

1  
2 CITY OF ST. ANTHONY  
3 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

4 AUGUST 17, 2021  
5 7:00 p.m.  
6

7 **CALL TO ORDER.**

8  
9 Chairperson Westrick called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.  
10

11 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

12  
13 Chairperson Westrick invited the Commission and the audience to join her in the Pledge of  
14 Allegiance.  
15

16 **ROLL CALL.**

17  
18 Commissioners Present: Chair Westrick, Commissioners Kuykendall, Erickson, Rude,  
19 Hendrickson, and Morita.  
20

21 Absent: Commissioner Socha  
22

23 Also Present: City Planner Stephen Grittman and City Clerk Nicole Miller.  
24

25 **I. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 17, 2021, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
26 **AGENDA.**  
27

28 Motion by Commissioner Rude, seconded by Commissioner Morita, to approve the August  
29 17, 2021, Planning Commission agenda.  
30

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

33  
34 **II. APPROVAL OF THE JULY 20, 2021, REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION**  
35 **MEETING MINUTES.**  
36

37 Motion by Commissioner Rude, seconded by Commissioner Morita, to approve the July 20,  
38 2021, Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.  
39

40 **Motion carried 6-0.**  
41

42 **III. PUBLIC HEARING.**  
43

44 **A. 3501 Maplewood Dr. – Fence Variance**  
45

46 Chair Westrick reviewed how the public hearings will proceed this evening.  
47

48 Chair Westrick opened the public hearing at 7:11 p.m.  
49

1 Mr. Grittmann stated he was in contact with the applicant. The applicant will be revising their  
2 proposal and asked that the Public Hearing be continued to the Planning Commission's  
3 September 21, 2021 meeting and table any action until that time.

4  
5  
6 Commissioner Rude stated he would appreciate if there is information about the neighboring  
7 fences. Mr. Grittmann will research and include in the information provided on September 21,  
8 2021.

9  
10 Motion by Commissioner Morita, seconded by Commissioner Erickson, to table consideration  
11 of the request (3501 Maplewood Drive – Fence Variance) and the public hearing until the  
12 September 21, 2021 meeting.

13  
14 **Motion carried 6-0.**

15  
16 Chairperson Westrick tabled the public hearing at 7:17 p.m. The item will be presented at the  
17 September 21, 2021 meeting.

18  
19 **B. Preliminary Planned Unit Development Request (2654 and 2534 Kenzie Terrace  
20 and 2401 Lowry Avenue NE).**

21  
22 Chair Westrick opened the public hearing at 7:18 p.m.

23  
24 City Planner Stephen Grittmann reviewed the applicants are Interstate Development, with  
25 Bremer Bank, and co-applicant City of St. Anthony Village. The project involves applying a  
26 PUD zoning district over the 3 subject parcels, two of which are owned by Bremer Bank, and  
27 one which is owned by the City. Interstate proposes to construct a new bank facility for  
28 Bremer on the City's "old bowling alley" site. A zoning map was displayed for Commission  
29 review. Once that construction is completed, Bremer would relocate from its existing building  
30 to the new site. At that point, Interstate would undertake demolition of the Old Bremer  
31 building and construct a new 76-unit multi-family structure on the property. As part of the  
32 three-way transaction, the City would take control of the small triangle at 2534 Kenzie,  
33 currently vacant. The City has discussed, in concept, ideas relating to City entrance  
34 monumentation on that site. Future development opportunities are not clear. The units would  
35 not be subsidized and would be a market rate project being more affordable. This is similar to  
36 the project on 37<sup>th</sup> and Stinson.

37  
38 Site plans were shown to the Commission which Mr. Grittmann described in detail. The bank  
39 building elevations were provided. The building materials will be brick and glass. An image  
40 of the proposed apartment building was provided. The garage level is at grade. The  
41 landscaping for the apartment building was reviewed. There would be signage on the building.

42  
43 The PUD considerations included:

- 44
- Scattered site PUD to total 3 acres, per code.
  - Bank site encroachment, toward alley violates 25' setback.
- 45

- 1           • Recently revised side setbacks require 25’ north setback on residential (15’ proposed,  
2           consistent with original zoning).
- 3           • Residential parking at less than 2 spaces per unit (meets new R-4).
- 4           • Lot coverage/impervious surface for residential (R-4 code limits this to 50%);  
5           applicant’s proposal is approximately 65.9% (existing is 82.2%).

6  
7           Mr. Grittmann reviewed the recommended conditions. The applicants have reviewed the  
8           recommended conditions and are making adjustments. There will be further discussions  
9           regarding the conditions with the applicant. The complete landscaping plan was included in  
10          the Commission packet.

