



Planning Commission Agenda

Wednesday, April 1, 2026

5:30 PM

City Council Chambers

In accordance with [Minnesota Statutes §13D.02](#) and City policy, Council and Commission members may attend meetings remotely up to three times per calendar year.

Variance Board meeting will begin immediately following the Planning Commission meeting.

(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. Public Comment**
- 5. Approval of Meeting Minutes**
 - a. Review of March 4, 2026 Minutes
- 6. Communications and Recognitions**
 - a. Swear In New Members
- 7. Public Hearing**
- 8. Business**
 - a. Annual Organizational Business
- 9. Commission Direction on Member Initiated Agenda Items**
- 10. Adjourn to Variance Board Meeting**


REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION

Date: **4/1/2026**
Item No.: **5.a.**

Department Approval

Agenda Section
Approval of Meeting Minutes

Item Description: Review of March 4, 2026 Minutes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Application Information

n/a

Background

n/a

Staff Recommendation

n/a

Requested Planning Commission Action

Review the March 4, 2026 minutes and make a motion to approve subject to requested corrections.

Alternative Actions

n/a

Prepared by:

Attachments: 1. March 4, 2026 Minutes



**Planning Commission Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Draft Minutes – Wednesday, March 4, 2026 – 6:30 p.m.**

- 1 **1. Call to Order**
2 Chair Bjorum called to order the regular meeting of the Planning Commission at
3 approximately 6:30 p.m. and reviewed the Planning Commission's role and purpose.
4
- 5 **2. Roll Call**
6 At the request of Chair Bjorum, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
7
- 8 **Members Present:** Chair Erik Bjorum, Vice-Chair Pamela Aspnes, and
9 Commissioners Tammy McGehee, Allison Campbell Jensen
10 (Remote), Jon Barstad, Steve Cyra, and Erin Lynch.
11
- 12 **Members Absent:** None.
13
- 14 **Staff Present:** City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director
15 Janice Gundlach.
16
- 17 **3. Approve Agenda**
18
- 19 **MOTION**
20 **Member Barstad moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to approve the agenda as**
21 **presented.**
22
- 23 **Ayes: 7**
24 **Nays: 0**
25 **Motion carried.**
26
- 27 **4. Public Comment**
28
- 29 **5. Review of Minutes**
30
- 31 **a. December 3, 2025, Planning Commission Regular Meeting**
32
- 33 **MOTION**
34 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Lynch, to approve the**
35 **December 3, 2025, meeting minutes.**
36
- 37 **Ayes: 7**
38 **Nays: 0**
39 **Motion carried.**
40
- 41 **6. Communications and Recognitions:**

42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88

- a. **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.*

Member McGehee provided an update on the city campus planning discussions, explaining that two meetings had been held involving representatives from the city council, each city commission, nearby property stakeholders, and an independent representative from the VFW. She noted that early discussions confirmed the VFW would remain in its current location. She emphasized the importance of preserving Veterans Park, which had originally been donated by the VFW, ensuring veterans' perspectives are reflected in the planning.

Member McGehee explained that during the first meeting, participants broke into groups to share broad ideas for the campus layout. Landscape architecture facilitators later developed several concept options based on those ideas, and participants reviewed them at the second meeting, providing feedback through comments and notes. She said the current concept generally places the Public Works building near the existing license center location, with storage facilities such as salt bins along Lexington Avenue. Discussion also included landscaping along Lexington, parking lot size and configuration, and the possibility of shared parking between the VFW and other facilities.

Member McGehee added that the license center and dance facility could potentially be relocated to the west side of the VFW building, which would involve using a portion of the park area. Additional topics included building design, exterior finishes, access points, and pedestrian walkways. She said the date for the third meeting had not yet been scheduled because the designers wanted time to incorporate feedback and prepare revised concepts, though she expected the next meeting to occur within about a month to six weeks.

