



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

1. Call to Order

Chair Bjorum 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 Bjorum, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Erik Bjorum, Vice-Chair Pamela Aspnes, and Commissioners Steve Cyra, Allison Jensen, Rose Lindsay, Erin Lynch, and Ben Schaefer.

Members Absent: None.

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

3. Approve Agenda

MOTION

Member Lynch moved, seconded by Member Aspnes, to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Public Comment

None.

5. Review of Minutes

a. April 1, 2026, Planning Commission Regular Meeting

MOTION

Member Aspnes moved, seconded by Member Cyra, to approve the April 1, 2026, meeting minutes.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. **Communications and Recognitions:**
7. **Public Hearing**
8. **Business**
9. **Commission Direction on Commission Member-Initiated Agenda Items**
 - a. **Evaluate Roseville’s EVCS and EVSE (Electric Vehicle Charging) Requirements for New Parking Areas**

Commission Member Cyra stated that he wanted to provide a brief overview of the memorandum he prepared on the city’s non-residential parking area electric-vehicle charging requirements. He explained that the discussion centered specifically on whether the current ordinance should be reevaluated. He noted that the Roseville Planning Commission adopted the ordinance, which went into effect in March 2023. Since adoption, the city has received two variance applications that demonstrate the challenges of complying with the requirements in certain situations.

Member Cyra explained that the ordinance's stated objectives were clear and worthwhile, specifically to facilitate electric vehicle use and expedite the deployment of convenient, cost-effective charging infrastructure. He stated that the issue was not whether those goals were appropriate, but whether the existing ordinance was the best means of achieving them.

Member Cyra reviewed the current ordinance requirements. He explained that new parking lots with 30 to 49 spaces must provide two Level 2 charging stations, including at least one accessible station. Parking lots with 50 or more spaces must provide Level 2 or greater charging stations equal to 5 percent of parking spaces, with at least one accessible charger. He further explained that all new residential parking areas, as well as all nonresidential parking areas, regardless of size, must have 10 percent of the required parking spaces wired for electric vehicle service equipment infrastructure.

Member Cyra discussed the two recent variance requests that prompted his concerns. He stated that the first case involved Dick's Sporting Goods, where the ordinance would have required 15 Level 2 chargers and 30 EVSE-ready stalls. He explained that the applicant argued that Level 3 fast charging made more sense for a retail environment with higher customer turnover, and that planning staff supported a variance allowing a total of six chargers, including three Level 2 and three Level 3, along with the required EVSE stalls. He noted that the variance board ultimately approved that request.

Member Cyra then referenced the Hempel Real Estate case discussed during the prior month’s meeting. He explained that the proposed 528-space parking lot would have required 26 charging stations and 53 EVSE stalls under the ordinance. The applicant instead proposed eight Level 2 chargers and 22 EVSE stalls. He noted that the variance request in that case was denied.

Member Cyra stated that those cases highlighted potential edge cases where compliance may be difficult for developers. He said it would be beneficial to examine how Roseville's ordinance compares with neighboring municipalities to determine whether the city's requirements are aligned regionally, even if they are not identical. He also suggested reviewing broader market trends related to electric vehicle adoption and charger utilization rates.

Member Cyra stated that the economic impacts on businesses should also be considered. Using the Rosedale variance case as an example, he noted that compliance costs were estimated at more than \$500,000. He also said the city should evaluate long-term maintenance obligations associated with charging infrastructure. He commented that requiring businesses to install chargers effectively places them into a separate business operation involving the management and maintenance of charging equipment.

Member Cyra concluded by stating that he looked forward to hearing additional input from the commission regarding the issue.

Chair Bjorum clarified that, for purposes of the evening's discussion, the matter was open for commission discussion based on the information and memorandum provided by Member Cyra.

Chair Bjorum noted that Member Cyra had also included a draft motion within the meeting materials that, if approved, would direct city staff to review the current electric vehicle charging requirements contained in the zoning code. He asked Community Development Director Gundlach to confirm that understanding and stated that the item was open for discussion and conversation before any potential action by the commission.

Ms. Gundlach explained that the policy governing commissioner-initiated items exists to ensure that staff resources are not expended unless a majority of the Roseville Planning Commission supports pursuing the topic. She stated that Member Cyra had outlined his concerns and requested areas for review. The commission first needed to determine by vote whether a majority wished to take up the issue for further discussion.

Ms. Gundlach explained that if a majority of the commission supported examining the topic, staff could then begin dedicating resources toward researching the issues identified in Member Cyra's materials. She stated that the commission should also provide direction regarding timing, noting that staff likely could not return with information the following month, but potentially by the meeting after that.

