



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, August 6, 2025 – 6:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

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

2. Roll Call

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

Members Present: Chair Erik Bjorum, Vice-Chair Pamela Aspnes, and Commissioners Tammy McGehee, Allison Campbell Jensen, Jon Barstad, Steve Cyra, and Erin Lynch.

Members Absent: None.

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

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Public Comment

None.

5. Review of Minutes

a. May 7, 2025 Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Campbell Jensen, to approve the May 7, 2025, meeting minutes.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. **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.

7. **Public Hearing**

- a. **A Request by Frostbite Cannabis, Inc. to Allow a Cannabis Combination Business, to Include a Cannabis Retailer with On-Site Consumption, as a Conditional Use at 2218 County Road D West, Suite 200 (PF25-011)**
Chair Bjorum opened the public hearing for PF25-011 at approximately 6:34 p.m. and provided an overview of the purpose and process of the public hearing. He noted the item will be heard at the August 25, 2025, City Council meeting.

City Planner Paschke summarized the request as outlined in the staff report dated August 6, 2025. He clarified the state regulations and zoning requirements for adult cannabis use, including distance restrictions from specific uses. The request meets all zoning standards and does not need special mitigation or conditions. Three conditions are suggested: obtaining the final license from the Office of Cannabis Management, securing the final business registration from the city, and ensuring compliance with all state and local laws.

Commissioner Cyra asked about the first item, “Prospect cannabis shall be permitted to have a retail kind of dispensary with on-site consumption only.” It sounds like people need to consume the cannabis while they are there.

Mr. Paschke indicated that this is the retail sales portion. On-site consumption would involve people possibly getting a THC drink and consuming it in a lounge area, which is permitted, or obtaining edibles and other items. Smoking cannabis would not be allowed, just like smoking in a facility, whether public or private. It is limited to those two specific uses.

Ms. Gundlach reviewed cannabis-related uses that would fall under a microbusiness license at the state level, which could be conducted at the business.

Commissioner McGehee inquired whether a checklist is available for owners visiting the city, but not the state, that allows them to select the items they wish to include in the facility. She appreciated the staff's attention to detail in only including items that

required attention again. Additionally, she asked if the wording in number five was customized, as she thought it was slightly different from what she was used to.

Mr. Paschke explained that number five is actually how it appears under the conditional use. The variance might be slightly different from what it is in the conditional use.

Member Aspnes questioned the state's review of the separate entrance for on-site consumption.

Mr. Paschke explained that the State Office of Cannabis Management will conduct inspections to ensure all aspects comply with their numerous rules and regulations.

Member Barstad mentioned he didn't know much about this type of business, so he did some research. He explained he came across a report titled "The Economic Benefits and Costs, Social Costs of Legalizing Recreational Marijuana," written by a group at the Federal Reserve in Kansas City. He was curious about the history so far regarding the economics of this issue, how it might help the community, and other related matters. The report shows some growth in housing, state incomes per capita, and population. However, there was a 2% increase in population, a 3% rise in per capita income, and a 6% increase in housing. He also found data on increases in use disorders at 17%, homelessness at 35%, chronic homelessness, and arrests at 13%. Upon closer examination of this topic, he noted that many communities find it very new, and the available data is limited, as is the sampling. When he reviewed what he believes is their responsibility—working within the boundaries of their comprehensive plan—he wondered if staff could help them understand or define how this issue shapes the community and if it can help improve the quality of life for Roseville's citizens.

Ms. Gundlach explained that there was a lot of discussion at the planning commission and city council when the city was exploring both the zoning regulations related to adult-use cannabis and the business regulations. However, those were outside the purview of this commission; the fundamental issue is that the State Law has stated that cities must permit this. There are certain areas where state law exempts or takes precedence over local authorities' control, and this is one of them. The state did that very deliberately because they wanted to legalize cannabis in the state, and they wanted to make sure the regulations were applied uniformly across all cities and counties, because based on what they had learned from other states and other cannabis regulations, they felt that it was the best way to regulate the drug. There is a significant amount of background information from the state regarding the city's authority and its limitations.

Ms. Gundlach reviewed with the commission the city's authority and the previous discussions the city council had with the city attorney regarding the regulation of these types of businesses.

Mr. Jacob Affeldt, the applicant, addressed concerns by sharing his personal experience with cannabis and reaffirming his dedication to responsible staff training on the product. He indicated that on-site consumption will not be included in the plan for this location.

Member Barstad wondered if, since there will be no on-site consumption at this facility, it would be within the commission's power to amend this proposal by removing that provision. He questioned whether this could be a discussion point.

Mr. Paschke explained that the commission could discuss this, but he did not believe there would be harm in including it as part of the conditional use. The reason the commission is reviewing this is because it involves a combination license through the state, which the City Code requires to be a conditional use. If it had gone through a different process, both options would have been permitted, and the commission would not have needed to be involved. This approach enables the applicant to establish themselves as a retailer and potentially expand later with a lounge area, where individuals can consume edibles, drinks, and other items that comply with OCM requirements.

