



Planning Commission Agenda

Wednesday, August 7, 2024

6:30 PM

City Council Chambers

(Any times listed are approximate – please note that items may be earlier or later than listed on the agenda)

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Approval of Agenda**
- 4. Review of Minutes**
 - a. Review June 5, 2024 Minutes.
- 5. Communications and Recognitions**
 - a. Receive 2024 Community Survey Results
- 6. Public Hearing**
 - a. A request by Northwest Transportation Services, LLC to allow outdoor storage of fleet vehicles overnight as a CONDITIONAL USE at 2277 Highway 36.
- 7. Business**
- 8. Commission Direction on Commission Member Initiated Agenda Items**
- 9. Adjourn**



Item No.: 4.a.

Review of Minutes

Item Description: Review June 5, 2024 Minutes.

N/A

N/A

N/A

Review the June 5, 2024 minutes and make a motion to approve subject to requested corrections.

N/A

Attachments: 1. June 5, 2024 Minutes



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, June 5, 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, Vice-Chair Karen Schaffhausen, and Commissioners Michelle Kruzel, Tammy McGehee, Pamela Aspnes, and Erik Bjorum.

Members Absent: Matthew Bauer

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes

a. April 3, 2024, Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to approve the April 3, 2024, 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. A Request by Northwest Transportation Services, LLC, for a Conditional Use to Allow Outdoor Storage of Fleet Vehicles at 2277 Highway 36**

Chair Pribyl indicated the applicant has requested this item be postponed until August 7, 2024.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Bjorum, to table consideration of the request to the August 7, 2024, Planning Commission meeting.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

7. Commission Direction on Commission Member Initiated Agenda Items

- a. Discuss Comprehensive Plan Engagement Strategies**

Chair Pribyl indicated Commission McGehee requested this item be placed on the Commission's agenda. She explained the Commission needs to vote on whether to discuss Comprehensive Plan engagement strategies at a future meeting.

Member McGehee indicated she did not prepare a report but was interested in what the members of the Commission thought of the Planning Commission. She knew that Commission Bauer was interested. She noted she could table this item due to this being a short meeting anyway. She did not think this was going to be discussed at the meeting and wondered if there was any member open to discussing this at a future meeting. She was more interested in hearing from other people rather than making a presentation.

Chair Pribyl indicated this item could be tabled or the Commission could discuss whether everyone would want to go through this at a future meeting or not.

Member Schaffhausen asked staff when the City initiates the next Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Paschke thought within the next four years. This is on a ten-year cycle with the Met Council and cities usually start two years in advance of that cycle deadline.

88 There is a 2030 plan, and the next plan will be a 2050 plan. He believed the City
89 adopted the last plan two or three years ago.
90

91 Member McGehee explained one of the things she was thinking was this year the City
92 had a visioning plan that came after the Comprehensive Plan, and it is a useful
93 document to have ahead of time. She thought there was no urgency to this, and it was
94 early, but she thought it was worthwhile to think about because it is a problem getting
95 people interested in the City Government and what is going on and it takes some
96 work. She thought if the City wanted some type of visioning because now it seems
97 clear that the Council did not change the direction a lot of the responsibility for the
98 Comprehensive Plan falls on the group that is here at a time that it is supposed to be
99 thought about. She thought the Commission could think about whether there is a
100 process and review what things were successful and what things were less successful
101 and what can be changed to engage people a little earlier to keep their interest in what
102 is going on.
103

104 Member Aspnes thought this was a worthwhile topic for the Planning Commission to
105 talk about. She thought this was premature but personally, because she was not
106 involved in the Planning Commission during the last Comprehensive Plan planning,
107 she would find it helpful to know what that full process looks like, and what the
108 expectations are for the Planning Commission around that. It seems premature
109 because there are so many things that are going to change in the next couple of years,
110 based on how rapidly things have changed in the last four years and if the City is
111 going to start a cycle in roughly three to four years or longer, she thought there will
112 be a lot of changes it would make sense to wait but not forget to have some
113 conversation around this in the future.
114

115 Member McGehee did not think discussion needed to be this year, but she wanted the
116 Commission to think about this and think whether the Commission was going to take
117 a more proactive role. She thought that in the past it had not been very proactive.
118

119 Member Kruzel asked what pieces Member McGehee is looking at for discussion.
120

121 Member McGehee explained her original thought was if this were useable or
122 important to have a community visioning in advance of starting this process and if it
123 is then the Commission should talk to the Council about that and see how the Council
124 would approach that. That would be in advance, and the Commission could use that
125 information from the community visioning as a part of the planning moving forward.
126 She understood that things may change but she did not think that anyone could start
127 the process too early getting community engagement.
128

129 Chair Pribyl asked if the Commission agreed not to put this on an agenda in the next
130 couple of months but to keep it in mind for future discussion, this year or early in the
131 next year.
132

133 The Commission concurred.
134

Regular Planning Commission Meeting

Minutes – Wednesday, June 5, 2024

Page 4

Member McGehee explained she would be willing to contribute some things but wanted to see what other Commissioners thought.

Member Schaffhausen agreed that this is premature as far as what is on the docket and her preference would be not this year but something that can be tackled later. She did believe this is important and that the whole intention as far as getting more engagement is invaluable and she thought for the Commission's time it would be better spent in the short term focusing on the tasks in front of them.

Member Aspnes indicated her agreement.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Aspnes, to table this item until the second quarter of 2025.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

8. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Aspnes, seconded by Member Bjorum, to adjourn the meeting at 6:50 p.m.

Ayes: 6

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION

Date: **8/7/2024**
Item No.: **5.a.**

Department Approval

Janice Gundlach

Agenda Section

Communications and Recognitions

Item Description: Receive 2024 Community Survey Results

Application Information

Applicant: n/a
Location: n/a
Application Submission: n/a
City Action Deadline: n/a
Zoning: n/a

Background

At the June 3, 2024 City Council meeting, the Morris Leatherman Company presented the 2024 Community Survey results to the City Council. This survey is completed every 2-3 years and provides feedback on a variety of City programs and services, and helps to rate the quality of life in the City. The survey has 130 questions and is given to a 400-person random sample via phone.

