



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting  
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive  
Minutes – Wednesday, September 2, 2020 – 6:30 p.m.**

*Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 13.D.021, Planning Commission members, City Staff, and members of the public participated in this meeting electronically due to the COVID-19 pandemic.*

**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; and Commissioners Julie Kimble, Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Michelle Pribyl and Karen Schaffhausen.

**Members Absent:** Commissioner Sparby.

**Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach and Community Development Department Assistant Staci Johnson.

**3. Approve Agenda**

**MOTION**

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

**Ayes: 6**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**4. Review of Minutes**

**a. July 1, 2020 Planning Commission Regular Meeting**

Commissioner McGehee indicated she sent her changes to staff.

**MOTION**

**Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to approve the July 1, 2020 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. **Request by City of Roseville to Rezone Lot 2, Block 1, Fairview Fire Station, from Institutional District to Regional Business District (PF20-006)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PF20-006 at approximately 6:37 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council September 24<sup>th</sup> or September 28<sup>th</sup> Regular meeting.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated September 2, 2020.

**Public Comment**

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

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 6:42 p.m.

**Commission Deliberation**

None.

**MOTION**

**Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Schaffhausen, to recommend to the City Council approval of the proposed Rezoning from Institutional District to Regional Business-1 District for Lot 2, Block 1, Fairview Fire Station, based on the content of this RPCA, public input, and Planning Commission deliberation (PF20-006).**

Commissioner Pribyl thought this seemed a reasonable rezoning and was consistent with the other parcels in the area along Fairview.

**Ayes: 6**  
**Nays: 0**  
**Motion carried.**

**b. Request by City of Roseville for Approval of an Amendment to Title 11, Subdivisions, to Regulate Subdivision Proposals that Would Locate a New Street Adjacent to the Rear Boundaries of Existing Parcel (PJOJ0042)**

Chair Gitzen opened the public hearing for PROJ0042 at approximately 6:45 p.m. and reported on the purpose and process of a public hearing. He advised this item will be before the City Council at either the September 21<sup>st</sup> or September 28<sup>th</sup> Regular meeting

Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated September 2, 2020.

Member Kimble thought the examples are very much appreciated because it helps them to understand this. She wondered if the links will be in the online version of the Code for people to understand this better.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he did not give that any thought and is a subject to some greater discussion.

Member Kimble thought in a couple of instances examples like this would be really helpful and she hoped that could get figured out because it helps to illustrate the language.

Member McGehee asked if this is only related to new plats being developed. She wondered if one added twenty feet behind the existing property then would that be adequate or not ok because the existing lots would back up against a proposed road and in that case are not of sufficient depth on their own.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he did not remember the depth of the lots on the former application but believed those were less than 260 feet.

Member McGehee indicated that was correct.

Mr. Lloyd indicated if there is enough room on the lot for the roadway to be moved far enough away for the provision being discussed than conceivably the existing lots would not be through lots or staff would be attempting to mitigate impacts with the twenty-foot outlot and screening in there.

Member McGehee thought another thing that is vague is the business of topographical things that make it difficult. She indicated she would like this to be a little more defined because it sets up a process that is easy to come forward with a request without really putting a tremendous amount of effort into something else.

Member Pribyl asked regarding the definition of through lots, she noticed there is no reference to public street, but it does say street and street right-of-way so does “street” by definition include both unless it distinctly states public or private.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that was correct and in the Subdivision Code there are regulations for how streets are built. The standards for construction are the same whether public or private.

Member Pribyl explained in regard to the through lot definition under number two, Mr. Lloyd did a really good explanation of why there is not a number in the minimum required width and that it varies by District. She wondered if there were any residential zoning districts that allow a lot less than 110 feet deep.

Mr. Lloyd indicated there was not.

Member Kruzel asked if the language was consistent or similar to adjacent cities or communities.

