OF REMAINING HIGHWAY EASEMENT = 4,250 SQ.FT.
 TOTAL NET AREA OF EXISTING PARCEL LESS PROPOSED R/W = 45,481 SQ.FT.

PROPOSED LOTS = 6

LOT 1 = 6,393 SQ.FT.
 LOT 2 = 6,002 SQ.FT.
 LOT 3 = 6,001 SQ.FT.
 LOT 4 = 6,002 SQ.FT.
 LOT 5 = 6,002 SQ.FT.
 LOT 6 = 6,317 SQ.FT.

PROPOSED OUTLOT A = 8,764 SQ.FT.
 PROPOSED R/W = 4,250 SQ.FT.



CONTACT:

HEIFORT HILLS DEVELOPMENT, LLC
 ATTN: TODD GANZ
 PHONE: 612-369-2747
 tdganz@gmail.com

COUNTY/CITY:

RAMSEY COUNTY

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

REVISIONS:

DATE	REVISION
4-4-19	PRELIMINARY PLAT


CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that this plan was prepared by me, or under my direct supervision, and that I am a duly Licensed Land Surveyor under the laws of the state of Minnesota.

Daniel L. Thurnes
 Daniel L. Thurnes Registration Number: 25718
 Date: 3-21-19

PROJECT LOCATION:

2433
 COUNTY ROAD B W
 PID#082923330004



**CORNERSTONE
 LAND SURVEYING, INC.**

FILE NAME: SURVTG02
 PROJECT NO.: TG19002

PRELIMINARY PLAT **S2**





REMOVAL PLAN

GRADING, DRAINAGE, AND EROSION CONTROL PLAN

REMOVAL PLAN

1. PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS PER CITY OF ROSEVILLE, MINNESOTA ENGINEERING SERVICES DIVISION STANDARD DETAIL SPECIFICATIONS 2018 AND THE 2018 EDITION OF THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION" SHALL APPLY, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.


SEE TREE PRESERVATION PLAN FOR TREE REMOVALS



GRADING AND EROSION CONTROL

- PROJECT SPECIFICATIONS PER CITY OF ROSEVILLE, MINNESOTA ENGINEERING SERVICES DIVISION STANDARD DETAIL SPECIFICATIONS 2018 AND THE 2018 EDITION OF THE MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION" SHALL APPLY, UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
- SEDIMENT CONTROL STRUCTURES AND SILT FENCE MUST BE IN PLACE PRIOR TO STARTING OF GRADING AND MUST BE MAINTAINED UNTIL FINAL STABILIZATION HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED.
- TURF SHALL BE ESTABLISHED PER MINNESOTA ENGINEERING SERVICES DIVISION STANDARD DETAIL SPECIFICATIONS 2018, THE CURRENT EDITION OF THE MnDOT SEEDING MANUAL, AND MnDOT SPECIFICATION 2575.
- WHEREVER CONSTRUCTION VEHICLE ACCESS ROUTES INTERSECT PAVED PUBLIC ROADS, PROVISIONS MUST BE MADE TO MINIMIZE THE TRANSPORT OF SEDIMENT (MUD) BY RUNOFF OR VEHICLE TRACKING ONTO THE PAVED ROAD SURFACE. WHERE SEDIMENT IS TRANSPORTED ONTO A PUBLIC ROAD SURFACE, THE ROADS SHALL BE CLEANED THOROUGHLY AT THE END OF EACH DAY. SEDIMENT SHALL BE REMOVED FROM ROADS BY SHOVELING OR SWEEPING AND BE TRANSPORTED TO A SEDIMENT CONTROLLED DISPOSAL AREA. STREET WASHING SHALL BE ALLOWED ONLY AFTER SEDIMENT IS REMOVED IN THIS MANNER.
- THE GRADING CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL EROSION CONTROL MEASURES CALLED FOR ON THE PLANS, WHICH MAY INCLUDE SILT FENCE, ROCK EXIT SEDIMENTATION BASINS OR TEMPORARY SEDIMENT TRAPS WHICH SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED AND MADE SERVICEABLE PRIOR TO COMMENCING ANY GRADING OPERATIONS.
- ALL EROSION FACILITIES SHALL BE MAINTAINED BY THE CONTRACTOR DURING GRADING OPERATIONS AND UNTIL AFTER TURF IS ESTABLISHED.
- IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR TO DISPOSE OF OFF-SITE ALL TREES, STUMPS, BRUSH, OR OTHER DEBRIS THAT EXISTS WITHIN THE CONSTRUCTION AREA.
- ALL GRADED SLOPES SHALL NOT EXCEED 4:1, EXCEPT AS NOTED.
- THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL DUST CONTROL.
- THE GRADING CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE STRIPPING AND STOCKPIILING OF TOPSOIL. TOPSOIL SHALL BE STOCKPIILED IN AREAS DESIGNATED BY THE ENGINEER.
- PROPOSED CONCRETE CURB AND GUTTER SHALL MATCH EXISTING GUTTER.

CBMH 1
(OCS WITH WEIR WALL & 4" ORIFICE)



UTILITIES:	CONTACT INFORMATION
CENTURYLINK	(763) 712-5017
CENTERPOINT ENERGY	(763) 323-2760
COMCAST	(952) 607-4078
CONNEXUS ENERGY	(763) 323-4268
GREAT RIVERS ENERGY	(763) 445-5984
KOCH PIPELINE	(952) 832-2684 (952) 807-4183
XCEL ENERGY	(612) 526-4508

DATE	REVISION HISTORY

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN WAS PREPARED BY ME OR UNDER MY DIRECT SUPERVISION AND THAT I AM A DULY REGISTERED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.
Thomas P. Collins
DATE 4/12/2019 REG. NO. 26471

RFC ENGINEERING, INC.
Consulting Engineers


13635 Johnson Street
Ham Lake, MN 55304
Telephone 763-862-8000
Fax 763-862-8042

MIDLAND LEGACY ESTATE
ROSEVILLE, MN
GRADING, DRAINAGE, EROSION CONTROL
AND REMOVAL PLAN

DWG: REMOVALS_GRADING
DATE: 3/28/19
JOB NUMBER: 1903
SHEET: C 2
FILE: 36-1-151

DESIGN BY: CSA/GJM DRAWN BY: CSA/GJM CHECKED BY: TPC

MIDLAND LEGACY ESTATE



KNOW ALL PERSONS BY THESE PRESENTS: That Heifort Hills Development, LLC., a Minnesota limited liability company, owner of the following described property situated in the City of Roseville, County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota:

The north 90 feet of the south 123 feet of the west 110 feet of the east 143 feet and the north 220.66 feet of the south 343.66 feet of the west 180.5 feet of the east 213.5 feet of the East Half of the West Half of the Southwest Quarter of Section 8, Township 29 North, Range 23 West.

Has caused the same to be surveyed and platted as MIDLAND LEGACY ESTATE and does hereby dedicate to the public for public use forever the public ways and easements for drainage and utility purposes only as shown on this plat.

In witness whereof said Heifort Hills Development, LLC., a Minnesota limited liability company, has caused these presents to be signed by its proper officer this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Signed: Heifort Hills Development, LLC., a Minnesota limited liability company

_____, manager
Todd D. Ganz

STATE OF _____
COUNTY OF _____

The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 20____, by Todd D. Ganz, manager of Heifort Hills Development, LLC., a Minnesota limited liability company, on behalf of the company.

Notary Public, _____ County, _____
My Commission Expires _____

I, Daniel L. Thurmes, do hereby certify that I have surveyed or directly supervised the survey of the property described on this plat; prepared this plat or directly supervised the preparation of this plat; that this plat is a correct representation of the boundary survey; that all mathematical data and labels are correctly designated on this plat; that all monuments depicted on this plat have been correctly set; that all monuments indicated on this plat will be correctly set within one year; that all water boundaries and wet lands, as defined in Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.01, Subd. 3, as of the date of this surveyor's certification are shown and labeled on this plat; and all public ways are shown and labeled on this plat.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Daniel L. Thurmes, Land Surveyor
Minnesota License No. 25718

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF _____
The foregoing instrument was acknowledged before me this _____ day of _____, 20____, by Daniel L. Thurmes, Licensed Land Surveyor.

Notary Public, _____ County, Minnesota
My Commission Expires _____

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
We do hereby certify that on the _____ day of _____, 20____, the City Council of the City of ROSEVILLE, Minnesota, approved this plat. Also, the conditions of Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.03, Subd. 2, have been fulfilled

_____, Mayor _____, Clerk

PROPERTY TAX, RECORDS, AND ELECTION SERVICES DEPARTMENT
Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 505.021, Subd. 9, taxes payable in the year 20____ on the land hereinbefore described have been paid. Also, pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 272.12, there are no delinquent taxes and transfer entered this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Christopher A. Samuel, Ramsey County Auditor/Treasurer

By _____, Deputy


COUNTY SURVEYOR
Pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 383A.42, this plat is approved this _____ day of _____, 20____.

Craig W. Hinzman, L.S.
Ramsey County Surveyor


COUNTY RECORDER, County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota
I hereby certify that this plat of MIDLAND LEGACY ESTATE was filed in the office of the County Recorder for public record on this _____ day of _____, 20____, at _____ o'clock _____ M. and was duly filed in Book _____ of Plats, Page _____, as Document Number _____.

Deputy County Recorder


DRAINAGE AND UTILITY EASEMENTS
ARE SHOWN AS THUS:
(NOT TO SCALE)



BEING 10 FEET IN WIDTH AND ADJOINING STREET LINES AND REAR LOT LINES AND BEING 2.50 FEET IN WIDTH AND ADJOINING LOT LINES UNLESS OTHERWISE SHOWN ON THE PLAT.