Several of the questions, or the responses, reference housing and/or commercial and shopping areas. Given the Planning Commission is tasked with zoning, which impacts where housing and commercial and shopping areas are, staff was asked to provide the survey results to the Commission for informational purposes. The questions that reference these topics, or zoning generally, are noted below:

- Housing: questions 4, 7, 13, 14, 77-84, 91
- Shopping and/or commercial areas: questions 4, 17, 87-88

It should be noted that there are a few references to affordability in housing, and while the Commission reviews housing projects as part of its zoning authority, affordability, or cost, is not a component of zoning but instead is a focus that generally resides with the Roseville Economic Development Authority. However, the Commission can address what housing types are allowed, and where, through zoning, and certain housing types can be considered more affordable than others. This is only to say that cost and housing type, while related, are very different in the context of zoning and the Commission's level of influence.

Staff Recommendation

Receive survey information.

Requested Planning Commission Action

Receive survey information.

Alternative Actions

None

Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director

Attachments: 1. 2024 City of Roseville Survey Results

ATTACHMENT 1

THE MORRIS LEATHERMAN COMPANY
3128 Dean Court
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55416

City of Roseville
Residential Survey
FINAL APRIL 2024

Hello, I'm _____ of the Morris Leatherman Company, a polling firm located in Minneapolis. We have been retained by the City of Roseville to speak with a random sample of residents about issues facing the community. This survey is being conducted because the City Council and City Staff are interested in your opinions and suggestions about current and future city needs. I want to assure you that all individual responses will be held strictly confidential; only summaries of the entire sample will be reported.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Approximately, how many years have you lived in Roseville? | TWO YEARS OR LESS.....9%
THREE TO FIVE YEARS....17%
SIX TO TEN YEARS.....20%
11 TO TWENTY YEARS.....18%
21 TO 30 YEARS.....17%
OVER THIRTY YEARS.....19% |
| 2. As things stand now, how long in the future do you expect to live in Roseville? | TWO YEARS OR LESS.....5%
THREE TO FIVE YEARS....11%
SIX TO TEN YEARS.....17%
OVER TEN YEARS.....55%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....12% |
| 3. How would you rate the quality of life in Roseville - excellent, good, only fair, or poor? | EXCELLENT.....33%
GOOD.....54%
ONLY FAIR.....10%
POOR.....3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% |
| 4. What do you like most, if anything, about living in Roseville? | DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
NOTHING.....3%
CONVENIENT LOCATION....11%
NEIGHBORHOOD/HOUSING...13%
SAFE.....6%
FRIENDLY PEOPLE.....13%
CLOSE TO FAMILY/
FRIENDS.....17%
CLOSE TO JOB.....13%
SCHOOLS.....5%
PARKS/TRAILS.....9%
SHOPPING.....3%
QUIET AND PEACEFUL.....7%
SCATTERED.....1% |

ATTACHMENT 1

5. What do you think is the most serious issue facing Roseville today?

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%
NOTHING.....	22%
HIGH TAXES.....	16%
RISING CRIME.....	25%
POOR CITY SPENDING.....	2%
LACK OF JOBS/BUSINESS...	7%
AGING POPULATION.....	9%
AGING INFRASTRUCTURE....	6%
STREET REPAIR.....	7%
SCATTERED.....	6%

6. All in all, do you think things in Roseville are generally headed in the right direction, or do you feel things are off on the wrong track?

RIGHT DIRECTION.....	85%
WRONG TRACK.....	13%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	3%

IF "WRONG TRACK," ASK: (n=50)

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%
HIGH TAXES.....	14%
POOR CITY SPENDING.....	6%
RISING CRIME.....	60%
GROWING DIVERSITY.....	6%
TOO MUCH RETAIL.....	4%
TOO MANY RENTALS.....	2%
SCATTERED.....	8%

7. Please tell me why you feel things have gotten off on the wrong track?

DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%
HIGH TAXES.....	14%
POOR CITY SPENDING.....	6%
RISING CRIME.....	60%
GROWING DIVERSITY.....	6%
TOO MUCH RETAIL.....	4%
TOO MANY RENTALS.....	2%
SCATTERED.....	8%

8. How would you rate the sense of community identity among residents in Roseville - would you say it is very strong, somewhat strong, not too strong, or not at all strong?

VERY STRONG.....	28%
SOMEWHAT STRONG.....	58%
NOT TOO STRONG.....	10%
NOT AT ALL STRONG.....	3%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	2%

9. Please tell me which of the following do you feel the closest connection to - the City of Roseville as a whole, your neighborhood, your School District or something else? (IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?

CITY OF ROSEVILLE.....	18%
NEIGHBORHOOD.....	43%
SCHOOL DISTRICT.....	7%
CHURCH.....	3%
WORKPLACE.....	6%
FAMILY/FRIENDS.....	23%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

10.	How welcome do you feel in the	VERY WELCOME.....59%
	City of Roseville - very welcome,	SOMEWHAT WELCOME.....29%
	somewhat welcome, not too welcome,	NOT TOO WELCOME.....6%
	or not at all welcome?	NOT AT ALL WELCOME.....2%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....5%

IF A RESPONSE IS GIVEN, ASK: (n=382)

11.	Why do you feel that way?	UNSURE.....2%
		FRIENDLY PEOPLE.....49%
		UNFRIENDLY PEOPLE.....3%
		WATCH OUT FOR EACH
		OTHER.....3%
		DON'T KNOW NEIGHBORS....5%
		LOTS OF COMMUNITY
		EVENTS.....7%
		WELCOME DIVERSITY.....3%
		FRIENDLY SCHOOLS.....2%
		FEELS LIKE HOME.....6%
		RACISM.....4%
		WELCOMING.....2%
		FAMILY & FRIENDS HERE...2%
		LOT OF LONG TERM
		RESIDENTS.....2%
		GREAT SERVICES.....2%
		SCATTERED.....8%

Let's spend a few minutes discussing the future of the City of Roseville.