Ms. Gundlach explained that the materials prepared by Member Cyra provided a comprehensive starting point for the scope of work and outlined the areas he believed should be examined. She added that if the commission agreed, those materials could serve as the initial framework for staff research, although additional topics or research needs could arise during future discussions.

Ms. Gundlach explained that the city's sustainability specialist would likely handle much of the research, as the subject matter closely aligned with that role. She also noted that

some of the information Member Cyra referenced was unavailable when the ordinance was originally enacted, explaining that many communities still lack electric vehicle charging requirements in their ordinances. She stated that when the ordinance was adopted, staff understood that implementation would involve some trial and error and that future refinements might become necessary over time.

Ms. Gundlach emphasized that ordinances should not be viewed as permanently fixed and instead should be continually evaluated and amended as conditions change. She reiterated that Member Cyra's materials would provide a strong foundation for the discussion if the commission chose to proceed with the review. She concluded by noting that any eventual recommendation developed by the commission would ultimately be forwarded to the Roseville City Council for consideration.

Member Aspnes stated that he had watched the recent Roseville City Council meeting, during which the council convened as the Board of Adjustment and Appeals to consider the applicant's appeal of the denied variance request. She explained that the city council ultimately voted to overturn the variance board's denial and grant the appeal.

Member Aspnes stated that there was significant discussion during the meeting regarding the same electric vehicle charging ordinance issues being raised by Member Cyra. She encouraged members of the Roseville Planning Commission to watch the meeting replay, noting that the discussion occurred early in the agenda. She commented that the city council appeared to expect the planning commission to examine the issue further.

Ms. Gundlach agreed with Member Aspnes' observations. She stated that the city council discussion addressed many of the same topics outlined in Member Cyra's written materials, as well as findings staff had prepared in support of the Hempel variance recommendation. She noted that the discussion covered issues including distinctions among Level 1, Level 2, and Level 3 charging, short-term versus long-term parking considerations, and differences among commercial, private, and publicly accessible charging infrastructure. She stated that many related factors could be explored as part of the commission's review.

Chair Bjorum provided additional context based on his prior experience serving on the Roseville Planning Commission during the earlier variance discussion involving Dick's Sporting Goods at Rosedale Center. He explained that the ownership group at Rosedale had not fully understood the city's electric vehicle charging requirements when the parking lot project was completed, and had already constructed the parking lot before realizing the ordinance applied to the project. As a result, he said the applicant was required to return to the city to seek relief through the variance process.

Chair Bjorum stated that part of the reason the variance was viewed favorably was that the applicant agreed to install Level 3 charging stations, which he described as a more expensive, faster-charging option. Drawing on his professional experience as an architect, he explained that commercial properties such as Rosedale often have opportunities to partner with charging providers to generate revenue for property owners. He noted that

the Rosedale ownership group had not effectively pursued those opportunities and had generally failed to follow the ordinance requirements initially.

Chair Bjorum commented that the costs associated with the Rosedale project were not unreasonable, given what he regularly encounters in his professional work, and stated that the project costs would not have been alarming from his perspective. He contrasted that situation with the Hempel variance case, which he acknowledged involved substantially higher impacts given the nature of that business. He stated that he believed the variance process was appropriately used in that case.

Chair Bjorum stated that he was not opposed to the commission reviewing the ordinance if members wished to do so. Still, he wanted to provide additional context regarding how the requirements compare with industry practices. He explained that from a residential and multifamily development standpoint, the city's ordinance requirements are not out of line with current standards. He noted that many affordable housing projects financed through Minnesota Housing programs are subject to even stricter electrification requirements than those currently imposed by the city. He stated that some developments now require electrifying entire parking garages and installing multiple Level 2 charging stations, while bypassing Level 1 charging entirely.

Chair Bjorum concluded by suggesting that, if the commission proceeds to review the ordinance, the discussion should focus primarily on commercial applications rather than residential requirements, stating that he did not believe the residential portion of the ordinance required reconsideration.

Member Cyra agreed with Chair Bjorum's comments regarding the residential requirements. He stated that he had no concerns about the residential portion of the electric vehicle charging ordinance and believed the review should focus solely on the nonresidential requirements.

Member Campbell Jensen stated that, coming into the discussion without the previously provided historical context, her initial reaction was that the commission had now encountered two examples suggesting that the current ordinance requirements may not be appropriately calibrated for certain projects. Referring to the Hempel case, she stated that she was struck by the scale of the requirement, noting that the ordinance would have required approximately 75 parking spaces associated with electric-vehicle charging infrastructure. In contrast, the applicant initially proposed only a minimal number of charging spaces before later offering 8 charging stations.