FOR THE PURPOSES OF THIS SURVEY THE SOUTH LINE OF THE S 1/2 OF THE E 1/2 SW 1/4 OF SEC. 8, T29N, R23W IS ASSUMED TO BEAR N89°50'35"W.



LEGEND

- Denotes monument found (as noted)
- Denotes 1/2 inch x 14 inch iron pipe set and marked with Minnesota License No. 25718 to be set within one year after recording of this plat.
- Denotes 1/2 inch x 14 inch iron pipe set and marked with Minnesota License No. 25718 unless otherwise indicated.



CORNERSTONE
LAND SURVEYING, INC.

FINAL
PLAT S3

Neighborhood Meeting Summary for Re-Zoning

2433 County Road B West

Roseville, MN 55113

Meeting/Open House at Midland Hills Country Club

Monday, March 4th, 2019

6:30PM – 8:30PM

To the City of Roseville and All Who Attended;

17 people signed in, 5 more from the neighborhood were there, but did not sign in.

The overall meeting was very positive and well received by the neighbors. They all liked that twinhomes were being constructed and sold with quality exteriors and large main level living area and the large full basements that can be finished also.

There were only 2 questions asked by neighbors that were concerning them before the meeting. 1 – When building and selling \$500,000.00 homes that are 2 doors down from my home that we have been in since 1972, will affect our home taxes? My response was and is that it would be about 5 years for any tax increase and the county assessor is the one that decides if any increase other than normal appreciation value is required.

2 – How many more vehicles will be driving in on County Road B West once all the homes are constructed and sold? My response was that probably 7 to 16 more vehicles. Most of these will probably be purchased by 55 and older with empty nests.

After these questions were answered there were numerous questions about when will the twinhomes be ready for purchase? Will there be a HOA in place to mow grass and remove snow? How big is the garage? Can the owner have a small garden area at the back of their unit? Who is going to build them?

Overall the meeting was positive and very enjoyable to meet the neighborhood people.

Thank you,

Todd Ganz, President

612-369-2747

Integrity Land Development, Inc.

13635 Johnson St. NE

Ham Lake, MN 55304



REQUEST FOR PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

Agenda Date: **05/01/19**
Agenda Item: **6d**

Prepared By

Department Approval

Janice Gundlach

Agenda Section
Public Hearings

Item Description: Request by CommonBond Communities for consideration of a **Comprehensive Land Use Plan map change, Zoning map change, and Conditional Use** at 165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street (**PF19-004**).

1 **APPLICATION INFORMATION**

2 Applicant: CommonBond Communities
3 Location: 165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and
4 3033 Rice Street
5 Property Owner: Mary and Jim Krautbauer
6 Application Submission: April 5, 2019
7 City Action Deadline: June 3, 2019, extended to August 2, 2019
8 Project File History: none

9 **LEVEL OF DISCRETION IN DECISION MAKING:**

10 Actions taken on a Comprehensive Plan Land Use change and Rezoning request are legislative;
11 the City has broad discretion in making land use decisions based on advancing the health, safety,
12 and general welfare of the community. Actions taken on a Conditional Use request are quasi-
13 judicial; the City’s role is to determine the facts associated with the request and weigh those facts
14 against the legal standards in State Statutes and City Code.

15 **PROPOSAL**

16 The proposal by CommonBond Communities consists of a Comprehensive Land Use Map
17 Change and subsequent Rezoning to permit the construction of a 60 unit affordable, multi-family
18 senior housing project. The development proposal also seeks consideration of a Conditional Use
19 approval to support the increase in unit density on the property from 24 units per acre to 32 units
20 per acre (Attachment C – project narrative and concept plans).

21 Specifically, the land use map change seeks to amend the existing Comprehensive Plan Map
22 from LR - Low Density Residential (1/2 of 165 Owasso Blvd and 3029 and 3033 Rice Street)
23 and NB - Neighborhood Business (1/2 of 165 Owasso Blvd and 3011 Rice Street) to HR – High
24 Density Residential. Similarly, the proposal seeks to amend the existing Official Zoning Map
25 from Low Density Residential-1 (LDR-1) and Community Business (CB) District to High
26 Density Residential-1 (HDR-1) District.

27 On March 14, 2019, CommonBond Communities held the required Open House Meeting to
28 discuss with those in attendance their desires for the subject property. Approximately 31 area
29 residents attended. A summary of the Open House can be found as Attachment D and was
30 mailed to the meeting attendees who provided their address.

31 **COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN MAP CHANGE:**

32 Applicant initiated Comprehensive Plan and Official Zoning Map changes go through the same
33 open house and public hearing process as City initiated map changes. They also require a
34 recommendation by the Planning Commission to approve a change to the Comprehensive Plan
35 with an affirmative vote of at least 5/7ths of the Planning Commission's total membership.

36 The subject property lies within Planning District 5 of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, which does
37 not specifically provide direction regarding this subject property. The District does, however,
38 discuss the future need of a Rice Street Corridor study.

39 As stewards of the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, staff has been advancing specified goals and
40 policies contained within the Land Use Chapter of the Plan since its adoption in 2009. In 2010,
41 the Planning Division worked with its consultant to develop a new Zoning Code to be consistent
42 with the Plan. More specifically, a number of changes were made to ensure consistency with the
43 General Land Use, Residential Area, Commercial Area, and Mixed-Use Area Goals and Policies.
44 In the years since the 2010 Zoning Code adoption, the Planning Division has continued to
45 advance these Policy goals with amendments to various chapters of the Zoning Code.

46 Similarly, when developments come forward seeking guidance concerning the Comprehensive
47 Plan, staff works with these individuals on whether a proposed project advances the Goals and
48 Policies of the Plan.

49 The Planning Division has reviewed the proposal by CommonBond Communities to develop 60-
50 units of affordable, multi-family senior housing at 165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and
51 3033 Rice Street to determine if the proposed land use map change from Low Density
52 Residential and Neighborhood Business to High Density Residential is supported by the Goals
53 and Policies of the Roseville 2030 Comprehensive. The following Goals and Policies of the Plan
54 are applicable to this project:

55 **General Land Use Goals and Policies**

56 **Goal 1: Maintain and improve Roseville as an attractive place to live, work, and play by**
57 **promoting sustainable land-use patterns, land-use changes, and new developments that**
58 **contribute to the preservation and enhancement of the community's vitality and sense**
59 **of identity.**

60 Policy 1.1: Promote and provide for informed and meaningful citizen participation in
61 planning and review processes.

62 Policy 1.2: Ensure that the City's official controls are maintained to be consistent with
63 the 2030 Land Use Plan.

64 Policy 1.3: Ensure high-quality design, innovation, sustainability, and aesthetic appeal in
65 private and public development and redevelopment, with emphasis on efficient site
66 access, appropriately sized parking areas, and overall beautification through the adoption
67 and utilization of year-round landscaping and site design standards, guidelines,
68 principles, and other criteria.

69 Policy 1.4: Maintain orderly transitions between different land uses in accord with the
70 general land-use guidance of the Comprehensive Plan by establishing or strengthening
71 development design standards.

72 Policy 1.5: Promote well-planned and coordinated development.

73 Policy 1.6: Encourage improvements to the connectivity and walkability between and
74 within the community's neighborhoods, gathering places and commercial areas through
75 new development, redevelopment, and infrastructure projects.

76 Policy 1.7: Create a higher aesthetic level for the community through use of
77 redevelopment and infrastructure improvements to reduce or eliminate visual pollutants
78 such as overhead power, cable, and telephone lines, traffic controllers, junction boxes,
79 and inappropriate signage.

80 **Goal 2: Maintain and improve the mix of residential, commercial, employment, parks,**
81 **and civic land uses throughout the community to promote a balanced tax base and to**
82 **anticipate long-term economic and social changes.**

83 Policy 2.1: Review the Land Use Plan regularly to ensure its usefulness as a practical
84 guide to current and future development. Whenever practicable, coordinate the Plan with
85 the plans of neighboring communities, the county, school districts, and the most current
86 Metropolitan Council system plans.

87 Policy 2.2: Promote and support transit-oriented development and redevelopment near
88 existing and future transit corridors.

89 **Goal 3: Identify underutilized, deteriorated, or blighted properties and guide them**
90 **toward revitalization, reinvestment, or redevelopment consistent with community goals**
91 **and good planning and development principles.**

92 Policy 3.2: Promote redevelopment that reduces blight, expands the tax base, enhances
93 the mix of land uses in the community, and achieves other community objectives.

94 **Goal 4: Protect, improve, and expand the community's natural amenities and**
95 **environmental quality.**

96 Policy 4.1: Promote the use of energy-saving and sustainable design practices during all
97 phases of development including land uses, site design, technologies, buildings, and
98 construction techniques.

99 Policy 4.2: Seek to use environmental best practices for further protection, maintenance,
100 and enhancement of natural ecological systems including lakes, lakeshore, wetlands,
101 natural and man-made storm water ponding areas, aquifers, and drainage areas.

102 Policy 4.3: Promote preservation, replacement, and addition of trees within the
103 community.

104 **Goal 5: Create meaningful opportunities for community and neighborhood engagement**
105 **in land-use decisions.**

106 Policy 5.1: Utilize traditional and innovative ways to notify the public, the community,
107 and neighborhoods about upcoming land-use decisions as early as possible in the review
108 process.

109 Policy 5.2: Require meetings between the land-use applicant and affected persons and/or
110 neighborhoods for changes in land-use designations and projects that have significant
111 impacts, prior to submittal of the request to the City.