12.	When thinking about a city's	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
	quality of life, what do you think	SAFETY.....24%
	is the most important aspect of	SENSE OF COMMUNITY.....17%
	that quality?	GOOD SCHOOLS.....16%
		UPKEEP OF CITY.....9%
		OPEN SPACE/NATURE.....9%
		PARKS/RECREATION.....8%
		UPKEEP OF HOUSING.....4%
		QUIET AND PEACEFUL.....12%
		SCATTERED.....1%

ATTACHMENT 1

13. What aspects, if any, of the community should be fixed or improved in the future?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |
| NOTHING..... | 16% |
| LOWER TAXES..... | 16% |
| BETTER ROADS..... | 11% |
| MORE JOBS..... | 8% |
| MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT..... | 6% |
| MORE SENIOR HOUSING..... | 7% |
| LESS AFFORDABLE | |
| LOW INCOME HOUSING.. | 3% |
| SIDEWALKS..... | 8% |
| REDUCE CRIME..... | 21% |
| SCATTERED..... | 3% |
14. What, if anything, is currently missing from the City of Roseville which, if present, would greatly improve the quality of life for residents?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |
| NOTHING..... | 36% |
| MORE PUBLIC TRANSIT.... | 10% |
| MORE JOBS..... | 17% |
| MORE ENTERTAINMENT..... | 10% |
| MORE AFFORDABLE | |
| HOUSING..... | 11% |
| SIDEWALKS..... | 14% |
| SCATTERED..... | 1% |

I would like to read a list of characteristics others have mentioned that indicate a city has a high quality of life.

15. Please tell me which one you think is most important for a city to have? (ROTATE AND READ LIST)
16. Which is second most important? (RE-READ LIST; OMITTING FIRST CHOICE)
17. Which is least important? (RE-READ LIST; OMITTING FIRST TWO CHOICES)

	MOST	SEC	LST
HIGH PROPERTY VALUES.....	6%	4%	10%
WELL MAINTAINED PROPERTIES.....	10%	9%	10%
LOW PROPERTY TAXES.....	8%	8%	9%
LOW CRIME RATE.....	26%	22%	7%
GOOD SCHOOL SYSTEM.....	18%	15%	7%
VARIETY OF SHOPPING OPPORTUNITIES.....	4%	5%	11%
VARIETY OF PARK AND RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES.....	5%	8%	8%
JOB OPPORTUNITIES.....	6%	10%	7%
COMMUNITY EVENTS AND FESTIVALS.....	4%	7%	11%
SENSE OF COMMUNITY.....	13%	11%	10%
ELSE.....	1%	1%	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%	0%	10%

Let's discuss recreational opportunities in the community....

18. How would you rate park and recreational facilities in Roseville - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
EXCELLENT.....28%
GOOD.....66%
ONLY FAIR.....6%
POOR.....0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
19. Which Roseville recreation facilities, if any, do you or members of your household use most frequently?
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
NONE.....18%
TRAILS.....38%
NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS.....34%
ATHLETIC FACILITIES.....10%
20. How would you rate the upkeep and maintenance of Roseville City Parks - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?
EXCELLENT.....31%
GOOD.....62%
ONLY FAIR.....7%
POOR.....1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
21. In the past year, have you or any members of this household participated in any city-sponsored park and recreation programs?
YES.....34%
NO.....66%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

IF "YES," ASK: (n=137)

22. Were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your experience?
SATISFIED.....96%
DISSATISFIED.....2%
NEUTRAL (VOL.).....2%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

23. Are there any park and recreation programs you would like to see offered or expanded?

UNSURE, 10%, NO, 84%; PICKLEBALL, 2%; SCATTERED, 4%.

24. How often do you or members of your household use the trail system, weather permitting - twice or more per week, weekly, two or three times per month, monthly, quarterly, less frequently, or not at all?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| TWICE OR MORE A WEEK... | 15% |
| WEEKLY..... | 22% |
| TWO/THREE PER MONTH.... | 22% |
| MONTHLY..... | 13% |
| QUARTERLY..... | 3% |
| LESS FREQUENTLY..... | 11% |
| NOT AT ALL..... | 14% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |

25. Which of the following would be your top priority for the city's trails and sidewalk system? (ROTATE)

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL TRAILS FOR EXERCISE WITHIN PARKS.....	33%
CONSTRUCTION OF TRAILS CONNECTING NEIGHBORHOODS AND PARKS.....	38%
CONSTRUCTION OF TRAILS CONNECTING NEIGHBORHOODS AND SHOPPING AND BUSINESS AREAS.....	21%
ELSE.....	1%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

The City has park buildings at Autumn Grove, Lexington, Rosebrook, Oasis, Sandcastle and Villa Parks, as well as a newer community building at Cedarholm Golf Course, the Cedarholm Community Building.

26. Are you aware of Roseville's park buildings and the newer Cedarholm Community Building?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 65% |
| NO..... | 35% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |
27. Have you or members of your household visited or used one of the park buildings or the new Cedarholm Community Building?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 36% |
| NO..... | 64% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |

IF "YES," ASK: (n=143)

28. How would you rate your experience - excellent, good, only fair or poor?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| EXCELLENT..... | 32% |
| GOOD..... | 68% |
| ONLY FAIR..... | 1% |
| POOR..... | 0% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |

29. Would you consider using one of the park buildings or the new Cedarholm Community Building again?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 95% |
| NO..... | 2% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 3% |

IF "NO,"ASK: (n=3)

30. Why won't you use one of the park buildings or the new Cedarholm Community Building again?

NO NEED, 100%.

31. Do you feel the current mix of recreational or sports facilities meet the needs of members of your household?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 95% |
| NO..... | 1% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 4% |

IF "NO," ASK: (n=4)

32. What recreational or sports facilities do you feel are missing?

PICKLEBALL COURTS, 100%.

Moving on....

