

1 CITY OF ST. ANTHONY  
2 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
3 SEPTEMBER 20, 2022  
4 7:00 p.m.  
5

6 **CALL TO ORDER.**

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

10 **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE.**

11  
12 Chair Socha invited the Commission and the audience to join her in the Pledge of Allegiance.  
13

14 **ROLL CALL.**

15  
16 Commissioners Present: Chair Socha, Commissioners Erickson, Gaveske, Kukendall, Morita  
17 and Rude.  
18

19 Absent: Commissioner Hendrickson.  
20

21 Also Present: City Planner Stephen Grittman and Assistant to the City Manager  
22 Nicole Miller.  
23  
24

25 **I. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 20, 2022 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
26 **AGENDA.**

27  
28 Motion by Commissioner Morita, seconded by Commissioner Gaveske, to approve the  
29 September 20, 2022, Regular Planning Commission Meeting Agenda.  
30

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

33 **II. APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 16, 2022, REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION**  
34 **MEETING MINUTES.**

35  
36 Motion by Commissioner Erickson, seconded by Commissioner Morita, to approve the  
37 August 16, 2022, Regular Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.  
38

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

41 **III. PUBLIC HEARING.**

42 **A. Conditional Use Permit/PUD Chase Bank**

43  
44 Chair Socha opened the public hearing at 7:04 p.m.  
45

46  
47 City Planner Grittman reviewed the applicants are the owners of the property (3800 Silver  
48 Lake Road), representing Chase Bank as a new construction tenant. The project involves  
49 amending a PUD zoning district to accommodate a new banking facility with a Drive-through

1 facility. The developer proposes to construct a new bank facility on a portion of the former  
2 Walmart parking lot, now an empty space in front of the “ruby” multi-family residential  
3 building.

4  
5 The building is a 3,308 square foot structure that would sit on the south half of what is  
6 currently a vacant parcel. The applicant proposed to remove the existing asphalt and concrete  
7 on that portion of the site – the plans indicate that the northerly portion of the site would be  
8 subject to the property owner’s separate work.

9  
10 Banking and other financial institutions are permitted uses in the Commercial District  
11 generally, and in the Silver Lake PUD specifically. The drive-through facility requires a  
12 separate Conditional Use Permit. As such, the request for a Conditional Use Permit  
13 incorporates an amendment to the Silver Lake PUD District. In this case, the drive-through  
14 facility serves an ATM, and there are no drive-through teller windows.

15  
16 The project construction limits relate to the south portion of the existing parcel. No  
17 subdivision is being proposed at this time, and the northerly portion of the site has no specific  
18 plans for modification as a part of this request.

19  
20 Staff has reviewed the project for land use compliance with the intent and policies of the  
21 City’s Comprehensive Plan, and for zoning consistency with the Commercial District as a  
22 baseline.

23  
24 The Comprehensive Plan promotes use of the subject properties that reflect the proposed  
25 commercial uses in the area. The proposed Conditional Use Permit PUD meets the  
26 requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the baseline district zoning standards. There are no  
27 areas requested for PUD flexibility.

28  
29 Planning Staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit to amend the Silver Lake  
30 PUD district as proposed for the banking facility with a drive-through window and lane.

31  
32 The new bank building would be approximately 3,803 square feet. The site currently has no  
33 direct access to Silver Lake Road and would take its access from an internal private street in  
34 the Silver Lake PUD. The applicants will need to confirm access permission for the subject  
35 property, which previously had been utilized as parking for the former Walmart facility.  
36 Moreover, when the northerly portion of the site is ready for development, a plat and revised  
37 access easements may be required as a part of those land use applications.

38  
39 Traffic entering the site would have access to parking along the front entry portion of the  
40 building, as well as parking along the east (front) of the lot. This southerly access point would  
41 also serve the drive-through lane that loops to the ATM window on the west side of the  
42 building. A total of 31 parking spaces serve the building, a ratio of one space per 123 square  
43 feet gross. The zoning ordinance requires at least one space per 300 square feet. The proposal  
44 is easily consistent with this aspect of the code.

1 The drive-through gains its access from this southerly driveway. The drive-through appears to  
2 have stacking space for as many as six to seven vehicles, with a by-pass lane for vehicles that  
3 decide to leave the queue. For ATM-only service, this stacking amount should easily serve  
4 peak use of the facility. The bank also includes a walk-up vestibule with additional ATM  
5 services as a part of the main banking lobby.

6  
7 A second access drive is shown north of the building, connecting the private street to the north  
8 portion of the bank driveway. In the northeast corner of the site, an internal driveway  
9 connection would be made to the future development on the north portion of the subject  
10 parcel. As noted, driveway easements would be required to ensure that all parcels have  
11 continued access throughout the PUD area.

12  
13 Building Materials are a combination of primarily brick, glass, and cast stone with metal panel  
14 accents. The building itself would be as high as 22 feet to the top of the highest parapet, well  
15 under the maximum 35-foot building height. No issues with materials or general design are  
16 evident.

17  
18 No signage information has been included with the permit request. It should be noted that  
19 under the general sign requirements, each freestanding business location is permitted to have  
20 two signs, with total area based on the code requirement applied to the site in question.  
21 Separate sign permitting will be a requirement for identification on the building.

22  
23 The landscaping plan illustrates a fairly well landscaped site. Additional overstory tree  
24 planting is shown along the west boundary adjoining the private street, and the remainder of  
25 the site includes a variety of ornamental trees, shrubs, perennial plantings, and lawn. The  
26 limits of construction appear to retain a row of existing trees along the common PUD  
27 driveway along the south boundary of the site. A diagram of the landscape plan was shown to  
28 the Commissioners.