112 Policy 5.3: Provide for and promote opportunities for informed citizen participation at all
113 levels in the planning and review processes at both the neighborhood and community
114 level.

115 **Residential Area Goals and Policies**

116 **Goal 6: Preserve and enhance the residential character and livability of existing** 117 **neighborhoods and ensure that adjacent uses are compatible with existing** 118 **neighborhoods.**

119 Policy 6.1: Promote maintenance and reinvestment in existing residential buildings and
120 properties, residential amenities, and infrastructure to enhance the long-term desirability
121 of existing neighborhoods and to maintain and improve property values.

122 Policy 6.2: Where higher intensity uses are adjacent to existing residential
123 neighborhoods, create effective land use buffers and physical screening.

124 **Goal 7: Achieve a broad and flexible range of housing choices within the community to** 125 **provide sufficient alternatives to meet the changing housing needs of current and future** 126 **residents throughout all stages of life.**

127 Policy 7.1: Promote flexible development standards for new residential developments to
128 allow innovative development patterns and more efficient densities that protect and
129 enhance the character, stability, and vitality of residential neighborhoods.

130 Policy 7.2: Encourage high-quality, mixed residential developments that achieve the
131 community's goals, policies, and performance standards, encourage parks and open
132 space, and use high-quality site design features and building materials.

133 Policy 7.3: Consider increased densities in new residential developments to reduce
134 housing costs, improve affordability, and attract transit-oriented development.

135 Policy 7.4: Promote increased housing options within the community that enable more
136 people to live closer to community services and amenities such as commercial areas,
137 parks, and trails.

138 Policy 7.5: Consider the conversion of underutilized commercial development into
139 housing or mixed-use development.

140 **Goal 8: Promote a sense of community by encouraging neighborhood identity efforts** 141 **within the community.**

142 Policy 8.2: Where feasible, provide or improve connections between residential areas and
143 neighborhood amenities such as parks, trails, and neighborhood business areas.

144 The requested Land Use Map change and initial proposal by CommonBond meets several of the
145 above applicable Goals and Policies. As such, the requested change and initial proposal is not in
146 conflict with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. The Commission should discuss the Goals and
147 Polices above when making a recommendation on the request to determine if the proposed
148 project is strong enough to justify the Land Use Map change.

149 **HOUSING NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

150 In consideration of the Comprehensive Plan Land Use change and Rezoning request being highly
 151 discretionary, it is appropriate to consider the findings of the Housing Needs Assessment
 152 completed in October 2018 (done at the direction of the Economic Development Authority)
 153 when making a recommendation of whether to approve or deny these requests. Staff offers the
 154 following factors, taken directly from the Housing Needs Assessment, for consideration:

- 155 • Page 127 states: “Given the limited vacant land supply, most new development will occur
 156 as a result of redevelopment through clearing of existing buildings.”
- 157 • Page 129: The proposed property was not identified as a “housing opportunity site”
 158 within the assessment.
- 159 • Page 69 states: “The overall vacancy rate for all stabilized senior properties in Roseville
 160 is 2.5%, which is below market equilibrium”.
- 161 • Page 125: 166 units of affordable senior housing has been identified as a need in
 162 Roseville through the year 2023.
- 163 • Page 145 states: there is extreme pressure “on our ability to meeting housing demand at
 164 virtually all price points, most significantly for households that need affordable and
 165 subsidized housing” and “the usual arguments toward medium and high-density housing
 166 such as lowering homes values, increased traffic and reduced safety are often
 167 unfounded”.
- 168 • Page 150 suggests the following City Priority: “Encourage and support the development
 169 of an active adult age-restricted rental community, either affordable (60% AMI) or
 170 market rate.”

171 The full report is available on the City’s web page under “Resident Resources”, then “Housing.”

172 **ZONING MAP CHANGE:**

173 If the Comprehensive Plan change is supported and approved, the requested Zoning Map change
 174 becomes a procedural step to ensure the zoning map continues to be “consistent with the
 175 guidance and intent of the Comprehensive Plan” as required in City Code §1009.04 (Zoning
 176 Changes).

177 **CONDITIONAL USE ANALYSIS**

178 Table 1004-6 within the HDR district specifies density allowances and the need for a CU when
 179 seeking to increase density. Specifically, footnote “b” states density may be increased to 36
 180 units with an approved CU.

B. Dimensional Standards:

Table 1004-6	HDR-1		HDR-2
	Attached	Multifamily	Multifamily
Maximum density	24 Units/net acre ^b		36 Units/net acre ^c
Minimum density	12 Units/net acre		24 Units/net acre
Maximum building height	35 Feet	45 Feet ^d	65 Feet ^e
Maximum improvement area	75%	75%	85%
Minimum front yard building setback			
Street	30 Feet	30 Feet	10 Feet
Interior courtyard	10 Feet	10 Feet	15 Feet
Minimum side yard building setback			

Interior - adjacent to LDR-1, LDR-2, and MDR	8 Feet (end unit)	20 feet or 50% of building height, whichever is greater	20 feet or 50% of building height, whichever is greater ^a
Interior - adjacent all other districts	8 Feet (end unit)	10 feet or 50% of building height, whichever is greater	10 feet or 50% of building height, whichever is greater ^a
Corner	15 Feet	20 Feet	20% Height of the building ^a
Minimum rear yard building setback	30 Feet	30 Feet	20 feet or 50% of building height, whichever is greater ^a
<p>a The City may require a greater or lesser setback based on surrounding land uses.</p> <p>b Density in the HDR-1 district may be increased to 36 units/net acre with approved conditional use.</p> <p>c Density in the HDR-2 district may be increased to more than 36 units/net acre with approved conditional use.</p> <p>d Building height over 45 feet and under 65 feet requires an approved conditional use in the HDR-1.</p> <p>e Building height over 65 feet requires an approved conditional use in HDR-2.</p> <p>(Ord. 1411, 6-13-2011); (Ord. 1405, 2-28-2011); (Ord. 1511, 10-24</p>			

181 As stated, the proposal by CommonBond Communities is to develop 60 units of senior, multi-
182 family affordable housing on the approximately 1.9 acre site located at the northwest corner of
183 South Owasso Boulevard and Rice Street. Although there are project details yet to be
184 considered, the requested CU only relates to the request to increase maximum density from 24 to
185 32 units per acre. It should otherwise be assumed, all other project details will comply with
186 underlying zoning unless a variance is considered and approved as a separate action at a later
187 date.

188 §1009.02.C sets forth the general Standards and Criteria for conditional uses the Planning
189 Division, Planning Commission, and City Council must review and make findings in support of,
190 in opposition to, the request. Based on the subject request, the Planning Division makes the
191 follow findings:

- 192 1. *The proposed use is not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan:* Assuming there is support
193 for the Comprehensive Land Use Map Change, then the use of the property for development
194 of 60 affordable, multi-family senior units would advance a number of Land Use and
195 Housing chapter goals and policies, and be deemed consistent with the Plan.
- 196 2. *The proposed use is not in conflict with any Regulating Maps or other adopted plan:* This
197 criterion does not apply. The subject property at Rice and South Owasso Boulevard does not
198 have a regulating plan or other adopted plan that guides future development.
- 199 3. *The proposed use is not in conflict with any City Code requirements:* As currently proposed,
200 the Planning Division is not aware of any conflicts with existing requirements of §1004.06
201 (Multi-Family Design Standards) or those applicable requirements of §1011 (Property
202 Performance Standards). However, the full details of the site and building development have
203 not yet been finalized. That said, should the project be supported and move forward, staff
204 would work with CommonBond and its engineers and architects to develop a project that
205 achieves compliance with all applicable Code requirements. The Planning Division has
206 discussed with CommonBond the possibility of shifting the building closer to Rice Street and
207 South Owasso Boulevard (south and east). Such a shift provides greater separation from the
208 adjacent single family residential properties and also provides potential for greater green

209 space and landscaping on the site. This could help address some concerns that were voiced
210 at the Open House. It should be noted, that shifting the building closer to Rice Street and
211 South Owasso Boulevard would require a variance to setback requirements, which triggers
212 another public hearing before the Variance Board, including notification to the neighborhood
213 within 500 feet of the property.

- 214 4. *The proposed use will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public*
215 *facilities:* The Planning Division has determined the proposed increase in unit density from
216 24 to 32 units per acre will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public
217 facilities. Specifically, staff has determined there may be increased use of area parks by
218 theses seniors, however, their activities will not tax or be a burden to those parks.

219 With regard to excessive burden on streets, during the Open House Meeting adjacent
220 property owners and citizens voiced concerns regarding added traffic on Rice Street and
221 South Owasso Boulevard To address these concerns, CommonBond hired a consultant to
222 conduct a traffic study (Attachment E) to determine the impact of a 60-unit senior housing
223 project on the northwest corner. The study analyzed the existing and proposed conditions of
224 the subject development area. Results of the existing operations analysis indicate the study
225 intersection currently operates at an acceptable overall LOS A during the a.m. and p.m. peak
226 hours. No significant side-street delay or queuing issues were observed. Results of the year
227 2021 build operations analysis indicate the study intersection and proposed access location
228 are expected to operate at an acceptable overall LOS A during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours
229 for both build scenarios. The reference to both build scenarios includes: A) development
230 consistent with the underlying zoning, and B) the proposed request by CommonBond. In
231 fact, in the scenario that examines existing zoning potential, development results in 330
232 trips/day compared to the 222 trips/day under the proposed development (Page 5). Given the
233 minimal overall impact of the land use scenarios, roadway network improvements are not
234 anticipated to be needed from a traffic capacity perspective as a result of newly generated
235 traffic.