I would like to read you a list of a few city services. For each one, please tell me whether you would rate the quality of the service as excellent, good, only fair, or poor? (ROTATE)

	EXCL	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DK/R
33. Police protection?	46%	43%	11%	0%	0%
34. Fire protection?	43%	51%	4%	0%	2%
35. Emergency medical services?	47%	41%	5%	1%	6%
36. Sewer and water?	24%	67%	7%	1%	2%
37. Drainage and flood control?	25%	62%	10%	1%	2%
38. Building inspections?	26%	56%	6%	0%	12%
39. Animal control?	34%	57%	7%	1%	2%
40. Code enforcement?	27%	64%	5%	0%	5%

IF ANY SERVICES WERE RATED "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR" IN QUESTIONS #33-40, ASK: (n=109)

41. Why did you rate _____ as (only fair/poor)?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
	COULD IMPROVE.....8%
	FLOODING.....18%
	MORE PATROLLING.....31%
	POOR INSPECTIONS.....3%
	LOOSE ANIMALS.....16%
	RUNDOWN HOMES.....6%
	RUDE/UNFRIENDLY.....1%
	POOR TASTE OF WATER....11%
	SLOW SERVICE.....6%

Now, for the next six city services, please consider only their job on city-maintained streets and roads in neighborhoods. That means excluding interstate highways, state and county roads that are taken care of by other levels of government. Therefore, Interstate 35W, Highway 36, County Road C or Lexington Avenue, should not be considered. How would you rate (ROTATE)

	EXCL	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	DK/R
42. Street repair and maintenance?	22%	57%	21%	0%	0%
43. Snow plowing?	32%	57%	11%	1%	0%
44. Trail and pathway plowing in parks?	32%	50%	16%	1%	2%
45. Trail and pathway plowing in neighborhoods?	30%	57%	13%	1%	0%
46. Pathway repair and maintenance in the parks?	30%	55%	14%	1%	1%
47. Pathway repair and maintenance in neighborhoods?	21%	62%	11%	1%	6%
48. Do you consider the city portion of your property taxes to be very high, somewhat high, about average, somewhat low, or very low in comparison with neighboring cities?					
				VERY HIGH.....16%	
				SOMEWHAT HIGH.....30%	
				ABOUT AVERAGE.....45%	
				SOMEWHAT LOW.....2%	
				VERY LOW.....0%	
				DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%	
49. Would you favor or oppose an increase in YOUR city property tax if it were needed to maintain city services at their current level?					
				FAVOR.....57%	
				OPPOSE.....37%	
				DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%	

50.	When you consider the property taxes you pay and the quality of city services you receive, would you rate the general value of city services as excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....14%
		GOOD.....71%
		ONLY FAIR.....13%
		POOR.....1%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%

For each of the following long-term infrastructure projects, please tell me if you strongly support the City continuing to invest in it, somewhat support, somewhat oppose, or strongly oppose. (ROTATE)

	STS	SMS	SMO	STO	DKR
51. Water and sewer pipes?	42%	44%	11%	2%	1%
52. City buildings?	29%	48%	16%	5%	3%
53. Pedestrian pathways?	33%	47%	16%	3%	1%
54. Bikeways?	31%	44%	21%	3%	1%
55. City roads?	45%	49%	4%	1%	2%

In Minnesota, cities and counties are permitted to ask the Legislature for permission to hold a public vote on an increase to the local sales tax to pay for improvements that are regionally significant. The sales tax is assessed in the same way as the state sales tax, meaning that items such as clothes and groceries are exempt from the tax. During the 2023 Legislative session, the City of Roseville was given permission to hold a sales tax referendum this November for the construction of a Public Works and Parks and Recreation maintenance facility and a new license and passport center.

56.	Prior to this survey, were you aware of the sales tax referendum this November?	YES.....56%
		NO.....43%
		DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

The City will ask voters to approve two questions for a new local HALF cent sales tax increase for up to twenty years. For your information, a HALF cent sales tax increase would be 5 cents on every \$10 of taxable purchases in the City of Roseville. The local sales tax would expire once the approved projects are fully funded.

57. First, if the election were today, STRONGLY SUPPORT.....13%
 would you support or oppose a ref- SUPPORT.....56%
 erendum for a HALF cent sales tax OPPOSE.....19%
 increase for the construction of a STRONGLY OPPOSE.....5%
 Public Works and Parks and Recrea- DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%
 tion maintenance facility? (WAIT
 FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly
 that way?

IF A POSITION IS TAKEN, ASK: (n=371)

58. Could you tell me one or two DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
 reasons why you feel that NEEDED.....5%
 way? REASONABLE COST.....42%
 LIKE INSTEAD OF A
 PROPERTY TAX.....27%
 PREFER PROPERTY TAX.....3%
 NOT NEEDED.....4%
 POOR SPENDING.....1%
 TOO HIGH INCREASE.....1%
 INFLATION/ECONOMY.....9%
 NO MORE TAX INCREASE....6%
 SCATTERED.....2%

A second referendum question is required to allow the funds from the same HALF cent sales tax increase to be used to build a new license and passport center. There would **NOT** be a second HALF cent sales tax increase if this referendum also passes.

59. Next, if the election were today, STRONGLY SUPPORT.....14%
 would you support or oppose a ref- SUPPORT.....52%
 erendum to use the HALF cent sales OPPOSE.....22%
 tax increase to build new license STRONGLY OPPOSE.....7%
 and passport center? (WAIT FOR DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....6%
 RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly
 that way?

IF A POSITION IS TAKEN, ASK: (n=377)

60. Could you tell me one or two reasons why you feel that way?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |
| NEEDED..... | 8% |
| REASONABLE COST..... | 39% |
| LIKE INSTEAD OF A | |
| PROPERTY TAX..... | 23% |
| PREFER PROPERTY TAX..... | 3% |
| NOT NEEDED..... | 8% |
| POOR SPENDING..... | 2% |
| TOO HIGH INCREASE..... | 3% |
| INFLATION/ECONOMY..... | 14% |
| SCATTERED..... | 1% |

A sales tax increase would not only capture sales tax from city residents, but also from people outside the city who make purchases in Roseville. A University of Minnesota study projected almost 64% of the new sales tax revenue would come from people who live outside of Roseville and use city services.

61. Does that make you much more likely to support the sales tax increase, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or does it make no difference to you?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| MUCH MORE LIKELY..... | 21% |
| SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY... | 41% |
| SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY.... | 1% |
| MUCH LESS LIKELY..... | 2% |
| NO DIFFERENCE..... | 35% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |

It is projected with a HALF cent sales tax increase that the typical Roseville resident would pay an additional \$55.48 per year in sales tax.

