



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, January 8, 2020 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Chair Chuck Gitzen; Vice Chair Peter Sparby, and Commissioners Julie Kimble, Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl and Karen Schaffhausen.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. December 4, 2019 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Chair Gitzen indicated on line 297 “Police Chief” should be changed to “Community Development Director Gundlach”.

Member McGehee noted on line 111 the word “skate” should be changed to “escape”.

Member Sparby also had a change on line 135-136, pertaining to his comment the sentence should read “He indicated he was a little confused as to why ~~there is a~~ the additional components were part of the Planning Commission recommended action”.

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the December 4, 2019 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

5. Communications and Recognitions:

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

None.

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

None.

6. Public Hearing

- a. Consideration of a Request For A Conditional Use To Allow Two Drive Throughs At 2465 Fairview Avenue (PF19-023)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF19-023 at approximately 6:34 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council on January 27, 2020.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated January 8, 2020.

Chair Gitzen asked if staff has had any comments from the public.

Mr. Paschke indicated staff has not had any calls or emails related to this project from the public.

Member Kimble asked if there is anywhere else in Roseville that has two drive throughs.

Mr. Paschke explained he could not think of one particular site that have two drive throughs. There might be a number of sites that have a number of different uses that have multiple drive throughs. There is not one individual parcel that has two uses each with a drive through. Rosedale may end up with three or four when completed. He noted the library does have a drive through for book drops and also one for Dunn Bros.

Member Kimble asked what the reason was for the shared access with the property to the North. She wondered if the shared access was there before and was some condition.

Mr. Paschke explained the shared access would need to be related to this site redevelopment project. Whatever was consummated in the previous agreement would not be germane to this proposal. He believed the shared access expires at some point in 2020. The shared access was for the allowance of shared parking because of how the site is currently designed.

Member Kimble indicated she has frequented this site a lot and it is dangerous to make a left turn from this property and found it interesting that in the review of specific conditional use criteria, b “points of vehicular ingress and egress shall be located at least 60 feet from the street right-of-way lines of the nearest intersection” and yet it indicated the requirement does not apply to the HFCU site.

Mr. Paschke explained that is in regard to street intersections and not another access point. He noted the County would not allow access points as seen today and is why this site is being required to eliminate one.

Member Kimble thought it was interesting that there has not been a comment about a right turn only from this site because it is really dangerous because it is so close to that major intersection.

Mr. Paschke stated this was discussed with Ramsey County and the applicant and after some discussion the County determined it would support only one full access point to Fairview Avenue. Mr. Paschke further stated the County controls access to Fairview Avenue and as such the City and applicant has to abide by their decision. The County also received, for its review and comment, the traffic study completed for the project based on the two options. The final design will be required to be reviewed and approved by the County, prior to the City’s review and approval.

Member Kimble suggested there be really good directional signage because it can be really confusing and would be a recommendation she would have.

Member Schaffhausen seconded what Member Kimble has pointed out because that is a dicey spot. Specific to the pertinence of the meeting and the Conditional Use she was curious to know the two versus one access and if Ramsey County says no, what opportunity within the traffic study did it indicate this was safe because the left turn is tricky. She wondered how the city navigates that conversation. She noted she was appreciative of the process but was curious if the traffic study did any sort of commentary or evaluation of what would happen with planning scenarios or not and if that is something that can be revisited knowing it is a little bit of a tough spot and if nothing, can the Planning Commission go forward with some recommendation about signage.

Mr. Paschke explained the traffic study did not look at two access points and the main reason is that the County was not going to support two. The traffic study needed to consider an option or options the County could potentially accept. He thought

Condition F covered this and did not think the city needed to get any more detailed than the existing wording.

Member Kruzal asked how pedestrian foot traffic going into the credit union or coffee shop will play into this.

Mr. Paschke indicated he did not know the numbers but thought there will be people that will walk to the coffee shop or to the bank but he did not know if those numbers will be a lot and the city will do its best to be able to sign so that the pedestrians will be safe.

Member McGehee asked when the traffic study was done.

Mr. Paschke thought it was completed in late November 2019.

Member McGehee asked in the Conditional Use Permit, when someone has a conditional use with two drive throughs, would the two drive throughs become a part of the conditional use.

Mr. Paschke explained the Conditional Use Permit is only for the two drive throughs.

Member McGehee noted then whatever goes into the building, if the Credit Union fails, then the city would be stuck with two drive throughs on that site.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct and the only caveat is if the owner made changes to the plan and changing the circulation which would be the way the city would be able to go in and seek the owner to amend the conditional use and at that point the city may or may not support the two uses and two drive throughs.