236 Finally, a project of this size will require public infrastructure such as water and sewer.
237 Public Works has determined the current system can accommodate the increase in use and
238 discharge created by this proposed project.

- 239 5. *The proposed use will not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood, will not negatively*
240 *impact traffic or property values, and will not otherwise harm the public health, safety, and*
241 *general welfare:* The Planning Division has determined the proposed increase in unit density
242 from 24 to 32 units per acre will not be injurious to surrounding neighborhoods and will not
243 negatively impact traffic, property values, and will not otherwise harm public health, safety,
244 and general welfare.

245 At the Developer Open House meeting, concerns were raised about the impacts of shadows
246 cast by the proposed apartment building on the neighboring homes to the west. In response to
247 those concerns, CommonBond used software to model the building's shadow at various
248 times during the year and to quantify the length of time on given days that the shadow would
249 reach those homes; this information is included as Attachment F. Based on this information,
250 it appears that during late fall/winter season, the shadow from the proposed building would
251 sweep from south to north across the homes on the four abutting properties. The length of
252 time during which the shadow would lay on any single home isn't identified by the
253 information, but the average duration of this shadow is in transit across all the homes among
254 the dates it was calculated is about 50 minutes. In practice, the length of time any of the

255 homes would be affected by the shadow would be somewhat less than the 50-minute total,
256 but Planning Division staff wasn't sure about what equation would produce the correct
257 estimate. Should the Commission need clarification, the applicant should be asked to address
258 this item in more detail.

259 Lastly, with regard to other site development items such as, but not limited to, platting of
260 lots, building design, screening, landscaping, and tree preservation, such items will be
261 analyzed if these projects move forward. In the case of tree preservation, this item would be
262 addressed at the Minor Plat submittal process, which requires a public hearing before the
263 City Council.

264 **SUGGESTED PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION**

265 The Planning Division recommends the following actions by the Planning Commission as it
266 pertains to the requests by CommonBond Communities:

- 267 A. Based on community and neighborhood comments, and Planning Commissioner input,
268 staff recommends one of the following options with regard to the requested
269 Comprehensive Land Use Map Change:
- 270 1. By Motion recommend to the City Council the property (165 Owasso Boulevard, and
271 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street) be re-guided from a Comprehensive Land Use
272 Map designation of LR (Low Density Residential) and NB (Neighborhood Business)
273 to HR (High Density Residential)
 - 274 2. By Motion recommend to the City Council the property (165 Owasso Boulevard, and
275 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street) remain LR (Low Density Residential) and NB
276 (Neighborhood Business) and the applicant request be denied with findings.
- 277 B. Based on community and neighborhood comments, and Planning Commissioner input,
278 staff recommends one of the following options with regard to the requested Rezoning:
- 279 1. By Motion recommend to the City Council the property (165 Owasso Boulevard, and
280 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street) be rezoned from an Official Map classification of
281 LDR-1 (Low Density Residential-1 District) and NB (Neighborhood Business
282 District) to HDR-1 (High Density Residential-1 District); or
 - 283 2. By Motion recommend to the City Council the property (165 Owasso Boulevard, and
284 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street) remain LDR-1 (Low Density Residential-1
285 District) and NB (Neighborhood Business District) and the applicant request be
286 denied with findings.
- 287 C. Based on community and neighborhood comments, and Planning Commissioner input,
288 staff recommends one of the following options with regard the requested CU for
289 increased unit density at 165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street:
- 290 1. By Motion recommend to the City Council denial with findings the requested CU to
291 increase unit density for the CommonBond project from 24 to 32 units per acre; or
 - 292 2. By Motion recommend to the City Council approval of the requested CU to increase
293 unit density for the CommonBond project from 24 to 32 units per acre subject to the
294 following conditions:

- 295 a. The approval of a Comprehensive Land Use Map Change of 165 Owasso
296 Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street from LR (low Density
297 Residential) and NB (Neighborhood Business) to HR (High Density Residential)
- 298 b. The approval of a rezoning of 165 Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033
299 Rice Street from LDR-1 (Low Density Residential-1 District) and NB
300 (Neighborhood Business District) to HR-1 (High Density Residential-1 District)
- 301 c. The Comprehensive Land Use Map Change and Rezoning will not be finalized by
302 the City Council and published for effectiveness until plans have been submitted
303 confirming compliance with all other City Code standards with regard to the final
304 development plans.
- 305 d. The CU shall be specific to 60-units of affordable, multi-family senior housing as
306 proposed by CommonBond Communities.
- 307 e. Maximum density shall be limited to 32 units per acre.
- 308 f. The project meets the development requirements of §1004.06 Multiple-Family
309 Design Standard, §1011 Property Performance Standards, and §1019 Parking and
310 Loading Areas of the City Code.
- 311 g. A sidewalk connection should be considered on both the south and east sides of
312 the proposed development to connect into the existing pedestrian crossings at the
313 Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard intersection.

314 **ALTERNATIVE ACTION**


315 Pass a motion to table the item for future action. An action to table must be tied to the need
316 for clarity, analysis, and/or information necessary to make a recommendation on the request.
317 Tabling beyond August 2, 2019 will require the applicant’s consent per Minnesota Statutes
318 15.99 to avoid statutory approval.
319

Report prepared by: Thomas Paschke, City Planner, 651-792-7074


thomas.paschke@cityofroseville.com

- Attachments:
- A. Site map
 - B. Aerial photo
 - C. Narrative and concept plans
 - D. Open house summary
 - E. Traffic study
 - F. Shadow study

Attachment A for Planning File 19-004



City of
Little Canada




Location Map



Site Location

Data Sources
 * Ramsey County GIS Base Map (4/3/2019)
 For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:
 City of Roseville, Community Development Department,
 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

Disclaimer
 This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7085. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.03, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.



Attachment B for Planning File 19-004



Location Map




Prepared by:
Community Development Department
Printed: April 11, 2019



Site Location

Data Sources
 * Ramsey County GIS Base Map (4/3/2019)
 * Aerial Data: Sanborn (4/2017)
 For further information regarding the contents of this map contact:
 City of Roseville, Community Development Department,
 2660 Civic Center Drive, Roseville MN

Disclaimer
 This map is neither a legally recorded map nor a survey and is not intended to be used as one. This map is a compilation of records, information and data located in various city, county, state and federal offices and other sources regarding the area shown, and is to be used for reference purposes only. The City does not warrant that the Geographic Information System (GIS) Data used to prepare this map are error free, and the City does not represent that the GIS Data can be used for navigational, tracking or any other purpose requiring exacting measurement of distance or direction or precision in the depiction of geographic features. If errors or discrepancies are found please contact 651-792-7085. The preceding disclaimer is provided pursuant to Minnesota Statutes §466.02, Subd. 21 (2000), and the user of this map acknowledges that the City shall not be liable for any damages, and expressly waives all claims, and agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City from any and all claims brought by User, its employees or agents, or third parties which arise out of the user's access or use of data provided.



Roseville Senior Housing – Project Narrative


CommonBond Communities plans to purchase four adjoining parcels in Roseville located at 165 S Owasso Boulevard West, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street, in order to build a proposed 3-story, 60 unit senior affordable housing community. The project will provide homes for 60 senior households, offering quality housing that is within reach for seniors with low to moderate income, and offering amenities to meet the needs of seniors.

CommonBond was originally formed out of the Archdiocese of St. Paul in 1971, and is the largest housing provider of our kind in the Upper Midwest. We manage a portfolio that serves over 11,000 people, and are renowned for our expertise in both development and property management. CommonBond is a long-term owner and our presence in a community makes a difference. We are good neighbors and community partners; we focus on helping residents achieve stability and independence.

In order for the project to meet financial feasibility and to produce high quality affordable housing, CommonBond and the current land owners request that the City re-zone the parcels from low density residential and commercial, to High Density Residential (HDR1) and issue a conditional use permit for up to 36 units per acre.

A draft site plan is attached. The goal of the plan was to activate the corner with building presence and at the same time, shield the parking lot from sight lines on the street. It is likely that interior common areas will continue to move and that parking reductions may be sought in order to increase exterior amenity space for residents. CommonBond plans to continue to develop the site plan with insight from the community and other stakeholders while also maximizing efficiency and project resources.

The project will seek funding from the City of Roseville, Ramsey County, and Minnesota Housing in the form of 4% tax credits and Housing Infrastructure bonds in 2019. CommonBond would then acquire the site in early 2020 and begin construction in summer 2020.



BUILDING SUMMARY:

3 FLOORS TOTAL:
 18 UNITS FIRST FLOOR
 21 UNITS FLOORS 2-3

30 TOTAL 1 BEDROOM
 30 TOTAL 2 BEDROOM

- 1 BEDROOM
- 2 BEDROOM

PARKING SUMMARY:

97 TOTAL SURFACE STALLS
 (48 COMPACT)









Community Development Department
2660 Civic Center Drive
Roseville, MN 55113

DATE: March 21, 2019
TO: Attendees of CommonBond Open House Meeting
FROM: Thomas Paschke, Roseville City Planner
RE: Open House Summary

The City of Roseville would like to thank you for attending the Open House hosted by CommonBond Communities on March 14, 2019. For your information, I have enclosed a summary of the Open House (prepared by CommonBond staff) as well as the written comments received at the event.

The next step in the process is for CommonBond Communities to determine whether or not to move forward with their project by submitting a formal application seeking a Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map Change and Zoning Map Change (rezoning).

CommonBond is under no specific timeline to submit a formal application. However, if an application is submitted, a public hearing before the Planning Commission is required.