62. Does this make you much more likely to support the sales tax increase, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or does it make no difference to you?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| MUCH MORE LIKELY..... | 19% |
| SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY... | 37% |
| SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY.... | 7% |
| MUCH LESS LIKELY..... | 3% |
| NO DIFFERENCE..... | 33% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |

The current city budget does not include funding to make these improvements. If the sales tax increase is not approved, the City could consider a property tax increase which only Roseville residents and businesses would pay. These projects could cost the owner of a \$350,000 home in Roseville about \$430 per year for the improvements only.

63.	Does this make you much more likely to support the sales tax increase, somewhat more likely, somewhat less likely, much less likely, or does it make no difference to you?	MUCH MORE LIKELY.....32% SOMEWHAT MORE LIKELY...28% SOMEWHAT LESS LIKELY....3% MUCH LESS LIKELY.....3% NO DIFFERENCE.....33% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
-----	--	---

Changing topics....

64.	Other than voting, do you feel that if you wanted to, you could have a say about the way the City of Roseville runs things?	YES.....72% NO22% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....7%
-----	---	---

65.	From what you know, do you approve or disapprove of the job the Mayor and City Council are doing? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) And do you feel strongly that way?	STRONGLY APPROVE.....14% APPROVE.....78% DISAPPROVE.....6% STRONGLY DISAPPROVE.....0% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%
-----	--	---

IF "DISAPPROVE" OR "STRONGLY DISAPPROVE," ASK: (n=25)

66.	Why do you feel that way?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% POOR JOB.....20% POOR SPENDING.....28% COULD IMPROVE.....4% HIGH TAXES.....24% DON'T LISTEN.....16% RISING CRIME.....8%
67.	From what you have heard or seen, how would you rate the job performance of the Roseville City staff - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....16% GOOD.....76% ONLY FAIR.....5% POOR.....0% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%

IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=21)

68.	Why do you feel that way?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% POOR SPENDING.....29% DON'T LISTEN.....57% RUDE/UNPROFESSIONAL.....14%
-----	---------------------------	---

Thinking about another topic....

69.	How would you rate the general condition and appearance of Roseville - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....21% GOOD.....72% ONLY FAIR.....6% POOR.....0% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
-----	---	---

IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=26)

70.	Why do you feel that way?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% MESSY YARDS.....50% JUNK CARS.....8% VACANT BUSINESSES.....23% RUNDOWN HOMES.....19%
71.	Over the past two years, has the appearance of Roseville improved, declined, or remained the same?	IMPROVED.....44% DECLINED.....6% REMAINED THE SAME.....49% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
72.	How would you rate the job the City does enforcing city codes on nuisances - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?	EXCELLENT.....13% GOOD.....78% ONLY FAIR.....8% POOR.....0% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

IF "ONLY FAIR" OR "POOR," ASK: (n=31)

73.	What nuisances does the City need to do a better job of enforcing?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0% MESSY YARDS.....45% RUNDOWN HOMES.....10% JUNK CARS.....3% LOOSE ANIMALS.....19% VACANT BUSINESSES.....13% NOISE.....10%
-----	--	--

Turning to the issue of public safety in the community....

I would like to read you a short list of public safety concerns.

74. Please tell me which one you consider to be the greatest public safety concern in Roseville? If you feel that none of these problems are serious in Roseville, just say so.

Violent crime.....2%
 Drugs.....15%
 Youth crimes and vandalism.....13%
 Break-ins and theft from automobiles.....13%
 Business crimes, such as shop-
 lifting and check fraud.....4%
 Residential crimes, such as
 burglary, and theft.....10%
 Traffic speeding.....14%
 Reckless driving.....5%
 Identity theft.....2%
 Car Jacking/Auto Theft.....7%
 ALL EQUALLY.....7%
 NONE OF THE ABOVE.....8%
 DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%

IF "NONE OF THE ABOVE," ASK: (n=31)

75. Is there something not mentioned you consider to be the
 greatest public safety concern in Roseville?

NO, 90%; ASSAULTS/MUGGINGS, 10%.

76. How would you rate the amount of TOO MUCH.....3%
 patrolling the Roseville Police ABOUT RIGHT AMOUNT.....71%
 Department does in your neighbor- NOT ENOUGH.....25%
 hood -- would you say they do too DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....1%
 much, about the right amount, or
 not enough?

Changing topics...

I would like to read you a list of characteristics of a community.
 For each one, please tell me if you think Roseville currently has
 too many or too much, too few or too little, or about the right
 amount. (ROTATE)

	MANY /MCH	FEW/ LITT	ABT RGHT	DK/ REF
77. Affordable rental units?	21%	27%	49%	3%
78. Market rate rental units?	11%	25%	52%	13%
79. Condominiums?	14%	18%	66%	3%
80. Townhomes?	18%	16%	63%	3%
81. Affordable owner-occupied housing?	11%	25%	58%	6%
82. "Move up" housing?	17%	24%	56%	3%
83. Higher cost housing?	28%	18%	52%	2%

ATTACHMENT 1

	MANY /MCH	FEW/ LITT	ABT RGHT	DK/ REF
84. Assisted living for seniors?	8%	33%	52%	8%
85. Parks and open spaces?	14%	17%	70%	0%
86. Trails and bikeways?	13%	19%	67%	2%
87. Service and retail establishments?	15%	19%	66%	1%
88. Entertainment and dining opportunities?	15%	23%	61%	1%
89. If you were going to move from your current home for upgrading, how committed would you be to stay in Roseville - very committed, somewhat committed, not too committed, or not at all committed?	VERY COMMITTED.....35% SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....54% NOT TOO COMMITTED.....7% NOT AT ALL COMMITTED....3% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%			
90. And, if you were going to move from your current home for downsizing, how committed would you be to stay in Roseville - very committed, somewhat committed, not too committed, or not at all committed?	VERY COMMITTED.....36% SOMEWHAT COMMITTED.....52% NOT TOO COMMITTED.....7% NOT AT ALL COMMITTED....3% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....3%			

IF "NOT TOO COMMITTED" OR "NOT AT ALL COMMITTED" IN QUESTIONS
 #89 OR #90, ASK: (n=40)

91. Is there anything missing or that could be improved in Roseville that would make you committed to staying?

NO, 73%; MORE AFFORDABLE HOUSING, 8%; REDUCE CRIME, 5%; LOWER PROPERTY TAXES, 15%.

