



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, August 2, 2023 – 6:30 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order**

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

**2. Roll Call**

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

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

**Members Absent:** Erik Bjorum

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

**3. Approve Agenda**

**MOTION**

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

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

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

Chair Pribyl noted Members McGehee and Bjorum sent in some changes to the minutes.

Chair Pribyl indicated on lines 543 and 547, referred to the City of St. Paul and should be City of Minneapolis.

**MOTION**

**Member Aspnes moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the July 5, 2023 meeting minutes.**

Ayes: 6  
Nays: 0  
Motion carried.

**5. Communications and Recognitions:**

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

None.

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

None.

**6. Public Hearing**

None.

**7. Other Business Heading Information**

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

Community Development Director Janice Gundlach reviewed the City Council request regarding the Scope and Purpose update for the Planning Commission.

Chair Pribyl reviewed the items staff included in the packet for discussion. She asked the Commission if there was anything else to discuss.

Member Aspnes asked staff to remind her of what the sketch plan process could be like for the Planning Commission including timelines for the applicant.

Ms. Gundlach reviewed the sketch plan process other cities use that could be implemented in Roseville. She thought the sketch plan review would probably come before the open house to allow it to be reviewed by the public and then questions could be answered at the open house.

Chair Pribyl noted her experience with the sketch plan process in other cities is that not every project has this. She thought some discussion could be regarding what would trigger the sketch plan process to come forward. She explained regarding the list, these are just ideas that were put out there that the Commission discussed, and she did not know if a formal vote was needed but she thought overall agreement that these things are things that the Commission wants to take to the City Council for consideration. She wondered if anyone had concerns about the first item to propose to the City Council that some language be added to the beginning of the meeting, perhaps something similar to what is in the reports the Commission gets about their quasi-judicial role, explaining that more clearly to the public.

The Commission concurred.

Ms. Gundlach explained staff wants to look at the language that is in their reports and the notices too because staff thought there was an opportunity to improve that.

Chair Pribyl thought it would be nice if it was all cohesive and potentially repeated in different instances.

Member McGee thought as a part of that the Commission could run an educational piece with some more time effort into the newsletter that the City mails out. There is not a terrible rush for this to go out but that would ensure that it would be done as an educational piece that everybody in the City would at least be apprised of some of the zoning issues that are coming up and how the process works and what the Planning Commission's role is and what the City Council's role is.

Ms. Gundlach explained the discussion staff has had about looking at the way the City is communicating with the public on these public hearing notices is sort of incorporating the level of input spectrum under the International Association of Public Participation. She reviewed what the input spectrum does and the reason why she brought it up is because City staff is trying to re-evaluate those communications and those communications will in and of itself have an educational component to it.

Member Aspnes indicated she liked the idea of a bar graph with a continuum of informed to approval or engaged, whatever the two end points are. She noted she really liked that and thought the visual is really easy to see and then the key words at the points. She wondered if this type of language is going to be used in other parts of City government.

Ms. Gundlach explained she knew as a senior leadership team they have talked about trying to use those types of words with the public when communicating with them in terms of what type of feedback staff is trying to get. How that is actually being pushed out, she cannot address and did not know the answer to that yet.

Chair Pribyl thought the Commission was in concurrence with item one on the list. The second item is possible consider having an opportunity for more than one joint meeting per year to discuss topics. She wondered if anyone had concerns, comments, or questions about bringing that forward as a suggestion.

Member Kruzel wondered if the meetings would be as needed or scheduled twice a year.

Chair Pribyl thought that was one of the discussion points to discuss with the City Council, but her thought was the meetings would be as needed when issues come up.

Member Bauer thought it made sense to have more than one meeting a year with the City Council. His only concern is what the Commission is tasked with is adding something or modifying the City Code.

Member Aspnes asked if the Planning Commission has ever had a meeting with the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Ms. Gundlach indicated the two Commissions have not had a joint meeting since she has been with the City. Other Commissions have not typically met together, it has just been the individual Commissions meeting jointly with the City Council.

Chair Pribyl asked if anyone had concerns, comments, or questions about adding a sketch plan process.

Member Schaffhausen wondered for the conversation if it would be beneficial to kind of rough up a plan or would it be easier to talk about it in concept.