Member Aspnes recognized that the meeting was the final one for Member Barstad and thanked him for his outstanding service on both the Variance Board and the Planning Commission. She highlighted his thoroughness, attention to detail, and thoughtful questions during discussions and said his contributions would be greatly missed.

Member Aspnes also noted that it was Member McGee's final meeting serving as an alternate on the Variance Board and as a Commissioner on the Planning Commission. She thanked Member McGee for her long-standing service to the City of Roseville, including her time as a councilmember and her role representing the Planning Commission on the Civic Campus project, and praised her institutional knowledge and dedication to the community.

Chair Bjorum stated that serving in a public role is not always easy and acknowledged the commitment required to participate in public decision-making. He thanked both Member Barstad and Member McGee for their service, noting that he

89 had personally learned a great deal from McGee’s experience and appreciated the
90 contributions both had made during their time serving on the board.

91
92 **7. Public Hearing**

93
94 **a. Planning File Heading (PF26-001) Request by Minnesota State Patrol for**
95 **Consideration of a Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Zoning Map Change for**
96 **1500 Highway 36.**

97 Chair Bjorum opened the public hearing for PF26-001 at approximately 6:44 p.m. and
98 outlined the purpose and process. He advised that this item will be before the City
99 Council on March 23, 2026.

100
101 City Planner Paschke summarized the request as detailed in the staff report dated
102 March 4, 2026.

103
104 Mr. Paschke presented a request to amend the Comprehensive Plan and zoning map
105 for property located at 1500 Highway 36, just north of and east of the existing Target
106 store. He explained that the parcel along Highway 36 is currently designated as
107 Employment in the Comprehensive Plan. In contrast, the parcel to the south near the
108 Target parking area is designated as Core Mixed Use. The proposal would change
109 both parcels to an Institutional designation.

110
111 Mr. Paschke said the request was related to a planned facility for the Minnesota State
112 Patrol, which is part of the State of Minnesota. He explained that institutional land
113 use and zoning designations are typically used for public or civic facilities such as
114 government buildings, churches, and libraries. In contrast, the existing employment
115 and mixed-use designations are generally intended for private development. Because
116 the State Patrol is a public agency that will own and operate the site, staff determined
117 that the institutional designation would be the most appropriate classification for the
118 property.

119
120 Mr. Paschke noted that the project could technically be built under the current
121 employment zoning, but doing so would likely require multiple variances due to the
122 facility's specialized design and operational needs, including building entrance
123 orientation, overhead doors, frontage requirements, and security fencing. Under the
124 institutional zoning designation, the project could instead be reviewed as a special or
125 object-oriented building, which allows flexibility for unique civic structures. In that
126 case, the City Council would review and approve the site plan and building design
127 elements. At the same time, technical items such as stormwater management would
128 continue to be reviewed by the watershed district and city engineering staff.

129
130 Mr. Paschke concluded by stating that staff believed the institutional land use and
131 zoning designation best reflected the proposed public safety use and therefore
132 recommended approval of the Comprehensive Plan and zoning amendments.
133

134 Member McGehee asked what the proposed use would be for the portion of the
135 property located on the opposite side of Commerce Street in the concept plan.

136
137 Mr. Paschke stated that he was not certain of the final proposed use for the portion of
138 the property located on the other side of Commerce Street. He noted that the concept
139 plan currently shows a small parking lot, while earlier versions had included elements
140 such as solar panels. He stated the applicant would need to provide clarification on
141 the intended use of that area.

142
143 Member Cyra asked whether there is a practical difference between the
144 Comprehensive Plan land use map and the city’s official zoning map. He noted that
145 the staff report referenced both maps and stated that the zoning map must align with
146 the Comprehensive Plan land use map, and he asked for clarification on how the two
147 maps differ and how they relate to one another.

148
149 Mr. Paschke explained that the Comprehensive Plan land-use map and the official
150 zoning map serve related but distinct purposes. He noted that zoning must be
151 consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, meaning zoning districts must support the
152 goals and intended uses identified in the land use designations. For example, areas
153 designated as employment in the Comprehensive Plan typically correspond with
154 zoning districts that allow office, industrial, or similar employment-related uses. In
155 contrast, an institutional designation is intended for civic or public facilities owned by
156 government entities.