The City of Roseville works with organizations to offer a variety of different housing programs for residential homeowners. This includes foreclosure protection, home improvement loans for interior and exterior remodeling and a land trust program.

92. Prior to this survey, were you aware of this housing programs?	YES.....58%
	NO.....42%
	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

Changing topics....

The City contracts with a local company for curbside recycling services. Currently, residents are provided a single-sort recycling cart, and recyclables are picked up every two weeks.

93. Do you participate in the curbside recycling program by separating recyclable items from the rest of your garbage?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 81% |
| NO..... | 19% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |

IF "NO," ASK: (n=74)

94. Could you tell me one or two reasons why your household does not participate in the curbside recycling program?

TOO BUSY/HASSLE, 15%; NOT ENOUGH WASTE, 22%; TAKE ELSEWHERE, 9%; RENTER/ASSOCIATION, 46%; COST TOO MUCH, 3%; AGE/HEALTH, 2%; LACK OF INFORMATION, 4%.

95. Are there any changes or improvements in the service which could be made to induce you to participate in it?

UNSURE, 8%; NO, 89%; LARGER CARTS, 2%; MORE INFORMATION, 2%.

IF "YES" IN QUESTION #93, ASK: (n=325)

96. How often do you put recyclables out for collection - every two weeks, monthly, or less often?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| EVERY TWO WEEKS..... | 74% |
| MONTHLY..... | 19% |
| LESS OFTEN..... | 7% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |

When you think of the recyclables your household generates...

97. Would you favor or oppose a change to an every week collection schedule for recyclables for an additional fee? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| STRONGLY FAVOR..... | 11% |
| FAVOR..... | 39% |
| OPPOSE..... | 47% |
| STRONGLY OPPOSE..... | 2% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 2% |

98. Are there any changes or improvements in the curbside recycling program you would like to see?

UNSURE, 6%; NO, 90%; SCATTERED, 4%.

Most communities have one of two systems for trash collection.

Roseville operates under an open collection system, in which residents choose from a list of haulers licensed by the City to provide residential trash collection. Some cities use an arrangement in which the City manages a collection system, negotiates prices and standardizes services for residential trash collection.

99. Would you favor or oppose the City of Roseville changing from the current system, in which residents choose their trash hauler to a system where the City manages trash collection? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you feel strongly that way?

STRONGLY FAVOR.....	11%
FAVOR.....	37%
OPPOSE.....	31%
STRONGLY OPPOSE.....	6%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	16%

IF A RESPONSE IS GIVEN, ASK: (n=338)

100. Could you tell me one or two reasons for your decision?

UNSURE, 2%; LIKE CURRENT HAULER, 13%; PREFER TO CHOOSE, 25%; CITY/LESS TRUCKS, 18%; CHOICE/CHEAPER, 5%; CITY/CHEAPER, 13%; CITY/LESS POLLUTION, 9%; CITY/LESS STREET REPAIR, 4%; CITY/BETTER SERVICE, 8%; SCATTERED, 3%.

In 2019, the City of Roseville, in partnership with Ramsey County, opened an organics recycling drop-off site at the Leaf Recycling Center on Dale Street just south of County Road C. Roseville residents can now collect food scraps and other organic waste in their home and take it to a drop-off site.

101. Prior to this survey, were you aware Roseville has a drop-off site for residents to recycle food scraps and other organic waste?

YES.....	67%
NO.....	32%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	1%

IF "YES," ASK: (n=268)

102. Have you used this drop-off site? (IF "YES," ASK:) Do you use this site - more than once a week, once a week, every other week, once a month, or less often?

NO.....	32%
MORE THAN ONCE A WEEK...	4%
ONCE A WEEK.....	10%
EVERY OTHER WEEK.....	16%
ONCE A MONTH.....	20%
LESS OFTEN.....	18%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

IF "NO" IN QUESTION #102, ASK: (n=86)

103. Why don't you use the food scraps and organics recycling drop-off site?

UNSURE, 2%; NO INTEREST/HASSLE, 40%; NOT ENOUGH WASTE, 28%; COMPOST AT HOME, 11%; BAD ODOR, 13%; ATTRACTS ANIMALS, 2%; MESSY, 5%.

IF "NO" IN QUESTION #101, ASK: (n=126)

104. Now that you are aware of the organics drop-off site, how likely would your household be to use the site for recycling compostable waste - very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?

VERY LIKELY.....	7%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....	41%
NOT TOO LIKELY.....	28%
NOT AT ALL LIKELY.....	18%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	6%

IF "NOT TOO LIKELY" OR "NOT AT ALL LIKELY," ASK: (n=58)

105. Why would you not use the food scraps and organics recycling drop-off site?

NO INTEREST/HASSLE, 36%; NOT ENOUGH WASTE, 24%; COMPOST AT HOME, 7%; BAD ODOR, 7%; ATTRACTS ANIMALS, 10%; MESSY, 5%; RENTER/NO WHERE TO STORE, 10%.

106. When a curbside collection program for compostable waste is available, how likely would your household be to participate in it - very likely, somewhat likely, not too likely, or not at all likely?

VERY LIKELY.....	11%
SOMEWHAT LIKELY.....	42%
NOT TOO LIKELY.....	24%
NOT AT ALL LIKELY.....	16%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	8%

On another topic....

107. How would you rate the City's overall performance in communicating key local issues to residents in its publications, website, mailings, and on cable television - excellent, good, only fair, or poor?

