

1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting (Rescheduled 1-10-2023)

Documents:

[1-10-23 REGULAR MEETING AGENDA.PDF](#)

1.1. Planning Commission Regular Meeting Packet (Rescheduled 1-10-2023)

Documents:

[JANUARY 10, 2023 REGULAR MEETING PACKET.PDF](#)



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
ANOKA CITY HALL  
Tuesday, January 10, 2023  
7:00 P.M.**

**AGENDA**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Oath of Office**
- 4. Appointment of Officers**
  - a. Chairperson
  - b. Vice-Chairperson
  - c. Parking Advisory Board
- 5. Approval of Minutes**
  - a. October 26, 2022, Work Session Minutes
  - b. November 1, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes
  - c. November 15, 2022, Work Session Minutes
  - d. December 20, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes
- 6. Old Business**
  - a. None
- 7. New Business**
  - a. None
- 8. Public Hearings**  
**Miscellaneous**
  - a. None
- 8. Adjournment**



Auxiliary aids for handicapped persons are available upon request at least 96 hours in advance. Please call the City Manager's office at (763) 576-2710 to make arrangements.

---



**PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
ANOKA CITY HALL  
Tuesday, January 10, 2023  
7:00 P.M.**

**AGENDA**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Oath of Office**
- 4. Appointment of Officers**
  - a. Chairperson
  - b. Vice-Chairperson
  - c. Parking Advisory Board
- 5. Approval of Minutes**
  - a. October 26, 2022, Work Session Minutes
  - b. November 1, 2022, Regular Meeting Minutes
  - c. November 15, 2022, Work Session Minutes
  - d. December 20, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes
- 6. Old Business**
  - a. None
- 7. New Business**
  - a. None
- 8. Public Hearings**  
**Miscellaneous**
  - a. None
- 8. Adjournment**



Auxiliary aids for handicapped persons are available upon request at least 96 hours in advance. Please call the City Manager's office at (763) 576-2710 to make arrangements.

NOT APPROVED  
**ANOKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORKSESSION MEETING  
ANOKA CITY HALL  
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2022  
5:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER:

The worksession meeting of the Anoka Planning Commission was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Don Kjonaas, Borgie Bonthuis, Karna Brewer (arrived at 5:11 p.m.), Nancy Coleman, Colin Campbell, Shari Nemec, and Peter Rech

Planning Commissioners absent: Karna Brewer.

Staff present: City Planner Clark Palmer and Community Development Director Doug Borglund

DISCUSSION – 7<sup>TH</sup> AND BUNKER DEVELOPMENT SITE

Community Development Director Borglund identified the parcel in discussion and adjacent land uses, noting that this site is zoned B-5, Regional Business. He provided background noting the purchase agreement with Ryan Companies that was approved by the City Council on February 18, 2020 and the extensions that were approved in 2021 and 2022. He stated that Ryan Companies is working on the development submittal but has provided a simple site plan for review that would include an 80,000 square foot grocery store with additional outlots for future opportunities. He reviewed the proposed schedule. He reviewed the uses that would be allowed and those that would not be permitted within the B-5 district. He stated that there is some interest in some of the uses that are not listed as allowed and asked if the Commission had input on why some of those uses were not allowed.

Commissioner Brewer arrived.

Commissioner Bonthuis noted that the desire was to have a continuous building on the south side rather than individual buildings.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that the first request will be for the grocery store and one outlet.

Patrick Daly, Ryan Companies, stated that they are in the process of finalizing a lease with the grocer and hoped to share that name very soon. He commented that it has been a long road to get to this point and commented on the unique challenges of the market and economy. He stated that the grocery use has conditions that they would like to see before committing to the site as they do not want to be the only building developed on the site. He commented that because of the

competition with online markets, it is important to have other uses that bring traffic. He commented that gas stations, car washes, and single tenant restaurant or food service users bring in traffic that help increase the traffic for a grocery store. He stated that if those types of uses could be allowed on the site, the grocer could feel more comfortable in moving forward.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if the grocery store would sell flowers, have a bakery, sell alcohol, and/or sell gasoline. She stated that if the grocery store sells those items, then a similar tenant would not have incentive to come forward.

Mr. Daly replied that the store would sell flowers and would sell liquor, but because of the municipal clause in Anoka they would not look to sell that product but would have interest in the City having a liquor store on the site.