157
158 Mr. Paschke added that the different land use categories also carry different design
159 standards and development expectations, such as those that apply to residential or
160 employment areas.

161
162 Chair Bjorum invited the applicant to come forward. He then indicated that the
163 commission would open the floor for questions from commissioners directed to the
164 applicant.

165
166 Mr. Matthew Keenan introduced himself as a representative of the architecture and
167 engineering firm hired by the State of Minnesota to design and support the
168 construction of the proposed State Patrol facility. Mr. Jeremy Geiger introduced
169 himself as the Assistant Chief of the Minnesota State Patrol, and Ms. Wendy Kaufner
170 introduced herself as a representative from the Minnesota State Administration.

171
172 Member McGehee stated that since it was her final meeting, she wanted to ask
173 several questions about the proposed State Patrol facility. She expressed support for
174 the project and said she was interested in understanding more details about how the
175 site would function.

176 Member McGehee asked about expected traffic patterns, including how vehicles
177 would enter and exit the site, how many vehicles might be present, and whether the

178 facility would primarily serve administrative functions or operate as a working patrol
179 location with shift changes. She also asked about the sustainability elements
180 mentioned in project materials, including references to biomes, solar panels, and other
181 design features, and said she would like to hear more about how those sustainability
182 concepts would be incorporated into the building design.

183
184 Assistant Chief Geiger explained that the facility would function as an active working
185 building that consolidates several State Patrol operations currently spread across six
186 locations in the metro area. He said administrative staff and support personnel would
187 work there during normal business hours. However, he noted that the State Patrol
188 operates differently from many agencies because troopers do not report to the
189 building for shift roll calls. Instead, troopers typically begin their shifts from home
190 and go directly on patrol. As a result, the facility would not generate large traffic
191 surges from shift changes.

192
193 Assistant Chief Geiger added that there would still be some traffic from squad cars
194 and staff, particularly related to the garage area where vehicles would receive
195 technology servicing and equipment updates. Still, daily traffic patterns would be
196 relatively steady rather than concentrated at specific times.

197
198 Member McGehee responded that the explanation about traffic patterns was helpful,
199 noting that the nearby Highway 36 on- and off-ramp can be difficult to navigate. She
200 said she appreciated the clarification.

201
202 Ms. Kaufner explained that the project must follow the State of Minnesota's B3
203 sustainability guidelines because it is funded with state bonding money. She noted
204 that the building design will incorporate the required sustainability features, such as
205 solar panels and electric vehicle charging stations, as part of those standards.

206
207 Member McGehee complimented the proposed building's appearance and raised a
208 few additional suggestions for consideration. She encouraged the project team to
209 consider using bird-safe glass because the area is located along a migration corridor
210 in Roseville. She also suggested that the nearby green space near the Target property
211 and adjacent apartment buildings could potentially be used for some of the project's
212 proposed biome or sustainability features.

213
214 Member McGehee noted that additional green space or natural landscaping could
215 benefit nearby residents who have limited access to open space while also
216 complementing the project's environmental design elements.

217
218 Mr. Keenan responded that the project must comply with Minnesota's B3
219 sustainability requirements, which balance several goals, including building wellness
220 and natural lighting. He explained that while the design includes large windows to

221 bring in natural light, the building will also be fully equipped with bird-safe glass to
222 address concerns about bird migration.

223
224 Mr. Keenan added that the project will significantly improve the site's environmental
225 conditions, which are currently heavily paved and largely impervious. The
226 redevelopment will introduce more permeable surfaces, biofiltration and infiltration
227 areas for stormwater management, and extensive natural landscaping. He noted that
228 much of this green space and natural planting is planned for the southern portion of
229 the site, which will substantially increase vegetation and provide environmental
230 benefits for both wildlife and the surrounding area.