EXCELLENT.....	11%
GOOD.....	76%
ONLY FAIR.....	13%
POOR.....	0%
DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....	0%

ATTACHMENT 1

108. What is your primary source of information about the City of Roseville?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |
| NONE..... | 1% |
| CITY NEWSLETTER..... | 42% |
| EMAIL/E-NEWSLETTER..... | 11% |
| CITY WEBSITE..... | 20% |
| CABLE TV..... | 2% |
| WORD OF MOUTH..... | 13% |
| SOCIAL MEDIA..... | 10% |
| SCATTERED..... | 2% |
109. How would you most prefer to receive information about Roseville City Government and its activities - (ROTATE) email, information on the city website, city publications and newsletters, mailings to your home, local weekly newspaper, cable tv programming, the City's Facebook, the City's Twitter feed or Nextdoor?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| EMAIL..... | 9% |
| CITY WEBSITE..... | 21% |
| PUBLICATIONS/NEWSLTRS.. | 43% |
| MAILINGS TO HOME..... | 8% |
| LOCAL WEEKLY PAPERS..... | 1% |
| CABLE TV..... | 5% |
| CITY FACEBOOK..... | 10% |
| CITY TWITTER..... | 2% |
| NEXTDOOR..... | 1% |
110. Do you recall receiving the City's printed publication -- "Roseville City News" - in the mail during the past year?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 76% |
| NO..... | 24% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |
- IF "YES," ASK: (n=302)
111. Do you or any members of your household regularly read it?
- | | |
|-------------------------|-----|
| YES..... | 92% |
| NO..... | 8% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 0% |
112. How effective is this City publication in keeping you informed about activities in the city - very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective?
- | | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| VERY EFFECTIVE..... | 50% |
| SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE..... | 43% |
| NOT TOO EFFECTIVE..... | 6% |
| NOT AT ALL EFFECTIVE.... | 0% |
| DON'T KNOW/REFUSED..... | 1% |

I would like to ask you about information sources. For each one, tell me if you currently use that source of information; then, for each you currently use, tell me if you would be likely or unlikely to use it to obtain information about the City of Roseville.
(ROTATE)

	NOT USE	USE LIK	USE NLK	DK/ REF
113. Facebook?	39%	46%	15%	0%
114. Twitter?	60%	26%	14%	0%
115. YouTube?	52%	28%	20%	0%
116. Nextdoor?	63%	27%	10%	0%
117. Email?	38%	48%	14%	0%
118. City website?	23%	73%	4%	0%
119. Other social media sites?	65%	27%	8%	0%

Now, just a few more questions for demographic purposes....

Could you please tell me how many people in each of the following age groups live in your household.

120. Persons 65 or over?	NONE.....70%
	ONE.....16%
	TWO OR MORE.....14%
	REFUSED.....0%
121. Adults between the ages of 50 and 64 years of age?	NONE.....72%
	ONE.....13%
	TWO MORE.....15%
	REFUSED.....0%
122. Adults between the ages of 18 and 49 years of age?	NONE.....46%
	ONE.....19%
	TWO.....33%
	THREE OR MORE.....2%
	REFUSED.....0%
123. School-aged children and pre- schoolers?	NONE.....74%
	ONE.....10%
	TWO.....13%
	THREE OR MORE.....3%
	REFUSED.....0%
124. Do you own or rent your present residence?	OWN.....68%
	RENT.....32%
	REFUSED.....0%

125. What is your age, please? (READ CATEGORIES, IF NEEDED)	18-24.....11% 25-34.....16% 35-44.....15% 45-54.....16% 55-64.....15% 65 AND OVER.....27% REFUSED.....0%
126. Which of the following best describes your household: (READ) A. Single, no other family at home. B. Single parent with children at home. C. Married or partnered, with children at home. D. Married or partnered with no children or no children at home. E. Something else.	SINGLE/NO OTHER.....31% SINGLE PARENT.....5% MAR/PARTN/CHILDREN.....21% MAR/PARTN/NO CHILD.....43% SOMETHING ELSE.....1% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%
127. Which of the following categories represents your ethnicity - White, African-American, Hispanic-Latino, Asian-Pacific Islander, Native American, or something else? (IF "SOMETHING ELSE," ASK:) What would that be?	WHITE.....66% AFRICAN-AMERICAN.....11% HISPANIC-LATINO.....6% ASIAN-PACIFIC ISLAND...10% NATIVE AMERICAN.....1% SOMETHING ELSE.....0% MULTI/BI-RACIAL.....7% DON'T KNOW.....0% REFUSED.....0%
128. Do you live north or south of Highway 36? (WAIT FOR RESPONSE) Do you live east or west of Snelling Avenue?	NORTHWEST.....15% NORTHEAST.....44% SOUTHEAST.....26% SOUTHWEST.....15% DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....0%

129. Finally, thinking about your household finances, how would you describe your financial situation, would you say that -	STATEMENT A.....6%
A) Your monthly expenses are exceeding your income;	STATEMENT B.....41%
B) You are meeting your monthly expenses but are putting aside little or no savings;	STATEMENT C.....47%
C) You are managing comfortably while putting some money aside;	STATEMENT D.....4%
D) Managing very well?	DON'T KNOW/REFUSED.....2%
130. Gender (DO NOT ASK)	MALE.....48%
	FEMALE.....52%

REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION

Date: **8/7/2024**
Item No.: **6.a.**

Department Approval

Agenda Section
Public Hearing

Janice Gundlach

Item Description: A request by Northwest Transportation Services, LLC to allow outdoor storage of fleet vehicles overnight as a **CONDITIONAL USE** at 2277 Highway 36.

Application Information

Applicant: Northwest Transportation Services, LLC

Location: 2277 Highway 36

Application Submission: April 30, 2024

City Action Deadline: June 29, 2024

Zoning: Employment Center (E-2)

Background

Northwest Transportation Services, LLC (NTS) provides Type III Student Transportation Services, which is a transportation service that uses passenger cars, station wagons, vans, SUVs, and buses with a maximum seating capacity of ten or fewer people, including the driver and have a gross vehicle weight rating of 10,000 pounds or less. NTS has an ongoing commitment to serve Roseville Area Schools (ISD 623) and is presently providing daily transportation to over 75 special education and McKinney-Vento students.

In collaboration with 4mativ Technologies, NTS has forged a partnership with Ramsey County Child Foster Care and is facilitating transportation services for Ramsey County Foster youths to both Roseville Area Schools and Saint Paul Public Schools. These students, who reside within and beyond the Roseville Area School District, rely on NTS's specialized transportation services.