Community Development Director Borglund commented that the City operated liquor store has been discussed as part of the grocery store development.

Commissioner Rech stated that the two highlighted prohibited uses are the only two real commercial uses on that list.

Commissioner Brewer recalled past discussion about a desire for a clean and neat site and concern that trash could blow around the site or onto adjacent sites. She noted another discussion related to traffic and asked if the County would allow access onto 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. Daly commented that the entrance to the south shown as a right-in/right-out would be eliminated from future plans because of the desired spacing of the County.

Community Development Director Borglund provided details on the intersection improvements that occurred on 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue this summer.

Mr. Daly commented that they are attempting to be protective of the neighborhood and therefore did not want to only have access from 6<sup>th</sup>.

Community Development Director Borglund noted that both roads (Bunker and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue) are designed to handle traffic that would be proposed.

Commissioner Brewer asked if the City has reached out to the residents in that area to gain their input on this use.

Community Development Director Borglund provided details on the upcoming neighborhood meeting along with the public hearings for this case that will occur.

Commissioner Brewer commented that at the neighborhood meeting, it should not be presented that this is a done deal and that they are trying to convince people that this is what they want. She

stated that the purpose of the meeting should be to gain input from the residents and determine whether to move forward. She commented that these residents may an investment in their homes and may not have been aware that these plans have been in the works.

Jeff (resident) noted that he and the other resident present are residents on the north side of the development, which is why they are present tonight, in order to better understand the plan.

John (resident) commented that there is excitement from the neighborhood for a grocery store but also concern for the related improvements.

Mr. Daly commented that they have experience in grocery development near residential and therefore they have thoughts on how to mitigate lighting, noise, and timing of deliveries.

Jeff/John (residents) noted that many of those homes have recently built decks that would look at the back of the store and therefore there would be interest in screening whether that is done with a fence, trees, or a combination.

Commissioner Rech asked where other B-5 districts are located, in order to better understand the impacts of changing the allowed uses.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that this is the only site zoned B-5.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked the other uses that the grocery tenant would like.

Mr. Daly provided details on the potential uses. He noted that one building shown on the site plan would be a multi-tenant retail building with perhaps a liquor store and coffee tenant with a drive-thru. He noted that the middle building could be a carwash and the last building could be fast food or quick service restaurant.

Community Development Director Borglund noted the changes that have occurred in the food service market following COVID which blurs the line between convenience, sit down, and fast food.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if the residents have spoken with their neighbors about what would be desired.

Jeff/John (residents) replied that they would want quick service food, a coffee shop, car wash, etc. He noted that they like the uses proposed but have concern with how that would be screened to mitigate any concerns. He asked if there would be two access points onto 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Community Development Director Borglund provided details on those connections, noting that they would align with the access points for the library.

City Planner Clark noted that they attempted to keep the entrances away from the residential road.

Mr. Daly agreed that they wanted to keep the connection as far from the residential properties as they could while still aligning with the storefront. He stated that the store would be open 24 hours and estimated 80 to 120 employees at different times. He noted that they are trying to keep the commercial traffic coming in and out through 7<sup>th</sup>.

Jeff/John (residents) commented that there are a lot of kids playing in the neighborhood and perhaps there should be a stop sign added.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked the size of the parking lot.

Mr. Daly replied that there would be 319 stalls and explained how that would relate to the size of the building.

#### DISCUSSION – HOME OCCUPATION REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS

City Planner Palmer reviewed the purpose of the home occupation regulations as identified in the City Code. He stated that there are permitted home occupations, those allowed through an interim use permit, and others that are prohibited. He stated that the City Council recently had a discussion on the home occupation regulations and asked that the Commission review the regulations to consider similarities and differences to what is allowed in other communities. He reviewed some regulations used by other nearby communities and compared that to the Anoka regulations. He also provided details on the process for code enforcement related to home occupation.

Community Development Director Borglund explained that following the pandemic there are people working from home, or working remotely, which is different than a home occupation.

Commissioner Brewer commented on a business incubator that the Commission has toured in the past. She noted that it would be great to have something like that in the community which would be an interim step to get people from the home-based step to the retail space step. She asked if any of these regulations would encourage something bigger or discouraging something from getting too big at the home location.

Chair Kjonaas asked the expectations of the Commission tonight and whether there are elements that should be focused on.