Mr. Lloyd did not think so. He explained most of the adjacent cities, eleven surrounding Roseville want to discourage, avoid, or outright prohibit through lots but those that do also have some exceptions. That is consistent with how other communities are regulating them. None of the other communities around Roseville really have this much definition.

Member Schaffhausen thought staff went above and beyond with the presentation and thought it was really helpful. She thought if this cannot be defined more then it would be nice to see it.

Chair Gitzen wondered if staff was suggesting prohibiting corner lots.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the intention was not to prohibit corner lots, today lots which might also be corner lots are defined explicitly as not being through lots. The existing definition does not seem to recognize the situation where there are streets on more than just two sides of the property.

Mr. Lloyd reviewed some examples with the Commission regarding the proposed amendments.

### **Public Comment**

Ms. Nancy Nelson asked if a twenty-foot barrier was put between the back of the lot and a private road, is that original residential lot not a through lot because it does not have access to the road behind the property.

Mr. Lloyd indicated that is one of the reasons why the word “public” was taken out of the definition that is being proposed because by definition “private street” does not give access and does not have access to people who are not party to that private street.

The intention is that it is the outlot itself that in the circumstances of a private street, the twenty feet of width, is in a separate parcel all on its own and it is that parcel that is getting in the way of that access but functionally it is created as a through street. There could be a situation where the private street with landscaping and fencing along the adjacent rear yards because those are through lots, is somehow in the future incorporated into that development and may somehow be subdivided or turned around. It is not necessarily always and forever, may not connect, but he appreciated the scrutiny of the language and what it means. The intention is that the outlot and the screening provides more privacy and does not somehow mean that it is no longer a through lot because it went there for the privacy.

Chair Gitzen closed the public hearing at 7:57 p.m.

### **Commission Deliberation**

None.

### **MOTION**

**Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, to recommend to the City Council approval of the Proposed Amendments to Title 10 and Title 11 Regarding Through Lots, based on the content of this RPCA, public comment and Planning Commission deliberation (PROJ0042).**

Member Kimble thought this was thorough and reasonable. She thought it was hard for anything to be iron clad but at the same time the City does not want something that will be so totally inflexible that it does not work either. She thought the culmination of the way it was defined and the language that was suggested to be changed is reasonable and makes sense.

Member Kruzel agreed and thought it was nice to tighten up the parameter. She thanked Mr. Lloyd for his thoroughness.

Member McGehee indicated she would like this to go to the Council showing that the Commission is trying to tighten things up and make it a little bit clearer and she thought there have been some good questions from the public. She asked for a friendly amendment that would state “The Planning Commission would like to have staff and the Council more carefully the question of “how close is too close” with respect to what Member Pribyl brought up about what would be ok for a through lot.

Community Development Director Gundlach explained Commissioner McGehee’s friendly amendment really is asking questions and a friendly amendment should really be specific to the actual recommendation that is being made. What she would recommend is to take the vote on the motion that was made and then Commissioner McGehee’s comments could be added to the minutes and be presented to the City Council as a part of the overall recommendation. She indicated the City Council reviews the minutes with all of the recommendations that were made.

Commissioner Pribyl thought Mr. Lloyd did an excellent job of outlining all of the issues and trying to define things as well as he could and still allow some flexibility and understanding that every situation is going to be different and unique. She also shared some of the concerns of Commissioner McGehee about sort of the vagueness of the typographic or other conditions renderings of dividing otherwise unreasonable. She indicated she supported the motion.

Chair Gitzen agreed and thought the comments are good as far as acceptance. He thought this is putting another tool in the toolbox that the City can use to help protect the privacy of people living in the area of new development. He indicated he would support the motion.

**Ayes: 6**  
**Nays: 0**  
**Motion carried.**

**7. Adjourn**

**MOTION**  
**Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Kruzel, to adjourn the meeting at 8:09 p.m.**

**Ayes: 6**  
**Nays: 0**  
**Motion carried.**