Member Campbell Jensen stated that the significant gap between the ordinance requirements and the applicant's proposal suggested that either the ordinance or the applicant's expectations were misaligned. She added that the additional example involving Dick's Sporting Goods at Rosedale Center further reinforced her concerns.

Member Campbell Jensen emphasized her support for electric vehicles and efforts to encourage broader adoption. However, she stated that she was uncertain whether the current mandate structure was the appropriate mechanism for achieving those goals. She

indicated that she would support further discussion and review of the ordinance, particularly regarding commercial applications.

Member Lindsay stated that she was approaching the discussion with a fresh perspective, noting that it was only her second meeting as a member of the Roseville Planning Commission. She thanked Member Cyra for bringing the issue to the floor for discussion. She stated that she was proud that Roseville had been among the first cities to adopt this type of electric-vehicle charging ordinance.

Member Lindsay commented that when ordinances are newly implemented, it is appropriate to revisit them after practical experience and variance requests reveal how the regulations function in real-world situations. She agreed that there must be a balance between the city's environmental objectives and its economic development goals, while ensuring that the ordinance supports both priorities effectively.

Member Lindsay stated that she supported further review of the ordinance. She also expressed appreciation that Member Cyra's written materials identified potential alternative approaches and opportunities for continued expansion of electric vehicle infrastructure within Roseville properties, even if modifications to the ordinance were eventually considered. She thanked Member Cyra again for raising the topic for discussion by the commission.

Member Schaefer asked about the history of electric vehicle charging infrastructure on city-owned and municipal properties and whether the topic had previously been discussed or explored by the city.

Ms. Gundlach responded that the city has examined the installation of charging infrastructure on municipal properties. She explained that the city has considered adding chargers at park locations. Still, based on experiences in other communities, some are concerned that park charging stations might not see significant use. She noted, however, that the city is actively looking at installing chargers at facilities such as Roseville City Hall.

Ms. Gundlach stated that cost considerations also influence installation decisions. She noted that within the Community Development Department, two of the department's four vehicles are fully electric and are currently charged on site at City Hall. She stated that the city remains committed to expanding electric vehicle charging infrastructure on municipal property when feasible and in alignment with the city council's broader sustainability goals.

Ms. Gundlach added that municipal charging infrastructure does not necessarily need to be addressed separately in the ordinance, as the city can implement those improvements directly on its own properties as opportunities arise.

Chair Bjorum stated that, based on the discussion and comments provided by commission members, there appeared to be general interest in continuing the discussion regarding the electric vehicle charging ordinance. He stated that he would entertain a motion to move

the commissioner-initiated item forward for further review by the Roseville Planning Commission.

Chair Bjorum directed his comments to Member Cyra and referenced the draft motion included within his meeting materials. He stated that if Member Cyra wished to make the motion based on the language he had prepared, he could do so, although another commission member could also make the motion if desired.

Member Cyra stated that the language contained within his draft motion generally reflected the direction he wished to propose. He suggested that holding approximately two meetings before the item returns to the Roseville Planning Commission would likely give staff sufficient time to gather information and feedback.

Member Cyra explained that he would like city staff to provide additional information regarding the implementation of the current ordinance, including feedback and concerns received from developers. He also requested information comparing Roseville's electric vehicle charging requirements with those of neighboring municipalities.

MOTION

Member Cyra, seconded by Member Aspnes, to continue the Planning Commission's discussion regarding potential amendments to Roseville's electric vehicle charging requirements for new parking areas and to direct Planning Development staff to report back within two months regarding implementation of the current code, concerns raised by developers, and comparison between Roseville's requirements and those of neighboring communities.

Chair Bjorum asked if the motion required a time frame.

Ms. Gundlach noted that the commissioner-initiated item policy requires the Roseville Planning Commission to provide staff with a general timeline for returning with information. She stated that the July Planning Commission meeting appeared to be a reasonable timeframe for staff to prepare background information and research responsive to Member Cyra's request.

Ms. Gundlach explained that staff intended to gather information regarding regional comparisons with neighboring cities, developer feedback, and implementation experiences related to the current ordinance. She added that staff might also be able to address additional topics identified within Member Cyra's memorandum.

Ms. Gundlach stated that staff would provide as much information as possible by the July meeting to support a meaningful discussion by the commission. She also emphasized that there was no deadline for the commission to reach final decisions on potential ordinance amendments, and that the July discussion would serve as a starting point for continued evaluation.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

10. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Schaefer, seconded by Member Cyra, to adjourn the meeting at 7:02 p.m.

Ayes: 7

Nays: 0

Motion carried.