Should you have any questions or additional comments you would like to provide regarding the Open House, please email me at thomas.paschke@cityofroseville.com or you may call me at (651) 792-7074.

Roseville Open House – Community Questions/Feedback - 3.14.19

****While diligent notes were taken during the meeting, it is likely that many comments are paraphrased. It is the author's belief that despite the notes not being word-for-word, they maintain the spirit of the questions and feedback.*

- Question: What draws you to certain sites?
 - Answer: We work with brokers and are also brought sites by others. We were approached by the Seller for this particular site. We also look at opportunity, ability to give back to the community, and scoring for finance applications.
- Follow-up: Do you normally choose sites that aren't zoned properly?
 - Answer: We have all different types of sites—some are already zoned for what we need, others are not.
- Question: Is there somebody here from the City?
 - Bob Willmus, (City Council member) identified himself
 - Jim Bull, (Planning Commissioner) raised his hand
 - Follow-up: Why is the City allowing this change to happen—this area is residential?
 - Answer (CBC): The City has not decided anything yet. It's very early in the process and nothing has gone to Council.
 - Answer (Bob Willmus—paraphrased): It's common for Council members to attend these meetings to hear the feedback. This project has many review steps ahead of it. It will have to go before the Planning Commission and it sounds like the EDA as well.
- Feedback: I live on the corner and will share the backyard of the proposed project so I have very specific concerns and perhaps more skin in the game. I'm concerned about my investment. I have two small kids that play in my backyard and placing a parking lot in my backyard is not ok. I'm for affordable housing but this is not an appropriate site.
- Feedback: I live on Rice Street. I am for the mission of the organization and think affordable housing is good, but a 3-story building does not belong in this neighborhood. It's simply not a good idea. The only thing I've heard that makes this a good location for the project is that it's in a transit zone.
- Feedback (Planning Commissioner self-identified):
 - I live in the neighborhood and am on the Planning Commission. I am concerned about the dimensions of the building and the property line. There is a day-care on the property line. There will be traffic impacts. Have you done a traffic study? It is not appropriate for this project to be near a daycare with kids. This project will cause traffic congestion. Cars go fast off S. Owasso and off Rice Street – 10 feet from my driveway.
- Feedback: I am a family childcare provider. I like my privacy. The kids play outside and walk to buses on the corner. This development would cause traffic and make it dangerous for kids to walk to the bus. This is not ok.
- Question: Do you have a purchase option for the site?

- Answer: We do not yet have a signed agreement but are working on a Purchase Agreement with the Seller.
- Question: So you have a verbal agreement?
 - Answer: Yes –we are working through the Purchase Agreement with the Seller.
- Feedback (to attendees): So, I'm not a fan of this project. But they're going to make a choice at some point and I want us to think about all of the other possible outcomes. I think we should put together what we want—in order to put our stamp on it. I'm not a fan, but I think it's something we should figure out in light of possible alternatives.
- Feedback: I have comments for beyond the site. Overflow parking will end up on Woodbridge—it's the only place for them to park. We get nice morning light coming into our windows—now our whole enjoyment of the sun will change. This is a substantial change to the neighborhood. I'm also concerned about run-off. You talk about a retention pond. With a daycare nearby, you'll need to put up an ugly fence. Also, I'm concerned about that parking lot. All parking lots have lights. Those lights will shine into homes and people locking their cars will cause the horns to go off. Those are the concerns that I have.
- Feedback: You talk about being a good neighbor. As a good neighbor, would you put up a privacy wall that would act as a buffer?
- Question: Does this project have underground parking? Why put it all on the surface for seniors who now have to walk through a slippery parking lot?
 - Answer: We don't have any underground parking.
- Question: What is the current zoning of the corner parking lot?
 - Answer: Neighborhood business – commercial.
 - Answer (from attendees): Yes--but it only was zoned that way to put Christmas trees on it once a year.
- Feedback: This neighborhood is low density. Why are you trying for high density? Why can't you just have multiple locations for low density? Why not?
- Feedback: We've lived on Rice Street since 1997. I think there is danger in doing spot re-zoning. I think affordable housing and the overall plan is good and we'd love to have your sites in Roseville, but this site is just being plunked down. This is not an industrial corridor. It's residential and private and set-back. So this whole plan came as a shock to us.
- Feedback: I live 10 feet from this proposed project. I do not want lights from the parking lot shining into my house all night long. We had planned a large renovation but because of this have halted it.
- Feedback: We are not in opposition to affordable housing, but this project has no buffer between high density and low density so there's no privacy. It will reduce our property values.
- Feedback: This project is not a fit for Roseville. It took me 48 years to move back here. I enjoy the east sun through my windows. With the street lights and parking lot, it's just not a good fit.
- Feedback: My sister lives by County Road D where a lot of these projects have gone in and they never gave her anything. The neighbors are just filthy.
- Feedback: Right now we have really deep back yards. It's almost like a park. We don't have privacy fences and we like that. We wave at each other. This is not fitting into a neighborhood.

- Feedback: I don't think spot zoning is appropriate—doing little pieces here and there. I'm frustrated this is how it pans out. I don't want to become like Lexington and C – this is not appropriate.
- Feedback: I have 3 kids who attend daycare near this site. I think this is a tremendous project and is something my family is struggling with right now—finding a location for my mom. And I don't mean this the wrong way—but by the looks of this crowd, many of you may want to live here. But this is the wrong location. I am concerned about Roseville's overall strategic plan and stripping out trees. They need to do a long-term evaluation of issues like this. There are places going in around us right now and Cardigan is empty—people cannot afford to live there. I am concerned about my kid's safety. I do not think a parking lot in back of a daycare is appropriate.
- Feedback (Planning Commissioner): We spent 2 years going through an update of the Roseville Comprehensive Plan. This was not an area to be developed. The zoning is not tied to this project. The landowner can go anywhere and sell to anybody after the zoning is updated. There's no guarantee that this project will be the one to get developed.
- Question: We're neighbors who just moved in to this neighborhood. What happens if this project gets re-zoned but doesn't get funded?
 - Answer: There's always a chance we won't get funded but CommonBond is very good at what we do. Last year we put in 8 funding applications and all 8 were funded.
- Feedback: I just don't get why this project needs to go here. I appreciate and support low income housing and senior housing but we have a lot going up and it does not need to be here.
- Feedback: A lot of developments cut down trees and there's less infiltration and more run-off. I'm concerned about cutting down trees and lack of replacement. I'm a professional geologist and I'm worried about site repair. Why not put this on the A&W lot across the street? I don't think anyone would have an objection to this project being on that site rather than this one.
 - Answer: We will and are required to treat infiltration and storm water run-off on-site through the Minnesota Enterprise Green Communities Overlay requirements.
- Question: Why not put the parking lot closer to the street?
 - Answer (from attendees): So it looks nice for people driving past.
 - Answer: If you put the parking lot near the street, you'd be closer to the building.
- Feedback: I currently have a deep backyard – 150 feet. This project is going to stink, there's going to be oil spilling, and will wreck tons of trees. It will be ugly and it's going to pollute our neighborhood.
- Feedback: I do support this project. I don't think there will be an increase in traffic—look at Lexington & Victoria. (Question from attendees: Do you even live here? Answer: Not directly adjacent but I live in a neighborhood like this with projects going up like this. (Lots of shouting from attendees – request for civility). Right now there are seniors who live near me who cannot afford to stay in the neighborhood. To those of you who have commented this isn't residential, it is a residential building. Seniors are people who want to live in a neighborhood. And people are not stinky. I support this development.
- Feedback: Your site plan shows a great little bird's eye view but this is totally inappropriate. There's a reason it's zoned the way it's zoned.

- Feedback: I hate to say this but I think you are getting played by the Seller. They just want to get more out of their property and this is not appropriate.
- Feedback: Thank you for what you do. Your work is really important. We're all getting older and we need to have you here but you got gamed by the Seller to come over here. There's no guarantee for even a 2 story housing outcome. Whatever comes out of the re-zone is blanket approval. This is not a great idea for this spot—it's an abysmally bad idea.
- Question: Would you propose this a LEED project?
 - Answer: LEED is an interesting program but most developers choose not to do it due to the cost of the paperwork. We usually fulfill many of the requirements of the program but do not pursue the accreditation due to cost.
- Question: How many of us here support this project right now? Raise your hands if you support this project?
 - Response: 4-5 hands raised out of crowd of 35-40 folks
- Question: How many of you up there (pointing to CommonBond employees/presenters) would like this in your backyard?
 - Response: All employees/presenters raise their hands.
 - Feedback: I don't believe you.
- Feedback: Let me tell you—they are saying that property values won't go down but I've been in real estate for 16 years and I can pull up the MLS listings of homes next to high density properties and can show you that the property values are lower. This may stabilize in 10-15 years but they definitely are lower. I know many of us have made renovations on their homes hoping for their value to go back, but it won't with a parking lot next door and higher density. Our achievement is being taken away with only one seller that stands to profit. There will be immediate depreciation.
- Feedback: I have 2 daughters that walk up Owasso to get to the bus. You're saying there won't be a lot more traffic there because it's a senior project, but I'm 55 and I go in and out of my driveway multiple times a day. There will be traffic there. There will be many cars in the parking lot. I'm concerned about this in our neighborhood because of my kids.
- Feedback: I've lived here for 24 years and right now the run-off is a lot – at times even torrential. This will make it worse. Also, there's a new development down the road—Owasso Hills—that did cause a lot more traffic. There's going to be more traffic driving down Owasso to go down to Rosedale Mall. You need to think about that as well.
- Feedback: I have kids that are going to Terri's daycare and I'm concerned about this project. I think you can see by the meeting age of the homeowners here – that this is a testament to the fabric of this neighborhood.
- Feedback: I live 2 properties to the north of Terri and Wayne. And our backyards are really like a park back there. There are no chain link fences. I probably wouldn't have bought my house if I knew about this project. There's already a lot of traffic by the mobile home park. And I question how many of you would actually want this in your backyard.