Since 2022, the NTS fleet has expanded from one to 27 vans, enabling NTS to meet the increasing demand for their services. This growth has not only allowed NTS to serve more students but has also created job opportunities for 30 employees, including van drivers, bus aides, and office staff members. As a result of this expansion, NTS is actively seeking convenient office space and parking facilities to ensure the smooth operation of their services and to better serve the school district and Ramsey County.

NTS has entered into a lease agreement for 1,946 square feet of office space at the Roseville West office building located at 2277 Highway 36. Included with this lease is the ability to initially park up to 25 fleet vans on the premises in various areas of the parking lot (see Attachment 3).

2277 Highway 36 has a current zoning classification of Employment Center (E-2), which under the table of uses lists Outdoor Storage, Fleet Vehicles as a conditional use.

Zoning Code sections §1009.02.C and §1009.02.D.37 set the criteria for reviewing general and specific conditional use criteria related to this request. The Planning Division's review of these criteria can be found in the below Conditional Use Analysis section.

Conditional Use Analysis

Review of General Conditional Use Criteria: §1009.02.C of the Zoning Code establishes general standards and criteria for all conditional uses, which the Planning Commission and City Council must determine compliance with those stated findings.

The general code standards of §1009.02.C are as follows:

1. *The proposed use is not in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan.* While leased office space with fleet vehicles for transportation services does not appreciably advance the goals of the Comprehensive Plan aside from facilitating continued investment in a property, Planning Division staff believes it does not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan either. More specifically, the General and Commercial Area Goals and Policies sections of the Comprehensive Plan include a number of policies related to reinvestment, redevelopment, and quality development. The proposed leased space by NTS and its fleet vehicle parking, is one component of reinvestment at Roseville West, which would align with the related goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. *The proposed use is not in conflict with a Regulating Map or other adopted plan.* The proposed use is not in conflict with such plans because none applies to the property.
3. *The proposed use is not in conflict with any City Code requirements.* The essence of this request is the allowance for fleet vehicle parking (outdoor storage) on an existing parking lot. A review of the existing parking lot at Roseville West concludes it is in compliance with the standards contained in §1019 (Parking and Loading Areas) of the Zoning Code. Moreover, because this is a reinvestment into an existing tenant space that has otherwise been vacant for some time, there are few City Code items that apply to the reuse, short of obtaining necessary building permits. Specific to the proposed fleet vehicles, these vans will be used daily and parked/stored in designated stalls within the parking lot. Planning Division staff has determined the proposed parking of fleet vehicles within the parking lot at Roseville West is not in conflict with any Zoning Code standard or requirement.
4. *The proposed use will not create an excessive burden on parks, streets, and other public facilities.* The proposal to allow fleet vehicles to be parked/stored at Roseville West is not an uncommon use for an office building given the general mix of tenants. Similarly, an office building tends to have higher traffic volumes, especially if a medical clinic is a tenant. In the case of Roseville West, this specific office building has been in place since 1982 and initially included Hoffman Electric as a building tenant. Hoffman Electric had electrical equipment and trucks as part of its use in the garages located to the north of the site. Given this history, Planning Division staff does not anticipate the proposal to add a fleet vehicle storage at Roseville West to intensify any practical impacts on parks, streets, or public infrastructure.
5. *The proposed use will not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood, will not negatively impact traffic or property values, and will not otherwise harm the public health, safety, and general welfare.* The direct neighborhood to the Roseville West property is an office building to the west; a mix of office showroom and warehousing to the east and north; and

Highways 36 and 280 to the south and southwest. This “neighborhood” includes several properties with vehicle dependency, some of which includes semi-trucks and trailer storage (FedEx Ground, Dayton Freight, and Beltman Moving and Storage). Roseville West also lies along the frontage road that has direct access to and from Trunk Highway 36 and 280, along with St. Croix Street, both roadways that accommodate heavy truck traffic. With the existing traffic intensity in the area, Planning Division staff have concluded the inclusion of an outdoor storage component of fleet vehicles will not be injurious to the surrounding neighborhood, will not negatively impact traffic or property values, and will not otherwise harm the public health, safety, and general welfare.

Review of Specific Conditional Use Criteria: §1009.02.D.37 of the Zoning Code establishes additional standards and criteria that are specific to fleet vehicles. This code standard is as follows:

37. Fleet vehicles: All outdoor storage shall occur on paved surfaces consistent with the parking area requirements of Section 1019.11 of this Title and shall adhere to the parking area setback requirements in the applicable zoning district. Fleet vehicles in active use need not be screened, but inoperable or otherwise out-of-service vehicles (e.g., snowplows in the summer, or “retired” vehicles) shall adhere to the requirements for outdoor storage of inoperable/out-of-service vehicles or equipment. (Ord. 1544 2-12-2018)

The proposal to utilize specific parking spots for the storage/parking of fleet vehicles associated with NTS will occur in conformance with the standards of the Zoning Code and on a paved surface. Some of these vehicles may be parked overnight, while others may be taken home with drivers. The total amount of parking stalls to be used for fleet vehicles will depend on NTS’s needs (both now and in the future), parking needs of other tenants within the buildings, and lease arrangements with the owner or manager, none of which is factor in considering the conditional use. It is in the owner/manager’s best interest to ensure the parking needs of all of the building’s tenants are met by the available parking lot. The Planning Division has determined the fleet vehicle storage proposal is for active use, fully operational vehicles for which screening is not required.

Staff Recommendation

The Planning Division recommends approval of the Conditional Use to allow fleet vehicles to be stored/parked within specified areas of the Roseville West office building parking lot located at 2277 Highway based on the comments and findings of this RPCA dated June 5, 2024.

Requested Planning Commission Action

By motion, recommend approval of a Conditional use for Roseville West located at 2277 Highway 36, allowing outdoor storage of fleet vehicles at designated areas of the parking lot, based on the comments and findings of this RPCA dated June 5, 2024.

Alternative Actions

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

126

127

Prepared by: Thomas Paschke, City Planner

Attachments: None

128