Ms. Gundlach recommended at this point to take about it in concept and then it will likely be something that is incorporated into the Zoning Code and then the Planning Commission will have lots of time to get into the details. She noted she did not want the Planning Commission to spend too much time on this in case the City Council is not interested in adding it.

Member McGee asked if the Commission could have a list of the items going forward to the City Council for consideration.

Ms. Gundlach indicated she would be able to do that.

Member Bauer thought since there is a joint meeting with the City Council coming up, he wondered if it made sense, in anticipation that the Commission bring forward to the City Council zoning issues that the Commission has seen from the community, and if so, should the Commission have a meeting in September to discuss those topics so then the Commission is prepared for the joint meeting.

Ms. Gundlach indicated that always gets put on the Commission agenda before a joint meeting for discussion.

Member McGehee asked if the Commission should assume it can use communications. If there is something any of the Commission wish to discuss as a part of this and is not on the agenda, then there really is not a mechanism to get it on the agenda that she knows of. If there is a mechanism, she would like it to be explained to her and if not then she did not know if anyone wants it. She wondered if there should be a place at the end of the meeting for the Commission to bring up discussion items for future meetings, like the City Council does.

Chair Pribyl thought the communications section of their regular agenda that the item could be brought up there at that point or via email to Ms. Gundlach as a suggestion

for a future meeting or if that point in the agenda is not meant for that purpose the Commission could discuss adding something else to specifically address that.

Ms. Gundlach thought that was the purpose of the joint meeting with the City Council is for the Commission to bring items forward to the City Council that the Commission would like to work on in the upcoming year. The last thing she wants to do it have the Commissioners bring issues up during the year, spend a bunch of time working on them and then those things go to the City Council and the Council is not interested. Typically, the Planning Commission takes their direction from the City Council, not the other way around.

Member McGehee understood that but she had a little different take on the direction in attachment one where it says “strengthen information coming to the City Council.” She did not see this as something that would come to the Council randomly, but more that there would be something that had enough following here to actually say something about it and ask staff to run it up the flag pole, if it was something the Commission thought needed to be changed or something the Commission was thinking about rather than having individual Commission members say something to the Council. She was looking for a way that the Commission could have some consensus at the Commission level on a particular item. She did not have anything in mind, certainly the tree thing came up out of this and there may be other things that come up in the future. But, she was thinking the Commission does not have a formal process and typically she thinks of the communications and recognitions are something that the Commission or an individual commissioner knows about or is going on in the community; it is not a request for action by the commission. What was being suggested here would be a more formal method or process where the Chair would decide, or the Commission would decide whether there was enough interest in a particular item to discuss it further or to even discuss the item at all.

Chair Pribyl understood and explained it would be something the Commission would discuss at the Commission level and then add to the list of things to discuss with the City Council at the joint meeting.

Member McGehee indicated that was correct.

Chair Pribyl thought this would give the Commission the opportunity to collect those discussion points as the Commission met.

Member McGehee agreed.

Member Kruzel indicated other boards she sits on have something at the end of the meeting where the members are asked if there are any agenda items for the next month to be considered and at that point, a general consensus is made to go ahead with it or not. She was not sure if that would be ok with the City or not.

Chair Pribyl asked Ms. Gundlach if there were any issues with that, to add that as a standing piece of the business.

Ms. Paschke was not sure it would be an issue, but the question would be how the item goes from the Commission to the Council because it is not like the Council has an agenda section that has communications from the Planning Commission for staff to advocate for the Commission items on the Council docket. This would have to be broached with the City Council as to what the Planning Commission is thinking about as a whole of changing or researching because that is typically what the Commission is doing, modifying something, or seeking an amendment to something.

Chair Pribyl thought the idea was that those items would become a part of the Commissions list for discussion at the joint meeting if it would go that far.

Chair Pribyl thought it was a good idea to have a running list of items done throughout the year to discuss with the City Council at the joint meeting.

Ms. Gundlach indicated she will add this item to the list as item four, but staff would not be providing research support for items the Commission would bring forward during the year unless the City Council agreed the items brought forward would be items the Council would want the Planning Commission to discuss further and at that point staff would start research on those items.

**8. Adjourn**

**MOTION**

**Member Bauer, seconded by Member McGehee, to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.**

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**