→Call for remaining questions by CBC. Hearing none, meeting was closed and folks were encouraged to write post-it notes and place them on Site Plan for additional feedback.

→Mindy Greiling, Bonnie Koch: Co-Chairs of League of Women Voters were in attendance – did not speak but came up afterward and said they support affordable housing, will testify at public hearings, and support folks staying in their community through senior affordable housing.

→Craig Klausung, former Roseville mayor was in attendance – did not speak but said afterwards: I think this looks like a great project and a great location for the project. It will meet a real need in the community.

Post-it Note Feedback:



- No buffer – look right next door at Rosedale Estates. 100’ buffer.

- How are you going to buffer from the neighbor houses?
- Spot re-zoning is not a good idea.
- Extend sidewalk to building. There is no access.
- Parking lot (if surface) should face Rice Street, not houses.
- Storm water runoff control? Blacktop creates run-off and heat issues.
- Lighting concerns, effect on the neighbors
- Rice Street needs sidewalk to business area
- Hide with trees.
- Make it a 2 story w/parking on street side
- 3 stories is too tall for neighborhood
- Suggest 2 story limit (larger footprint) w/underground parking
- City needs to look at redevelopment zone, not spot rezone
- Positives
 - Housing Manager & Maintenance on site
 - Services for seniors
 - Transportation
- Questions
 - Need traffic light on Rice & S. Owasso?
 - Chance of Open House at another facility to see what it is like?
- Thank you for this meeting. I'm concerned about:
 - Light pollution from units and parking lot
 - Removal of trees
 - Removal of infiltration via grass yards
 - Increased roof area
 - Groundwater pollution running into Lady Slipper Park including vehicle drippage in the lot
 - Increased salt running into Lady Slipper & Lake Owasso
 - Increased traffic on the west side of Owasso Blvd./Rice
 - Increased turn around traffic on Woodbridge/Woodlynn
- This is not a site improvement. Why not the lot on the NE corner of this intersection?
- There are no guarantees that this project will be the ultimate use if the lot is rezoned!

Thank you for this meeting.

I'm concerned about

- light pollution from units & parking lot
- removal of trees
- removal of infiltration

Via grassy areas

- Increased roof area
- Groundwater pollution running into Lady Slipper Park including vehicle drippage in the lot.
- increased salt

- Running into Lady Slipper & Lake Owasso

- increased traffic on the west side of Owasso Blvd./Rice
- increased turnaround traffic on Woodbridge/Woodlynn

This is not a site improvement why not the lot on the NE corner of this intersection?

There are no guarantees that this project will be the ultimate use if the lot is rezoned!

Positives -

- Housing Manager & Maintenance on site
- Services for seniors
- transportation

Need for traffic light on Rice & S. Owasso?

Chance of open house at another facility to see what it is like?

City needs to look @ a redevelopment zone, not spot rezone

Suggest 2 story limit (larger footprint) w/ underground parking

3 stories is too tall for neighborhood

2 story w/ parking on street side

HIDE WITH
TREES

EXTEND SIDEWALK
TO BUILDING
THERE IS NO
ACCESS

RICE STREET
NEEDS SIDEWALK
TO BUSINESS
AREA

Lighting
~~concerns~~
affect ^{ON} the
neighbors.

no buffer -
look right next door
at Rosedale
Estates.
100' buffer.

Storm water
runoff control?
Blacktop creates
runoff and heat
issues.

Spot rezoning
is not a
good idea.

Parking lot
(if surface)
should face
Rice St, not
houses.

How are you
going to
~~protect the~~
buffer from the
neighbor houses?



Memorandum

SRF No. 12732

To: Jesse Freihammer PE
City Engineer/Assistant Public Works Director
City of Roseville

From: Matt Pacyna PE, Principal
Ethan Bialik, Engineer

Date: April 18, 2019

Subject: Senior Residential Traffic Study

Introduction


As requested, SRF has completed a traffic study for a proposed senior residential development located in the northwest quadrant of the Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard intersection in the City of Roseville (see Figure 1: Project Location). This study will evaluate the trip generation and traffic impacts associated with the proposed senior housing development, as well as the existing zoning based scenario, which consists of single family homes and a shopping center. The main objectives of the study are to review existing operations, evaluate potential traffic impacts of the proposed development alternatives, and recommend improvements to ensure safe and efficient operations. The following information provides the assumptions, analysis, and study recommendations offered for consideration.

Existing Conditions

The existing conditions were reviewed to establish a baseline to compare and determine any future impacts associated with the proposed development. The evaluation of existing conditions includes peak hour intersection turning movement counts, field observations and an intersection capacity analysis.

Data Collection

Weekday a.m. and p.m. peak period vehicular turning movement and pedestrian/bicyclist counts were collected at the Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard intersection on Wednesday, April 10, 2019. Observations were also completed to identify roadway characteristics within the study area (i.e. roadway geometry, posted speed limits, and traffic controls). Currently, Rice Street is a three-lane roadway with a two-way left-turn lane (TWLTL) and a 40-mile per hour (mph) posted speed limit. South Owasso Boulevard is a two-lane undivided roadway with a 30-mph speed limit. The Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard intersection is signalized. Note that South Owasso Boulevard is classified as an urban collector west of Rice Street and an urban local road east of Rice Street, while Rice Street is classified as an urban minor arterial. Existing geometrics, traffic control, and traffic volumes are shown in Figure 2.




H:\Projects\12000\12732\TrafficStudy\Figures1



Project Location

Senior Residential Traffic Study, Roseville, MN
City of Roseville, MN

Figure 1



H:\Projects\12000\12732\TrafficStudy\Figures\

Intersection Operations Analysis

An operations analysis was conducted to determine how traffic is currently operating at the study intersections. All intersections were analyzed using Synchro/SimTraffic and the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM). Capacity analysis results identify a Level of Service (LOS) which indicates how well an intersection is operating. Intersections are ranked from LOS A through LOS F. The LOS results are based on average delay per vehicle results from SimTraffic, which correspond to the delay threshold values shown in Table 1. LOS A indicates the best traffic operation and LOS F indicates an intersection where demand exceeds capacity. Overall intersection LOS A through D is generally considered acceptable by drivers in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Area.

Table 1. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized and Unsignalized Intersections

LOS Designation	Signalized Intersection Average Delay/Vehicle (seconds)	Unsignalized Intersection Average Delay/Vehicle (seconds)
A	≤ 10	≤ 10
B	> 10 - 20	> 10 - 15
C	> 20 - 35	> 15 - 25
D	> 35 - 55	> 25 - 35
E	> 55 - 80	> 35 - 50
F	> 80	> 50

For side-street stop controlled intersections, special emphasis is given to providing an estimate for the level of service of the side-street approach. Traffic operations at an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control can be described in two ways. First, consideration is given to the overall intersection level of service. This takes into account the total number of vehicles entering the intersection and the capability of the intersection to support these volumes. Second, it is important to consider the delay on the minor approach. Since the mainline does not have to stop, the majority of delay is attributed to the side-street approaches. It is typical of intersections with higher mainline traffic volumes to experience high levels of delay (poor levels of service) on the side-street approaches, but an acceptable overall intersection level of service during peak hour conditions.

Results of the existing operations analysis shown in Table 2 indicate that the study intersection operates at an acceptable LOS A during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours with the existing traffic control and geometric layout. No significant side-street delays or queuing issues were observed in the field or the traffic simulation at the study intersection.

Table 2. Existing Peak Hour Capacity Analysis

Intersection	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Rice Street and South Owasso Boulevard	A	5 Sec.	A	7 Sec.

- (1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst approach LOS. The delay shown represents the worst side-street approach delay.

Proposed Development

The proposed development, shown in Figure 3, consists of a 60-unit senior housing apartment. The proposed development is expected to be fully constructed by the year 2021. The senior apartment is proposing 97 parking spaces within a surface lot. Note that for purposes of this study, the proposed development will be compared to an existing zoning-based land use scenario for the site. The current zoning code allows for a typical building footprint size of approximately 8,000 SF of retail space and three (3) single family homes on for a lot of this size. It should be noted that it was assumed that the retail space would be generated as a strip retail center using the *ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition* land use code 820, which applies to general retail spaces.

Traffic Forecasts


The proposed development is expected to be constructed in the year 2020. Therefore, traffic forecasts were developed for year 2021 build conditions (one year after construction). To account for general background growth in the area, an annual growth rate of one-half (0.5) percent was applied to the existing peak hour traffic volumes to develop year 2021 background traffic forecasts. This growth rate is consistent with historical traffic growth in the area.

Trip generation estimates for the weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours and a daily basis were developed using the *ITE Trip Generation Manual, 10th Edition* for the two land use scenarios. Results of the trip generation estimates shown in Table 3 indicate that the existing zoning-based single-family housing and retail land use generates approximately 10 a.m. peak hour, 34 p.m. peak hour, and 330 daily trips.