11  
12          The project received concept review at a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and City  
13          Council earlier this year. Primary among the comments for this project were an interest in  
14          affordability for the multi-family project, as that has been a policy related to reuse of the  
15          City’s bowling alley property. Other objectives related to architecture and site planning at the  
16          Kenzie/Lowry/Stinson corner that create an entry statement to the community and supporting  
17          retention of Bremer Bank as a commercial presence in the City.

18  
19          Mr. Grittmann stated staff has reviewed the project for land use compliance with the intent and  
20          policies of the City’s Comprehensive Plan, and for zoning consistency with the C,  
21          Commercial and R-4, Multiple Family Residential Districts as baselines. In summary, the  
22          Comprehensive Plan promotes use of the subject properties that reflect the proposed uses of  
23          commercial and high density multiple family resident uses of up to 40 units per acre.

24  
25          The proposed PUD meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for many of the baseline  
26          standards. The principal areas of flexibility under the PUD include:

- 27  
28          1. Building height (code is 35 feet / 3 stories); applicant proposes approximately 56 feet to  
29          top of parapet and 4 stories;
- 30          2. Lot coverage/impervious surface (R-4 code limits this to 50%); applicant’s proposal is  
31          approximately 50.5%.
- 32          3. Density (R-4 code limits this to approximately 24 units per acre, Comprehensive Plan  
33          calls for 20-40 units per acre); applicant is proposing approximately 32-26 units per acre.

34  
35          Staff believes that the flexibility requested under the PUD is appropriate, given the objectives  
36          of the Comprehensive Plan and the related improvements and amenities proposed as part of  
37          the project. Staff is recommending approval of the Preliminary Plan stage of the PUD  
38          Amendment for Bremer Bank at 2654 Kenzie Terrace and Interstate Development at 2410  
39          Lowry Avenue NE, with a series of conditions.

40  
41          Mr. Grittmann reviewed the Site Plan Summary including Circulation, Building Materials,  
42          Signage, Landscaping, Trash Enclosure and Lighting.

43  
44          The building is proposed to be a four-story facility. The first level would be a parking level at  
45          grade and the upper three floors a mix of one bedroom (30), one bedroom/alcove (17), two  
46          bedroom (26) and three bedroom (3) units. Mr. Grittmann reviewed Site Access and Parking,

1 Setbacks, Building Height, Emergency Vehicle Access, Building Materials, Landscaping,  
2 Signage, Trash Handling, Grading, Drainage, and Utilities.

3  
4 The applicant (Victoria Perbix) from Intercity Development. She thanked Mr. Grittmann for his  
5 presentation and staff report and the Commissioners for their consideration of their proposal.  
6 She is available for any questions the Commissioners may have.

7  
8 Ms. Perbix addressed the items #3 and #4 of the conditions. She showed how 3-4 vehicles  
9 stacking could be provided. Bremer's current stacking potential is 2-3 as this would be  
10 sufficient. She reviewed the two evergreens that could be moved if possible that would be in  
11 the way of the development. The trash area has been moved to be serviced off the property  
12 rather than the alley. There would be no conflict with the monument sign. They are working  
13 with the lighting designer to meet the condition.

14  
15 Chair Westrick invited public comment. Mr. Grittmann stated there was no one in the Council  
16 Chambers.

17  
18 Ms. Carol Weiler, 2312 St. Anthony Parkway, noted there seems to be much less public  
19 engagement on this site compared to the Development 65 site. She would have appreciated  
20 more of an overview of the proposal at the public hearing. She has exchanged some emails  
21 with the City Planner about the traffic increase. The current Bremer building has very little  
22 traffic. There will be a substantial increase in traffic with this development. Most of the traffic  
23 will be on Stinson Parkway. She has concerns about that. She would encourage the access  
24 road that Hennepin County prefers. The number of access points should be limited if possible.  
25 She agrees with the plan to increase the landscaping along Stinson Parkway. She encouraged  
26 the use of mulch rather than rock. She questioned why there was no public presentation on the  
27 project.

28  
29 Mr. Ben Adamich, 2337 Taft Street NE, lives very close to proposed multi-family  
30 development. He had conversations with Mr. Grittmann where his questions were answered.  
31 He has questions about the parking adequacy for the proposed facility. Before the most recent  
32 R-4, the two spaces per unit, he would not like to see as many cars parking in the  
33 neighborhood. He suggested additional fees be charged for parking in the residential fees.  
34 This would encourage residents to use the constructed parking stalls. He also has concerns  
35 that the sustainability elements are being met by the developer (as shown in the  
36 Comprehensive Plan). There was not a lot of public engagement for this development. On the  
37 website it still refers to a senior housing and memory care facility.

