

1
2 CITY OF ST. ANTHONY
3 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

4 JULY 20, 2021
5 7:00 p.m.
6

7 **CALL TO ORDER.**

8
9 Acting Chair Socha called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
10

11 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

12
13 Acting Chair Socha invited the Commission and the audience to join her in the Pledge of Allegiance.
14

15 **ROLL CALL.**

16
17 Commissioners Present: Acting Chair Socha, Commissioners Kuykendall, Erickson, Rude,
18 Hendrickson, and Morita.
19

20 Absent: Chair Westrick
21

22 Also Present: City Planner Stephen Grittman
23
24

25 **I. APPROVAL OF THE JULY 20, 2021, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**
26 **AGENDA.**
27

28 Motion by Commissioner Morita, seconded by Commissioner Rude, to approve the July 20,
29 2021, Planning Commission agenda.
30

31 **Motion carried 6-0.**
32

33 **II. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 16, 2021, REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION**
34 **MEETING MINUTES.**
35

36 Motion by Commissioner Erickson, seconded by Commissioner Morita, to approve the March
37 16, 2021, Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.
38

39 **Motion carried 6-0.**
40

41 **III. PUBLIC HEARING.**
42

43 **A. R-4 Zoning District Amendments**
44

45 Acting Chair Socha reviewed how the public hearing will proceed this evening.
46

47 Acting Chair Socha opened the public hearing at 7:07 p.m.
48
49

1 City Planner Gritman reviewed in April, the Planning Commission discussed staff-proposed
2 amendments to the R-4 Zoning District during a work session and agreed that the proposed
3 amendment, with some additions and modifications, was ready to proceed to consideration at
4 a public hearing for formal Planning Commission recommendation.

5
6 From the original staff text, the Commission comments included the following changes,
7 which have been incorporated into the ordinance language, both in the comparative table and
8 the proposed ordinance itself. The changes are as follows:

- 9
- 10 • Modify the proposed allowable maximum height from sixty feet and five stories to
11 fifty feet and four stories.
 - 12 • Address the proposed requirement for location of senior multi-family on a collector or
13 arterial street (due to concerns over existing facilities that may not comply with this
14 standard). The proposed language includes an alternative that the facility is served by
15 alternative transit options, either public or privately offered.
 - 16 • Adding requirements to the “General Regulations” in Section 152.105 relating to
17 building materials, landscaping and sustainability.

18
19 Included in the Commissioner’s packets is a copy of the current regulations in place, as well
20 as an updated table-form document that lists the series of potential amendments to the district.
21 As part of the table-form document, comments are provided for each proposed change
22 discussing the rationale behind the new language. The revisions from the work session are
23 highlighted for additional clarity.

24
25 The current district language was established many years ago, and reflects a more moderate
26 density, suburban style of multi-family development. Just in the past few years, the City has
27 considered multi-family projects on four different sites (one of which did not proceed). Each
28 of those were required to utilize the PUD zoning process due to a series of modifications the
29 projects required from typical R-4 regulations, including density, setbacks, parking
30 calculations, height, and other factors.

31
32 The current R-4 District restricts density to anywhere from about 13 units per acre up to 24
33 units per acre, depending on the size of the building. Over the past two years, the City
34 considered, and adopted, an updated Comprehensive Plan that directs development in high
35 density zoning districts to between 20 and 40 units per acre.

36
37 While PUD is still a viable path for projects that exceed density or other aspects of the R-4
38 standards, it can be difficult to process when the individual aspects of the project are of
39 borderline quality or push the envelope in some way. Without baseline standards that reflect a
40 reasonable expectation for development in the district, everything is left to negotiation, which
41 can put the City in a difficult position.

42
43 The revisions to the district are intended to create a threshold for higher density projects that
44 set an expectation for development. Beyond this, the threshold for PUD consideration would
45 also then be higher, as this becomes the new baseline.

46

1 Mr. Grittmann reviewed the modifications in detail.

2
3 Acting Chair Socha asked for a point of clarification and asked if the existing senior facility
4 and will the revised Code allow existing structures to be grandfathered in or would they need
5 to be modified to meet the revised Code. Mr. Grittmann stated the new Code applies to new
6 development or re-development of existing facilities. If existing facilities are expanded, the
7 new Code would need to be adhered to. The setbacks were reduced. Mr. Grittmann noted he
8 has added text at the end of the Ordinance including Building Materials and Architecture;
9 Landscaping and Site Improvements; and Sustainability.

10
11 Planning Staff recommends approval of the proposed amendments, with any additional
12 changes discussed at the public hearing. These changes will make multi-family development
13 more straightforward in those areas where it is proposed, set specific minimum expectations
14 for such development, and bring the zoning ordinance more closely into conformance with the
15 Comprehensive Plan.

16
17 The Planning Commission's advisory action will then be forwarded to the City Council for its
18 final action at an upcoming meeting.

19
20 There were no public comments.

21
22 Chairperson Westrick closed the public hearing at 7:25 p.m.

23
24 Commissioner Rude asked if R-4 Districts border any R-1 Districts. Mr. Grittmann provided a
25 map showing that R-4 Districts border some Commercial properties. Mr. Grittmann stated there
26 is some multi-family south of Silver Lane but not directly abutting. Most of the R-4 abuts
27 either mid-Density, Industrial or Commercial. There is one area around Mirror Lake that has
28 some single-family homes. Commissioner Rude stated he was concerned about the setbacks.
29 Re-development on Mirror Lake would have reduced setbacks.

30
31 Commissioner Erickson asked if a project came forward and the proposal was for over 1000
32 square feet of Commercial space open to the public, is that possible through the PUD process.
33 Mr. Grittmann stated that is how that would happen and need to proceed through a PUD
34 District. Commissioner Erickson asked about the 50% in the building materials and was that a
35 standard in other Cities. Mr. Grittmann stated glass has been added in that calculation and
36 would not be overly burdensome to the builder.

37
38 Acting Chair Socha stated she had some concerns about affordable housing and would the
39 revised Code be burdensome to affordable housing projects. Mr. Grittmann stated he would be
40 surprised if this would obstruct affordable housing projects.

41
42 Acting Chair Socha asked the Commissioners if a consensus is met regarding the three major
43 changes to the Ordinance. The Commissioners had no more comments.

44
45 Motion by Commissioner Erickson, seconded by Commissioner Morita, to approve the
46 proposed amendments to the R-4 District Ordinance as presented by Staff.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

Motion carried 6-0.

IV. STAFF REPORTS.

Mr. Grittmann noted the August 2021 Planning Commission Meeting will have a busy agenda including the re-development of the Bremer Bank Site and moving Bremer Bank to the old bowling alley site. The proposed developer is Inter-State. Their plans were just submitted to City Staff earlier today.

Mr. Grittmann will present to the City Council at their August 10, 2021 Meeting.

V. OTHER BUSINESS – NONE.

VI. COMMUNITY FORUM – NONE.

VII. INFORMATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS – NONE.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT.

Motion by Commissioner Rude, seconded by Commissioner Kuykendall, to adjourn the meeting at 7:40 p.m.

Motion carried 6-0.

Respectfully submitted,
Debbie Wolfe
TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.