Member McGehee asked if the coffee shop has a sit-down area.

Mr. Paschke explained it does and in the design plan there is space for people to sit down.

Member McGehee assumed the parking right in front or behind the building would be adequate for the bank and coffee shop.

Mr. Paschke indicated that was correct as it relates to parking. He believed the parking in the front would be for customers and the parking at the back would be primarily for employees but also for customers of both uses.

Member McGehee asked if staff felt the parking was adequate in the front for both uses. She thought there should be more protection for pedestrians because she felt in the future with redevelopment of the area there will be more housing and opportunity for pedestrian access and she thought the city needed to plan for that because the Council did change the zoning to have housing around Rosedale. She noted that Minneapolis did just ban drive throughs in parking lots and is something the city

might want to look at as a safety issue. She concurred with all of the comments and did not think signage was sufficient to make the parking lot safe for anybody to walk across, given the amount of car traffic that is being encouraged to traverse this site.

Member Pribyl echoed the comments made and thought as an Option B if the north shared access is not a possibility and wondered if it was considered to have this single access point aligned with the drive through.

Mr. Paschke explained that had been talked about but was not necessary as a design and did not think that would change a whole lot of the potential impacts discussed. Signage will still be needed, and staff will work with the applicants on getting appropriate and adequate signage. He indicated the impacts will not go away whether the vehicle entrance would be aligned with the drive through.

Member Sparby asked if there have been any redevelopment requests for properties in the area.

Mr. Paschke indicated there has not been any redevelopment requests.

Member Sparby saw the traffic in the area as a broader issue that as things redevelop for the city to work with the County to try to lessen the impact on Fairview.

Member Schaffhausen explained with the two drive throughs, thinking about the library and the current site is the city setting a precedent.

Mr. Paschke indicated it was not. Each site has to stand on its own merits. He noted the Planning Commission needs to focus on the ten criteria as it relates to this Conditional Use request for those two access points.

Chair Gitzen asked if Ramsey County has indicated to staff any plans for Fairview in the next five years.

Mr. Paschke explained there might be some enhancements potentially depending on what Rosedale might do further down the road but there will not be anything major and he did not know that the County has a plan to redo Fairview Avenue at all.

Mr. Russ Sam, HTG Architects was at the meeting on behalf of Highway Federal Credit Union. He reviewed the access points and indicated it was chosen to maintain the existing south curb cut. The primary reason for that is all of the exiting will be coming from the coffee shop along the south side of the property and the drive through traffic will also loop around the west side of the building and exit out along the south side as well. The applicant felt that if the north curb cut there could be some congestion at the credit union drive through and the parking. The applicant felt if there was any conflict to stack back towards the west on the south side of the building which would still allow traffic to get into the site.

Mr. Sam indicated there is a pedestrian connection from Fairview to the front door and will work with staff further on this. Regarding the parking the applicant chose to reduce the amount of parking on the west side of the building because there should be adequate parking as shown plus if there is parking in certain areas of the site there could be conflicts with the drive through lanes or people trying to get to the coffee lane.

Member Kimble asked where the menu board is, if there will be room for other cars to get around to the west.

Mr. Sam explained originally there were two lanes of traffic there but more parking was needed on the site so that was eliminated.

Public Comment

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 7:29 p.m.

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to the City Council approval of a Conditional Use for 2465 Fairview Avenue, allowing two drive-throughs on the subject property based on the comments, findings, and the conditions stated in the January 8, 2020 staff report (PF19-023).

Member Sparby thought this made sense and is an improvement to the area, despite traffic in the area, what has been presented is the best use for the space and layout to move congestion through the area. He thought working with the property to the north is another good step.

Member Schaffhausen agreed and thought considering how this property has historically been used this is going to be an enormous improvement and appreciated the volume of effort and work done. Despite the concerns she thought this will be a nice step in the right direction for improving the space.

Member Kimble appreciated the explanation from Mr. Sam about why the drive was moved to the south and made a lot of sense. She reiterated her concern that the signage is really good and not just on the pavement.

Member McGehee thought the city needs to start thinking about the drive throughs and if those should continue to be allowed, especially multiple drive throughs. She agreed with all of the comments made.

Member Kruzel thought it was also innovative to have the coffee shop stay and have the credit union and was a good use of space and enhances Roseville.

Chair Gitzen supported the motion and thought it helped to have Mr. Sam there to explain the reasoning.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

7. Adjourn

MOTION
Member Kruzel, seconded by Member Pribyl to adjourn the meeting at 7:33 p.m.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.