38  
39 There was no further public comment.

40  
41 Chair Westrick closed the public hearing at 7:57 p.m.

42  
43 Chair Westrick re-opened the public hearing at 7:58 p.m.

44

1 Ms. Carol Weiler readdressed the Commission. She echoed the last observations and found it  
2 unusual these documents were not loaded on the website for viewing. She questioned  
3 people's ability to view the documents.  
4

5 Chair Westrick closed the public hearing at 7:59 p.m.  
6

7 Commissioner Morita asked the applicant on the number of units (76) and asked what the mix  
8 is. There will be 30 (1 bedroom units), 17 (1 bedroom/alcove units), 26 (2 bedroom units) and  
9 3 (3 bedroom units). There are 1.17 parking spaces per bedroom. Ms. Perbix stated they  
10 appreciate the comments on the parking. One of the resources they use is a parking generation  
11 manual. That manual recommends 1.3 stalls per unit. They look at different benchmarks as to  
12 how the parking is designed.  
13

14 Commissioner Erickson asked the applicant and noted the resident's concerns about parking  
15 are valid. The homes in Minneapolis are close together and there are not as many parking  
16 spaces available to the residents. Commissioner Erickson asked if the applicant could go with  
17 1.66 parking spaces per unit so nothing changes in a future proposal that would lower the  
18 threshold below that. Ms. Perbix stated what they have proposed is achievable. If this needs to  
19 be included as a condition they are willing to discuss.  
20

21 Commissioner Kuykendall stated his concerns are regarding traffic flow. It seems a U-turn  
22 would be needed to enter and there would be only right turns out of the project. Ms. Perbix  
23 stated in looking at the plan the intention was to provide right and left exit off of Kenzie.  
24 Commissioner Kuykendall stated there is a divider in the road. She will take the concern back  
25 to the planners. Mr. Grittmann stated there are currently two curb cuts. The easterly driveway  
26 cut will provide access to the site.  
27

28 Commissioner Kuykendall stated an aerial drawing would be nice. Ms. Perbix shared her  
29 laptop and Commissioner Morita noted there is a cut that would allow in/out to/from the  
30 property. The Fire Department has approved the plan.  
31

32 Commissioner Rude stated he would like to see a view of how this fits in with the neighboring  
33 properties. The Comprehensive Plan suggests properties should be near reasonable transit. Mr.  
34 Grittmann stated there are transit facilities on both sides of the site. Commissioner Rude asked  
35 about the triangle piece which could be combined with something else in the future for  
36 development. Mr. Grittmann stated at that time the PUD would need to be amended.  
37 Commissioner Rude asked about the drainage. He assumes it is draining south into the  
38 Minneapolis system. Is the drainage being re-constructed to the east of this property? Will the  
39 property have adequate drainage. Mr. Grittmann stated the applicant is required to take a very  
40 close look at the drainage and the City Engineer is also looking at this. There is a significant  
41 amount of underground storage. Commissioner Rude asked if this is to be a modular  
42 construction and Ms. Perbix stated it will be modular. Commissioner Rude asked if this was  
43 tabled for a month to allow for more citizen input, could some of the issues (traffic flow,  
44 garbage, etc.) be addressed. He stated if it would not be a problem with the time line, to wait a  
45 month. Mr. Grittmann stated there is time in the required timeline to do so. The number of  
46 phone calls on the project have increased.

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  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

Commissioner Hendrickson asked if there was any other community engagement done to date or any going forward. She asked about the sustainability elements of the project that the applicant would like to highlight. Ms. Perbix stated she is not aware of the Initiative in St. Anthony but they will implement as many of those that can be incorporated into the project. Mr. Grittmann stated the landscape has pollinator plant materials that would qualify in that regard.

Commissioner Erickson asked the applicant for the apartments do all units have balconies. Ms. Perbix stated the developer selects which units will have balconies. Not everyone wants to pay for a balcony. Commissioner Erickson asked how the rent differs with the modular building rather than traditional construction. Ms. Perbix stated she would need to research and come up with some sort of illustration. Commissioner Erickson stated in his work he deals with property tax appeals. He has heard from banks that the size of banks are obsolete due to the increase in mobile banking. He asks if the City has some assurances that this new building will not become obsolete in the future leaving an empty commercial building. Ms. Perbix noted Bremer has a new branch in Amery, WI using the same size building. She stated there have been some adjustments due to mobile banking.