Table 3. Trip Generation Estimates

Land Use Type (ITE Code)	Size	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour		Daily Trips
		In	Out	In	Out	
Single-Family Detached Housing (210)	3-units	1	2	2	1	28
Shopping Center (820)	8,000 SF	5	3	15	16	302
Single-Family Housing and Retail Scenario Total		5	5	17	17	330
Senior Adult Housing-Attached (252)	60-units	4	8	9	7	222
Senior Apartment Scenario Total		4	8	9	7	222

Upon a fully developed site, the overall total site trip generation for the senior apartment land use scenario is expected to be 12 a.m. peak hour, 16 p.m. peak hour, and 222 daily trips. The senior adult housing scenario would generate on average 2 more a.m. peak hour trips, 18 less p.m. peak hour trips, and 108 less daily trips than the existing zoning-based single family housing and retail land use scenario. Note that no multi-use trip reduction was applied due to the modest size of the development and to provide a more conservative estimate of site generated trips.



H:\Projects\12000\12732\TrafficStudy\Figures\



Site Plan

Senior Residential Traffic Study, Roseville, MN
City of Roseville, MN

01912732
April 2019

Figure 3

Trips for the proposed land use were distributed to the adjacent roadway network based on the directional distribution shown in Figure 4. The directional distribution was developed based on a review of existing travel patterns and engineering judgment. The resultant year 2021 traffic volumes for the proposed senior housing development and existing zoning-based scenario, which accounts for the general background growth and site generated trips, are shown in Figures 5 and 6, respectively.

Year 2021 Build Condition

Intersection Operations Analysis

To determine if the existing roadway network can accommodate year 2021 build traffic forecasts, a detailed traffic operations analysis was completed for the proposed development scenarios. The study intersections were once again analyzed using Synchro/SimTraffic.

Results of the year 2021 build operations analysis for both scenarios, shown in Table 4, indicates that the study intersection and proposed access are expected to operate at an acceptable overall LOS A during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours with the existing geometric layout and traffic control. No significant side-street delay or queuing issues are expected at the study intersections under either scenario. Therefore, given the minimal overall impact of the proposed land use scenarios, roadway network improvements are not anticipated to be needed based on a traffic capacity perspective as a result of the new development.

Table 4. Year 2021 Build Scenario Peak Hour Capacity Analysis

Intersection	A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
	LOS	Delay	LOS	Delay
Senior-Housing Scenario				
Rice Street and South Owasso Boulevard	A	5 sec.	A	7 sec.
South Owasso Boulevard and Proposed Access ⁽¹⁾	A/A	4 sec.	A/A	5 sec.
Existing Zoning-Based Scenario				
Rice Street and South Owasso Boulevard	A	5 sec.	A	7 sec.
South Owasso Boulevard and Proposed Access ⁽¹⁾	A/A	5 sec.	A/A	4 sec.

(1) Indicates an unsignalized intersection with side-street stop control, where the overall LOS is shown followed by the worst approach LOS. The delay shown represents the worst side-street approach delay.




H:\Projects\12000\12732\TrafficStudy\Figures\




Directional Distribution
Senior Residential Traffic Study, Roseville, MN
City of Roseville, MN

Figure 4



H:\Projects\12000\12732\TrafficStudy\Figures\



H:\Projects\12000\12732\TrafficStudy\Figures\

Site and Access Review

A review of the proposed senior housing development site plan was completed to identify any issues and recommend potential improvements with regard to sight distance, traffic controls, and circulation. Based on field observations, there is adequate sight distance at the proposed access location on South Owasso Boulevard to clearly identify approaching vehicles. Special consideration should be made to limit any sight distance impacts from future landscaping and signing. No other traffic control or circulation issues are expected. Note that a sidewalk connection should be considered on both the south and east sides of the proposed development to connect into the existing pedestrian crossings at the Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard intersection.

Summary and Conclusions

Based on the analysis, the following conclusions and recommendations are offered for consideration:

1. Results of the existing operations analysis indicate that the study intersection currently operates at an acceptable overall LOS A during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. No significant side-street delay or queuing issues were observed.
2. The proposed development consists of a 60-unit senior adult housing apartment. Access is planned along South Owasso Boulevard approximately 100 feet west of Rice Street.
3. Results of the trip generation estimates indicate the proposed senior housing development scenario is expected to generate a total of 12 a.m. peak hour, 16 p.m. peak hour, and 222 daily trips.
4. Results of the trip generation estimate indicate the existing zoning-based development scenario is expected to generate a total of 10 a.m. peak hour, 34 p.m. peak hour, and 330 daily trips.
5. Results of the year 2021 build operations analysis indicate that the study intersection and proposed access location are expected to operate at an acceptable overall LOS A during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours for both build scenarios.
6. Given the minimal overall impact of the land use scenarios, roadway network improvements are not anticipated to be needed from a traffic capacity perspective as a result of newly generated traffic.
7. Special consideration should be made to limit any sight distance impacts from future landscaping and signing.
8. A sidewalk connection should be considered on both the south and east sides of the proposed development to connect into the existing pedestrian crossings at the Rice Street/South Owasso Boulevard intersection.



275 Market Street, Ste. 368
 Minneapolis, MN 55405
 612.819.1835 www.firmground.com

I hereby certify that this plan, specification, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Architect under the laws of the state of Minnesota.

Thomas P. Wasmoen
 MMDDYYYY 20891
 Date License No.

PARTNERS/CONSULTANTS

OWNER
 COMMON BOND COMMUNITIES
 1080 MONTREAL AVE
 ST. PAUL, MN 55116

PROJECT
 ROSEVILLE RICE STREET MULTIFAMILY HOUSING
 3031 RICE STREET
 ROSEVILLE, MN 55113

PROJECT NO. 17.124
 DRAWN BY R. NICHOLS
 CHECKED BY T. WASMOEN
 © COPYRIGHT 2019 FIRMGROUND INC.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

#	ISSUE/REVISION	DATE

SHEET TITLE
 MARCH 21ST SOLAR STUDIES

SHEET NUMBER
C101
 FIRM GROUND
 architects & engineers



1 MARCH 21 @ 9 AM SOLAR STUDY
 C101



3 MARCH 21 @ 5 PM SOLAR STUDY
 C101



2 MARCH 21 @ 12 PM SOLAR STUDY
 C101

C:\Users\mich\Documents\Projects\17.124\17.124_03212019.dwg
 3/21/2019 4:24:44 PM
 R. NICHOLS
 T. WASMOEN



275 Market Street, Ste. 368
 Minneapolis, MN 55405
 612.819.1835 www.firmgroundae.com

I hereby certify that this plan, specification, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Architect under the laws of the state of Minnesota.

Thomas P. Wasmoen
 MMDD/YYYY 2088
 Date License No.

PARTNERS/CONSULTANTS

OWNER

COMMON BOND COMMUNITIES
 1080 MONTREAL AVE
 ST. PAUL, MN 55116

PROJECT

ROSEVILLE RICE STREET MULTIFAMILY HOUSING

3031 RICE STREET
 ROSEVILLE, MN 55113

PROJECT NO. 17-124
 DRAWN BY R. NICHOLS
 CHECKED BY T. WASMOEN
 © COPYRIGHT 2019 FIRMGROUND AE INC.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

#	ISSUE/REVISION	DATE


SHEET TITLE

JUNE 21ST SOLAR STUDIES

SHEET NUMBER


C102

FIRM GROUND architects & engineers




1 JUNE 21 @ 9 AM SOLAR STUDY

C102



3 JUNE 21 @ 5 PM SOLAR STUDY

C102



2 JUNE 21 @ 12 PM SOLAR STUDY

C102

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. NO PART OF THIS DOCUMENT IS TO BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM FIRM GROUND AE INC.



275 Market Street, Ste. 368
 Minneapolis, MN 55405
 612.919.1835 www.firmgroundae.com

I hereby certify that this plan, specification, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Architect under the laws of the state of Minnesota.

Thomas P. Wasmoen
 MM/DD/YYYY 20891
 Date License No.

PARTNERS/CONSULTANTS

OWNER

COMMON BOND COMMUNITIES
 1080 MONTREAL AVE
 ST. PAUL, MN 55116

PROJECT

ROSEVILLE RICE STREET MULTIFAMILY HOUSING

3031 RICE STREET
 ROSEVILLE, MN 55113

PROJECT NO. 17.124
 DRAWN BY R. NICHOLS
 CHECKED BY T. WASMOEN
 © COPYRIGHT 2019 FIRMGROUND AE INC.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

#	ISSUE/REVISION	DATE

SHEET TITLE

SEPTEMBER 21ST SOLAR STUDIES


SHEET NUMBER

C103

FIRM GROUND



1 SEPTEMBER 21 @ 9 AM SOLAR STUDY



3 SEPTEMBER 21 @ 5 PM SOLAR STUDY



2 SEPTEMBER 21 @ 12 PM SOLAR STUDY



275 Market Street, Ste. 368
Minneapolis, MN 55405
612.919.1835 www.firmground.com

I hereby certify that this plan, specification, or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Registered Architect under the laws of the state of Minnesota.

Thomas P. Wasmoen
MM/DD/YYYY 2009/1
Date License No.

PARTNERS/CONSULTANTS

OWNER
COMMON BOND COMMUNITIES
1080 MONTREAL AVE
ST. PAUL, MN 55116

PROJECT
ROSEVILLE RICE STREET MULTIFAMILY HOUSING
3031 RICE STREET
ROSEVILLE, MN 55113


PROJECT NO. 17.124
DRAWN BY R. NICHOLS
CHECKED BY T. WASMOEN
© COPYRIGHT 2019 FIRMGROUND INC.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

#	ISSUE/REVISION	DATE

SHEET TITLE
DECEMBER 21ST SOLAR STUDIES


SHEET NUMBER
C104
FIRM GROUND architects & engineers



1 DECEMBER 21 @ 9 AM SOLAR STUDY
C104



3 DECEMBER 21 @ 5 PM SOLAR STUDY
C104



2 DECEMBER 21 @ 12 PM SOLAR STUDY
C104

C:\Users\mitch\Documents\18412\FY 19
 11/15/18 4:42:37 PM
 R:\Projects\18412\FY 19\C104.dwg

Thomas Paschke

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 1:39 PM
To: *RVPlanningCommission
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Contact Planning Commission

Contact Planning Commission

Please complete this online form and submit.