231
232 Member McGehee commented that the proposed site design appeared very attractive
233 and that the inclusion of green space and landscaping was encouraging. She also
234 expressed appreciation that the project would include bird-safe glass, noting the
235 importance of protecting birds in the area.

236
237 Chair Bjorum asked whether the proposed State Patrol facility would permit any
238 public access or if it would be fully secured and gated. He also requested that the
239 applicant explain how security for the site would be managed.

240
241 Mr. Keenan explained that the site will include perimeter fencing and gated areas to
242 secure portions of the property. However, the facility will still have a limited public
243 component, particularly during normal business hours. He noted that the State Patrol
244 plans to host training sessions, classes, and other programs that bring members of the
245 public or partner groups to the site. While most staff areas will remain restricted for
246 security reasons, the design considers how visitors will access the facility and
247 includes plans to highlight the State Patrol's history for those who come to the
248 building.

249
250 Chair Bjorum asked for clarification about the type of perimeter fencing proposed for
251 the site. He referenced a previous project where fencing had raised concerns. He
252 asked whether the State Patrol facility would require high-security fencing, such as
253 tall fencing with razor wire, or if the design would instead use a more typical or
254 decorative style of security fencing.

255
256 Mr. Keenan explained that the proposed perimeter fencing would be designed to
257 provide security while still maintaining visibility and an appropriate appearance. He
258 said the fence would not be a solid barrier and would not include elements such as
259 razor wire or other features that would make it resemble a correctional facility.
260 Instead, it would be a more visually open fence that people can see through, and the
261 design team is still evaluating the appropriate height and placement to ensure it fits
262 well with the surrounding neighborhood and avoids creating a bunker-like
263 appearance.

264

265 Member Cyra asked whether the applicant had received any notable feedback from
266 the public during the project's open house. He asked if any concerns or suggestions
267 from residents led to changes in the plans, or if overall the public response indicated
268 general support for the project moving forward as proposed.

269
270 Mr. Keenan stated that the open house did not generate many comments specifically
271 related to the zoning change. Most attendee questions focused on general aspects of
272 the project, such as the building's appearance, placement, and how the facility would
273 be used. He noted that some feedback related to pedestrian movement and how
274 people travel between the nearby high school and Target, which the design team plans
275 to consider as the project moves forward. Overall, he said the project appeared to be
276 generally well-received by those who attended the open house.

277
278 Chair Bjorum invited members of the public to provide comments on the proposal.
279 After confirming that no one wished to speak, he closed the public hearing at 7:05
280 p.m. and asked if the commission had any further discussion before calling for a
281 motion.

282
283 Member Aspnes stated that she attended the project open house and reviewed the
284 proposed designs, where she asked questions about impervious surfaces and
285 stormwater management. She noted that earlier concepts had included a solar array on
286 the parcel south of Commerce Street, but it appeared that idea may no longer be part
287 of the plan.

288
289 Member Aspnes said she appreciated the proposed green space and native plantings
290 included in the project. However, she expressed concern that rezoning the property to
291 institutional would permanently remove it from the City of Roseville's property tax
292 rolls.

293
294 Mr. Paschke clarified that the property had already been removed from the city's
295 property tax rolls because the State of Minnesota owns it. He explained that the
296 zoning designation itself does not affect tax status.

297
298 Community Development Director Janice Gundlach clarified that zoning does not
299 determine whether a property is tax-exempt and noted that the property is already tax-
300 exempt because the State of Minnesota owns it. She also explained that rezoning the
301 property to institutional now does not permanently prevent it from being rezoned
302 again in the future, as the city has the authority to initiate zoning changes if
303 circumstances change.

304
305 Member Aspnes stated that the potential loss of property tax revenue had been her
306 only concern regarding the rezoning proposal.