Concerns from commissioners were expressed about the broader impact of legalizing recreational marijuana, referencing a report from the Federal Reserve in Kansas City.

Ms. Gundlach noted that the micro business license at the state level only allows for the operation of a single retail location, so the applicant could not obtain a micro business license at the state level and then open multiple other cannabis lounges or retail locations in different places.

Mr. Affeldt agreed and explained that the micro business is truly meant for small business owners and entrepreneurs to enter the market without needing millions of dollars in backing from other big companies.

Public Comment

Ms. Clare O'Malley, 4180 Victoria St N

Ms. O'Malley mentioned she works in Roseville, and her children attend New Brighton public schools. She expressed concerns about the traffic on Long Lake Road when exiting the parking lot. She asked whether a traffic study had been done or could be conducted. She also expressed concerns about dog safety in the parking facility, as this proposed business will share the exact location as Dogtopia. Additionally, she was concerned about the potential for underage drinking near the proposed company. She also wondered if additional insurance would be required in case a child picks up an edible, thinking it is a Caribou Coffee treat.

Commission Deliberation

Mr. Paschke and Ms. Gundlach discussed these concerns, emphasizing state regulations and the city's responsibility to ensure compliance. It was noted that the city does not require insurance. Still, it was assumed that the state probably has some requirements, such as having a certain amount of business liability insurance, similar to what liquor stores are required to have.

Mr. Affeldt reaffirmed their dedication to responsible operations and child-resistant packaging.

Commissioners discussed the possibility of adding more insurance requirements and how the city can enforce rules through business registration.

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Aspnes, to recommend to the City Council approval of a Conditional Use at 2218 County Road D, Suite 200, allowing a Cannabis Combination Business, consistent with the comments, findings, and attachments of this RPCA dated August 6, 2025, and subject to the following conditions: The proposed Cannabis Combination Business shall consist only of retail, with on-site consumption as a permitted accessory use, the applicant must secure the final license for cannabis from the state and the final business license be obtained from the City of Roseville. (PF25-011).

**Ayes: 6
Nays: 1 (Barstad)
Motion carried.**

8. Business

a. Receive Update on Civic Campus Project

Community Development Director Janice Gundlach provided an update on the Civic Campus project, referencing a memo from the City Manager. The project involves the renovation and expansion of the Civic Campus. She noted the commission was encouraged to pose questions or concerns to the city manager, with one commission member eventually being assigned to the task force.

Member Campbell Jensen proposed exploring the possibility of installing solar panels over parking lots and other sustainability initiatives.

Member McGehee concurred and indicated she would also like to see a permeable parking surface.

9. Commission Direction on Commission Member-Initiated Agenda Items

Ms. Gundlach outlined the process for presenting such topics to the commission and discussed the city council's prior decisions on sustainable building initiatives.

Member Cyra noted that since the May 7th Variance Board meeting, which he was not on the board but found variances interesting, he wondered if this could be

discussed in more depth at a future meeting, specifically regarding the nine-foot wall height maximum for accessory buildings.

Chair Bjorum indicated there was a process to this.

Ms. Gundlach reviewed her email correspondence with Commissioner Cyra. She mentioned that the commission can suggest topics for discussion. She stated that staff will include this item on the next planning commission agenda, and if the commission has questions, they should send them to staff. At the next meeting, the commission can decide whether or not to pursue the topic further, which would require a vote.

Member McGehee inquired about the possibility of discussing specific sustainability topics, such as LEED certification, for city buildings.

Ms. Gundlach believed there were two parts to that: the first related to city buildings. The planning commission's authority is to adopt the comprehensive plan, amend it as needed, and then adopt and enforce zoning regulations. She did not think the required commission zoning regulations should dictate what the city should do with its buildings. She pointed out that the city council would make those decisions, not the planning commission. She also mentioned that this item could be added to next month's agenda, and the commission could decide whether or not to spend time exploring that topic.

Ms. Gundlach reminded the commission and Commissioner McGehee that during the last zoning code update, there was a pervasive discussion about sustainable building items, including LEED certification. Recommendations were made and passed on to the City Council, but the council chose not to adopt any of those regulations.

Member Barstad wondered if a cost-benefit analysis was conducted during that conversation when the topic of adopting sustainable measures or pursuing LEED certification earlier arose.

Ms. Gundlach indicated that if there is no specific project, she was unsure how the city would conduct a cost-benefit analysis. General conversations were held regarding this idea. The consultant the city used also provided a significant amount of background information for the City Council to review and consider.

10. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Barstad, seconded by Member Cyra, to adjourn the meeting at 7:30 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