29  
30 The site plan also includes a detached trash enclosure facility in the southwest corner of the  
31 site. The drawings appear to suggest bollard protection of the enclosure, but details, materials,  
32 and other aspects of the enclosure are not identified. The enclosure should be constructed of  
33 materials that reflect those used in the principal building. Submission of plans verifying this  
34 requirement will be a condition of CUP approval.

35  
36 Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:

- 37  
38
- 39 1. The applicant provides signage details consistent with the City's sign ordinance for  
40 separate permitting.
  - 41 2. Access easements are updated as necessary to ensure access and cross use of common  
42 private streets in the PUD.
  - 43 3. The applicant provides plans for the proposed trash enclosure verifying consistency of  
44 materials between the enclosure and the principal building.
  - 45 4. Issues related to grading, drainage and utilities shall be subject to comment and  
46 recommendation by the City Engineer.
  5. Consideration of comments of other City 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  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

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

A map of the location of the site, the application and supporting material and a draft resolution were included for Commission review.

Commissioner Erickson asked what some typical considerations that are related to the drive-through ATM. Mr. Gritman stated the Commission should consider if the proposed use is consistent with the intent of the zoning district and the surrounding area and is capable of being served by the public services and does not create any unmanageable impacts on public service or property in the area.

Chair Socha asked if someone was using the ATM in the evening what direction would the headlights be pointing. Mr. Gritman stated the traffic will circulate to the north and clockwise around to the ATM itself and its headlights would be heading south and towards Starbucks.

Commissioner Morita asked if Silver Lake Road is on the right side of the building and Mr. Gritman showed on the drawing the location of Silver Lake Road. Commissioner Morita mentioned that is a very tight drive and would it be extended. Mr. Gritman stated the road should be more than adequate to serve the property.

Commissioner Rude asked about the dark dotted line and what does it represent. Mr. Gritman stated the limits of the landscaping on the site. The applicant will be providing more details on the trash enclosure.

Commissioner Morita asked why the entrance wouldn't be on the south side. Mr. Gritman stated entering traffic into that site will be busy.

Commissioner Rude stated he sent an email and asked if all Commissioners had received the email. The Commissioners responded they did not.

The applicant appeared before the Commission. Mr. Matt Linham, Design Engineer on the project. Chair Socha asked why the entrance would not be on the south side. Mr. Linham stated the south side has a signalized intersection. Being off the less busy for access would be safer. Full circulation will be created around the site. The west side was better than the south side.

Commissioner Rude asked if the ATM would have a screen for people to talk to when using the ATM. There could be talking 24 hours a day. He is concerned for those living in the Ruby. He is in favor of the project. Commissioner Rude had other suggestions on the location of the ATM. He is concerned about light and sound from the ATM. Mr. Linham stated there is parking between the Ruby and the bank. The ATM will have down-lighting and there should be no talking at the ATM.

1  
2 Commissioner Morita asked what landscaping will be between the Ruby and the ATM and  
3 Mr. Linham explained the screening buffer. Commissioner Morita stated the project seems  
4 fine.

5  
6 Chair Socha asked Commissioner Rude if he was wanting to limit hours. Commissioner Rude  
7 said he does not but is concerned the residents of the Ruby may have concerns.

8  
9 Commissioner Rude asked what the distance is from the Ruby to the ATM. Mr. Grittmann  
10 stated the building would be 80-90 feet from the lot line.

11  
12 Chair Socha stated part of the concern is about light and asked Mr. Grittmann about the  
13 lighting/electronic sign ordinance. The landscape plan does a good job of screening. Parking  
14 lot lighting is downcast and cannot shine on the Ruby building itself. Mr. Grittmann stated the  
15 owner of the Ruby was notified of the public hearing. Chair Socha is in support of the  
16 proposal.

17  
18 Chair Socha closed the public hearing at 7:37 p.m.

19  
20 Motion by Commissioner Morita, seconded by Commissioner Erickson, to recommend the  
21 City Council approve a resolution approving a request for a conditional use permit for a  
22 financial institution with drive-through in the Silver Lake PUD Zoning District with five  
23 conditions.

24  
25 **Motion carried 6-0.**

26  
27 Mr. Grittmann pointed out to Mr. Linham this will be on the City Council agenda on October  
28 11, 2022.

29  
30 **IV. STAFF REPORT.**

31  
32 The ordinance amendments, with the Planning Commission comments, were brought before  
33 the City Council at their meeting and approved the First Reading of the Ordinance. Chair  
34 Socha asked if the 6-foot 6-inch fence height was carried forward and Mr. Grittmann stated it  
35 was.

36  
37 **V. OTHER BUSINESS - NONE.**

38  
39 **VI. COMMUNITY FORUM.**

40  
41 No one appeared to address the Planning Commission.

42  
43 **VII. INFORMATION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

44  
45 Commissioner Rude thanked Mr. Grittmann for sending the article on the lawsuit to the  
46 Commission. Mr. Grittmann stated a permit was denied and those voting against are required to  
47

1 give denial reasons for the record. When something is denied there needs to be findings telling  
2 why it was denied. This is more for the City Council than the Planning Commission.

3

4 The next Planning Commission Meeting will be held on October 18, 2022

5

6 **VIII. ADJOURNMENT.**

7

8 Motion by Commissioner Rude, seconded by Commissioner Morita, to adjourn the meeting at  
9 7:50 p.m.

10

11

**Motion carried 6-0.**

12

13

14 Respectfully submitted,

15 Debbie Wolfe

16 *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

Approved