Commissioner Morita asked if this could be tabled for a month to give the public more time to review and get answers to questions. Ms. Perbix stated it would not be desirable for them to delay this a month. The track they are on in developing their construction plan and working with their suppliers for building materials. Commissioner Morita asked if the public would be able to comment at the City Council meeting and Mr. Grittmann stated with Mayor's approval public comments could be heard. Mr. Grittmann stated that could be included in the Commission's motion.

Chair Westrick asked if a traffic study was done for this project. Mr. Grittmann stated he is not aware of a separate traffic study. Plans were submitted to Hennepin County and they were satisfied with the curb cuts for access. Hennepin County looked at the additional traffic volume.

Commissioner Rude stated he has harped on this many times in the past. It seems they are losing commercial space. St. Anthony is the most densely populated city in Minnesota. He does not think St. Anthony is a balanced community. He does not know there is a financial plan to go another way. Traffic, lack of stores, and a lack of a park are all concerns. The applicant has put together a good plan. He questioned if another apartment building is needed in the City.

Chair Westrick asked Mr. Grittmann at the Preliminary PUD stage once this goes to Council it will not come back to the Planning Commission again. Mr. Grittmann showed the Preliminary Plan PUD Process and it would not come back to the Planning Commission again.

As a condition of Final PUD approval, the applicant will be required to enter into a PUD agreement with the City and post all the necessary securities required by it. Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Plan PUD with the following conditions:

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  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

1. The applicant participates in a subdivision of the portion of 2654 Kenzie that encroaches into the alley and the City retains ownership of that remnant.
2. Access-related issues shall be subject to comment and recommendation by the City Engineer, as well as Hennepin County and Minneapolis Park Board.
3. The proposed bank site plan is modified to increase drive-through lane stacking space.
4. The applicants modify the landscaping plan for the bank location to retain a portion of the existing evergreen plantings.
5. The proposed monument sign on the bank site is placed and designed to meet City ordinances for size and setback. If an electronic display is desired, the applicants will need to apply for a separate Conditional Use Permit under the applicable code.
6. The lighting plan for the proposed bank site is modified to show a zero footcandle light intensity at the boundary with the senior residential property to the west.
7. The applicant adds foundation plantings along the Stinson and Kenzie frontages of the residential building.
8. The City finds that the proposed parking supply is adequate to serve the residential facility.
9. Final PUD Plans demonstrate compliance with ADA parking supply requirements (for disabled persons).
10. As part of the Final PUD Plan submission, a final signage plan be submitted for review which demonstrates compliance with City requirements.
11. Issues related to grading, drainage and utilities shall be subject to comment and recommendation by the City Engineer.
12. The applicant enters into a PUD agreement with the City and post all the necessary securities required by it.
13. The applicant executes the required land transfers suitable to the City Council.
14. Consideration of comments of other City Staff.

This recommendation is based on a finding that the proposal, with the conditions cited, is consistent with the requirements for PUD consideration, with the long-term objectives of the recommendations and policies of the St. Anthony Comprehensive Plan.

Interstate's proposal was included in full for Commission review.

Motion by Commissioner Morita, seconded by Commissioner Rude, to recommend the City Council approve the Preliminary Planned Unit Development Request (2654 & 2534 Kenzie Terrance and 2401 Lowry Avenue NE) with 14 conditions and allow for further public comment during the City Council Meeting on September 14, 2021.

Motion by Chair Westrick, seconded by Commissioner Morita, amended the motion to include adherence to maintain parking ratios.

Motion by Commissioner Rude, seconded by Commissioner Morita, to amend the motion to include finalization of location of the dumpster at the bank location, be addressed by City Staff.

**Motion carried 6-0.**

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  
30  
31  
32  
33

**IV. STAFF REPORTS.**

Mr. Grittmann stated on September 21, 2021 will be the next Planning Commission Meeting. There is a Council/Planning Commission work session also to be held that evening regarding the gas station site. The work session will be held at 5:30 p.m. if there is a regular agenda for the Planning Commission Meeting and if not the work session will be held at 7:00 p.m.

**V. OTHER BUSINESS – NONE.**

**VI. COMMUNITY FORUM.**

Mr. Ben Adamich, 2337 Taft Street, asked if the City could update the website of current projects.

**VII. INFORMATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS – NONE.**

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT.**

Motion by Commissioner Morita, seconded by Commissioner Erickson, to adjourn the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

**Motion carried 6-0.**

Commissioner Morita volunteered to present at the September 14, 2021 City Council Meeting.

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