307
308 **MOTION**

309 **Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Aspnes, to recommend to the**
310 **City Council approval of the property at 1500 Highway 36 (includes the**
311 **following three parcels – 10-29-23-33-0001, 10-29-23-34-0002, and 10-29-23-33-**
312 **0002) be re-guided from a Comprehensive Plan Land Use map designation of**
313 **Core Mixed-Use and Employment to Institutional. (PF26-001).**

314
315 **Ayes: 7**
316 **Nays: 0**
317 **Motion carried.**

318
319 **Member Barstad moved, seconded by Member McGehee, to recommend to the**
320 **City Council approval of the property located at 1500 Highway 36 be rezoned**
321 **from Employment District (E-1) and Core Mixed-Use District (MU-4) to**
322 **Institutional (INST) District. (PF26-001)**

323
324 **Ayes: 7**
325 **Nays: 0**
326 **Motion carried.**

327
328 **8. Business**

329
330 **9. Commission Direction on Commission Member-Initiated Agenda Items**

331 Member McGehee mentioned that she had previously planned to raise a discussion about
332 beginning work on the city’s Comprehensive Plan update. She encouraged the
333 commission to begin considering how community input would be gathered as the process
334 moves forward and emphasized the importance of engaging residents throughout the
335 planning process.

336
337 Community Development Director Janice Gundlach acknowledged Commissioner
338 McGee’s concerns about the upcoming Comprehensive Plan update and the need for
339 community engagement. She explained that the city recently received its system
340 statement about a month and a half ago, and staff are currently reviewing it and
341 considering next steps.

342
343 Ms. Gundlach noted that the city is in a unique situation because the 2040
344 Comprehensive Plan was adopted during the COVID-19 pandemic, which limited
345 opportunities for implementation and community engagement. With the 2050
346 Comprehensive Plan process approaching, she said the city will need to carefully
347 consider how to approach the update, especially given the recent visioning and strategic
348 planning efforts already completed.

349
350 **10. Adjourn**

351
352 **MOTION**
353 **Member Aspnes, seconded by Member Cyra, to adjourn the meeting at 7:15**
354 **p.m.**

355
356
357
358
359
360

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.


REQUEST FOR COMMISSION ACTION

Date: **4/1/2026**
Item No.: **6.a.**

Department Approval

Agenda Section

Janice Gundlach

Communications and Recognitions

Item Description: Swear In New Members

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

Application Information

n/a

Background

In accordance with City Code Section 201.02.C, every appointed member, before beginning his or her duties shall take an oath stating that he or she will faithfully discharge the duties of the commission. At the March 2, 202 City Council meeting, the Council appointed Ben Schaefer and Rose Lindsay to the Planning Commission. New Commissioners Schaefer and Lindsay shall be sworn in at the April 1, 2026 meeting.

Staff Recommendation

The chair shall swear in new Commissioners Ben Schaefer and Rose Lindsay.

Requested Planning Commission Action

The chair shall swear in New Commissioners Ben Schaefer and Rose Lindsay.

Alternative Actions

n/a

Prepared by: Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director

Attachments: None


REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION

Date: **4/1/2026**
Item No.: **8.a.**

Department Approval

Agenda Section

Janice Gundlach

Business

Item Description: Annual Organizational Business

1
2 **Application Information**

3 n/a

4
5 **Background**

6 In accordance with City Code Section 201.03.A, each advisory commission shall elect a chair and vice-
7 chair from among its appointed members for a term of one-year, as well as appoint a member to serve
8 on the Ethics Commission. The Planning Commission shall also appoint three members, and one
9 alternate, to serve on the Variance Board.

10
11 **Staff Recommendation**

12 Elect members to serve as chair and vice-chair of the Planning Commission, appoint one member to
13 serve on the Ethics Commission, and appoint three members and one alternate to the Variance Board.

14
15 **Requested Planning Commission Action**

16 By motion, elect members to serve as chair and vice-chair of the Planning Commission, appoint one
17 member to serve on the Ethics Commission, and appoint three members and one alternate to the
18 Variance Board.

19
20 **Alternative Actions**

21 n/a

22 **Prepared by:** Janice Gundlach, Community Development Director

Attachments: None

23