



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

1. Call to Order

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

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 (Remote), Jon Barstad, Steve Cyra, and Erin Lynch.

Members Absent: None.

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

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

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

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Public Comment

5. Review of Minutes

a. December 3, 2025, Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member McGehee moved, seconded by Member Lynch, to approve the December 3, 2025, meeting minutes.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. Communications and Recognitions:

- 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

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

7. Public Hearing

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MOTION

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

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

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

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

8. Business

9. Commission Direction on Commission Member-Initiated Agenda Items

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

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

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

10. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Aspnes, seconded by Member Cyra, to adjourn the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

Ayes: 7
Nays: 0
Motion carried.