Subject: CommonBond Properties Proposal

Contact Information

Name: Craig Klausing

Address: 447 Rose Place

City: Roseville

State: MN

Zip: 55113

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information. No need to contact me

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern

Dear Planning Commission Members, I am writing in support of CommonBond's proposal for affordable senior housing. As noted in the City's Housing Needs Assessment (and cited by staff), 166 units of affordable senior housing has been identified as a need through 2023. With the construction 60 units, this project will help meet that need. The Housing Needs Assessment also identified the need for "affordable" housing, which it defined as 60% of area median income (AMI). This project will do better than that, with 52 units at 50% AMI and 8 units at 30%. This will help the seniors in our community most in need of help. I attended the open house on this proposal and would like to point out that the concerns raised by the neighbors (e.g., traffic, buffering, run-off, etc.) are addressed by CommonBond's proposal and staff's recommendations. I am

confident that this project will prove to be an asset to the surrounding neighbors. There were a number of comments (as there are with almost every proposal like this), that people supported the project, "but, just not here." Two comments on that; first if housing should always be built "somewhere else," it never gets built. There is a desperate need for this type of housing. Second, this is in fact a great location. Higher density housing provides a buffer from the traffic and the more intense uses to the east, southeast, and south. The use of this site for housing is compatible with the less dense housing to the north and west. Lastly, the staff report notes that the site was "not identified as a 'housing opportunity site' within the assessment." That is true, but that is a failure of the assessment, not a reflection of the suitability of the site for housing. The assessment identifies the site across South Owasso as an opportunity site. The logic for identifying that corner of the intersection (and it is a logical opportunity site) applies equally to the site across the street. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this proposal and I encourage you to support the change to the Comprehensive Plan, the rezoning and the conditional use for higher density. Craig Klausing

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Thomas Paschke

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 7:54 PM
To: *RVPlanningCommission
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Contact Planning Commission

Contact Planning Commission

Please complete this online form and submit.

Subject: Support for CommonBond Proposal

Contact Information

Name: Kitty Gogins

Address: 806 Millwood Ave

City: Roseville

State: MN

Zip: 55113

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information. Email

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern

Dear Planning Commission Members, I am writing in support of the proposal by CommonBond Communities to build sixty units of affordable, multi-family senior housing at Owasso Boulevard, and 3011, 3029, and 3033 Rice Street. I ask the Planning Commission to recommend to the City Council to make the necessary changes in the Comprehensive Land Use Map, subsequent Rezoning, and conditional use approval for 32 units per acre. I believe the changes move forward the Goals and Policies of the Roseville 2030 Comprehensive Plan and would greatly benefit our community. It particularly contributes to Goal 7 which outlines the need to achieve a broad and flexible range of housing choices within the community to provide sufficient alternatives to meet the changing housing needs of current and future residents throughout all stages of

life. The CommonBond proposal addresses several important findings of the Housing Needs Assessment completed in October 2018. The report notes (page 69): “The overall vacancy rate for all stabilized senior properties in Roseville is 2.5%, which is below market equilibrium.” and that (p.125) “166 units of affordable senior housing has been identified as a need in Roseville through the year 2023.” This proposal provides sixty units of critically needed affordable senior housing. The Planning Division findings eliminate all possible reasons for rejecting the plan. They found no conflict with the Comprehensive Plan, regulating Maps, other adopted plans, or City Code requirements. They concluded it will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public facilities nor be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood. CommonBond has demonstrated a commitment to being a good partner by taking neighbors’ concerns seriously and completing the needed research to allow a fact based assessment of impact. Please recommend approval of the needed changes so CommonBond can build the housing critical to our community. Sincerely, Kitty Gogins

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Thomas Paschke

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Tuesday, April 30, 2019 8:58 PM
To: *RVPlanningCommission
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Contact Planning Commission

Contact Planning Commission

Please complete this online form and submit.

Subject: Common Bond proposal

Contact Information

Name: Cynthia S White

Address: 2489 CHURCHILL ST

City: ROSEVILLE

State: MN

Zip: 55113

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information. Email

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern I am unable to attend your meeting on May 1. But I want to provide my support for the Common Bond project. Housing of this nature is becoming more and more needed in Roseville.

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Thomas Paschke

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 7:28 AM
To: *RVPlanningCommission
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Contact Planning Commission

Contact Planning Commission

Please complete this online form and submit.

Subject: Affordable housing for all

Contact Information

Name: Paul Thomas

Address: 2489 Churchill St

City: Roseville

State: MN

Zip: 55113

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information. Email

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Email Address: [REDACTED]

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern
I am unable to attend this meeting due to a prior engagement. But for that, I would be there to lend my support for the following. I offer my support for the CommonBond project to build an affordable 60 unit building for seniors. I attended a presentation by CommonBond on the this project and agree with their efforts. I am for more affordable housing in Roseville for all people of all economic levels. I hope the planning commission will work toward this goa.

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

Email not displaying correctly? [View it in your browser.](#)

Thomas Paschke

From: noreply@civicplus.com
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 1:46 PM
To: *RVPlanningCommission
Subject: Online Form Submittal: Contact Planning Commission

Contact Planning Commission

Please complete this online form and submit.

Subject: support of 60 unit affordable housing development

Contact Information

Name: Sida

Address: 1927 Simpson St.

City: Roseville

State: MN

Zip: 55113

How would you prefer to be contacted? Remember to fill in the corresponding contact information. Email

Phone Number: *Field not completed.*

Email Address: 

Please Share Your Comment, Question or Concern
My family has lived in the same house in Roseville for over 18 years. My husband grew up here, attending RAHS. We have two kids, both attended Roseville schools. As our kids get older and our parents also get older, we are trying to attract our parents to move closer to us. A vibrant senior community, with affordable housing options, is a must. I fully support the development of affordable housing for families of all types. The 60 unit senior development is an important step in ensuring our community is responsively and responsibly building our shared future. I urge you to support the development. Sida Ly-Xiong

Unless restricted by law, all correspondence to and from Roseville City government offices, including information submitted through electronic forms such as this one, may be public data subject to the Minnesota Data Practices Act and/or may be disclosed to third parties.

Thomas Paschke

From: Janice Gundlach
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 2:00 PM
To: Thomas Paschke
Subject: FW: Rezoning

fyi

Janice Gundlach | Community Development Director
O: 651.792-7071
janice.gundlach@cityofroseville.com



2660 Civic Center Drive | Roseville, MN 55113
[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

From: r willmus <rwillmus@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 1:06 PM
To: Janice Gundlach <Janice.Gundlach@cityofroseville.com>; Pat Trudgeon <Pat.Trudgeon@cityofroseville.com>
Subject: Fw: Rezoning

Please forward this to the planning commission.

Bob Willmus
Roseville City Council
651-633-4601
rwillmus@msn.com

From: D G <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 11:35 AM
To: rwillmus@msn.com
Subject: Rezoning

Hi
I am unfortunately not able to attend the meeting tonight. I would like to voice my opinionas I am strongly opposed to this rezoning in my neighborhood. I have lived here all my life and I've seen how the city of Roseville has no sense of value for the single property home owners. As far as keeping it a safe and an upscale neighborhood. Please consider this as my voice during the meeting today. I would like to follow up with any other meetings in the future to prevent this from lowering our property values!!!
Thank you

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Janice Gundlach](#)
To: [Thomas Paschke](#)
Subject: FW: Rezoning at W Owasso and Rice
Date: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 2:00:19 PM

fyi

Janice Gundlach | Community Development Director

O: 651.792-7071

janice.gundlach@cityofroseville.com



2660 Civic Center Drive | Roseville, MN 55113

[Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [YouTube](#)

From: r willmus <rwillmus@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 1:05 PM
To: Janice Gundlach <Janice.Gundlach@cityofroseville.com>; Pat Trudgeon <Pat.Trudgeon@cityofroseville.com>
Subject: Fw: Rezoning at W Owasso and Rice

Please forward this on to the planning commission.

Bob Willmus
Roseville City Council
651-633-4601
rwillmus@msn.com

From: Claudia Stepnick <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 1, 2019 11:11 AM
To: rwillmus@msn.com
Subject: Rezoning at W Owasso and Rice

Dear Robert

Thank you for your attention. Although I am unable to attend tonight's Planning Commission meeting, I just want to add my voice to the group fighting the rezoning of the property on the corner of W Owasso and Rice St. While that property may have value for homes, it seems like a very crowded place to introduce a high density property. With the nearby senior complex and the new apartment complex/townhouse just north of 696 on Rice St, housing needs are being addressed. Traffic has increased and rezoning may open that doorway even further.

This is an area that is just barely inside of the Roseville boundaries, but that makes it no less valuable to the spirit of our community. When I purchased my home in this area nearly 10 years ago, I was moving from another Roseville neighborhood and committed to staying within the Roseville city area. I was raised in Roseville and attended McCarron's Elementary, Capitol View Jr High and Kellogg High School. My children attended Roseville schools as well. Roseville is a wonderful place to live and we must be its guardians.

Before any rezoning is approved, please carefully think how it will affect the established neighborhood and its current residents. Do we really need another high density highrise in this Rice Street area?

Thank you for listening and examining this rezoning request very carefully as so many are counting on you to remember us.

Claudia Stepnick
2960 Matilda St
Roseville