



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, January 3, 2024 – 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, and Commissioners Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Pamela Aspnes, Matthew Bauer and Erik Bjorum.

Members Absent: Vice Chair Karen Schaffhausen

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

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. October 4, 2023 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Chair Pribyl noted Member McGehee sent some corrections via email.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bauer, to approve the October 4, 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

- a. **Troys Automotive LLC requests a Zoning Code text amendment to Table 1005-1, Table of Allowed Uses, to support “motor vehicle repair, auto body shop” as a Conditional Use in the Neighborhood Mixed-Use District**

Chair Pribyl opened the public hearing at approximately 6:35 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of the public hearing. She advised this item will be before the City Council on January 29, 2024.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated January 3, 2024.

Member Bauer asked if Mr. Paschke could expand on why staff feels that the MU3 would not be the appropriate choice in this case.

Mr. Paschke explained that MU3 allows for many more uses, not that those uses could ever develop or redevelop this site given the different rules and regulations, but it opens up more opportunities for uses that might not be appropriate for this area or for these small neighborhood nodes. Keeping this neighborhood business and going through the conditional use process allows staff and the Planning Commission to review and analyze potential impacts and seek remedies, which seems far better than opening it up to being a permitted use and having other uses allowed. Mr. Paschke also suggested rezoning the parcel could be deemed a “spot zone” as the higher intensity mixed-use district does not fit well with the other adjacent zoning districts and this zoning pattern would be inconsistent with other areas of the City

Ms. Gundlach indicated this particular site is surrounded by low density residential property and the MU1 Zoning is really set aside for properties that are in closer proximity to some of that more low-density residential property.

Member McGehee asked if staff has any more site plan information for how it would be laid out on the site.

Mr. Paschke indicated he has a site plan that he had worked with initially. He explained how the site plan was arranged.

Member McGehee asked why the applicant has had to come forward to the Planning Commission to change the building.

Mr. Paschke indicated the building is not permitted and the building cannot be expanded under the standards for non-conforming use, thus the reason for the proposed text amendment.

Member McGehee did not think the applicant was going to expand the business massively.

Mr. Paschke agreed and noted if this is approved the applicant will need to get a conditional use and then he believed there is at least one variance that will be required because of where the existing building lies and tying into that. There are still some more steps to this.

Member Aspnes indicated she was thinking about unintended consequences, if the City added car repair to MU1, where else could the City see that become a potential issue for Roseville. She wondered if there are other places where this could occur and did staff look into this.

Mr. Paschke explained realistically any site currently zoned MU1 could be motor vehicle repair or auto body shop. However, if a given property is a change in use the Zoning Code and all of the design standards would apply, just like if a site were to redevelop. The bar becomes much higher than a pre-existing use.

Ms. Gundlach expanded on the consequence of redevelopment within the MU1 district.

Chair Pribyl invited the applicant to speak to the Commission.

Mr. Troy Miller, 2171 Hamline Avenue, addressed the Commission on the reason he is wanting to expand his business.

Public Comment

Mr. Kerrik Wessel, explained he knows Mr. Miller and supports this business and the proposed changes.

No one else wished to address the Commission. Chair Pribyl closed the public hearing at 6:53 p.m.

Commission Deliberation

None.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to recommend to the City Council approval of a zoning text amendment to Table 1005-1 (Mixed Use District Table of Uses) to change “motor vehicle repair, auto body shop” from NP, Not Permitted to C, Conditional Use for the MU-1 district.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

7. Other Business

None.

8. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Aspnes, seconded by Member Bjorum, to adjourn the meeting at 6:55 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.