City Planner Palmer reviewed the current regulation prohibiting signage and confirmed the consensus of the Commission to leave that as is.

Commissioner Nemec asked how a daycare would advertise.

City Planner Palmer replied that a daycare is considered a permitted use in the residential districts and is not considered a home occupation.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that use has to be allowed by State Statute.

City Planner Palmer provided details on the retail sale language in the current regulation.

Community Development Director Borglund noted that language is not clear.

City Planner Palmer replied that a member of the Council liked the language used by Champlin and provided that example. He reviewed how different scenarios would be classified under the current regulations. He confirmed the consensus of the Commission to not allow home occupations to operate out of an accessory structure. He stated that he will put together some information that could be emailed to the Commission and the topic can be revisited at the next worksession.

Chair Kjonaas stated that if staff has recommendations, those should be identified in red to make the next review easier and more efficient.

ADJOURNMENT:

Time of adjournment: 6:31 p.m.

Submitted by: Amanda Staple, *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*



NOT APPROVED  
ANOKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
ANOKA CITY HALL  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2022  
7:00 P.M.

CALL TO ORDER:

The regular meeting of the Anoka Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Don Kjonaas, Karna Brewer, Borgie Bonthuis, Nancy Coleman, Colin Campbell, Shari Nemec, and Peter Rech

Planning Commissioners absent: None.

Staff present: City Planner Clark Palmer and Community Development Director Doug Borglund

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- a. Approval of September 7, 2022 Regular Meeting Minutes

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RECH, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 7, 2022, REGULAR MEETING.**

7 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

- b. Approval of September 20, 2022 Work Session Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Brewer noted that she was not present at the meeting and should be listed as absent.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER RECH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2022, WORK SESSION MEETING WITH THE NOTED CHANGE.**

6 ayes – 0 nays – 1 abstain (Brewer). Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW APPLICATIONS:

**Zoning Map Amendment, Rezoning to Low Density Residential; 1800 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 1801 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, 1803 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 1805 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, 1806 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 1807 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 1811 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, 1813 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, 1814 River Avenue, 1819 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, Unaddressed Parcel PID: 12-31-25-11-0135**

Community Development Director Borglund provided some background information on land use and municipal planning. He also provided details on the impacts of rezoning, the difference between eminent domain and rezoning, and the rights a property would maintain to have.

City Planner Palmer reported that in December 2021, the City Council adopted the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Part of the plan included adopting the 2040 Future Land Use Map. Four areas of the City were reguided from their previous land use under the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. In order to implement the plan, the Zoning Map needs to be updated including a rezoning of each of the four areas. The first of the four areas reguided includes south of Walker, between River Avenue and 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, north of Monroe Street. This area was reguided from High Density Residential/Commercial to Low Density Residential. This means the area will need to be rezoned to R-1 Low Density Residential to be consistent with the 2040 Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Kjonaas opened the public hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Andy Gaul, 1811 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, asked why 1808 and 1812 is separated as that is a combined residential lot.

City Planner Palmer provided details on the sale of that property which occurred and the zoning which allowed that development to take place.

Mr. Gaul asked the implications that this zoning change would have for anyone that may be interested in operating a home-based business.

City Planner Palmer replied that the same set of rules apply to home-based businesses regardless of which residential zoning district they belong to.

John Bush, 88 Madison Street, stated that his concern was with the vacant lot at the corner and asked what is planned for that as it seems to be excluded from the R-1 designation.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the City owns the parcel and is mowing and maintaining it but there is not yet a plan for that property.

Mr. Bush referenced some of the uses that were mentioned, such as a church. He noted that none of these parcels are large enough for a church and therefore that would be unlikely. He commented that the City lot seems to be small for parking and asked how that would fit with the residential uses.

City Planner Palmer identified the unaddressed parcel which is zoned the same as Riverspoint. He noted that the parcel is included in the rezoning to low density residential.

Chair Kjonaas asked if the park along the river should be noted as not buildable property.

City Planner Palmer replied that the park does have an overlay on the map. He stated that the property is classified as park.

City Planner Palmer referenced an email received from a resident at 1768 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, and read her statement into the record in support of the rezoning as proposed.

As no one further wished to appear, Chair Kjonaas closed the public hearing at 7:24 p.m.

Commissioner Bonthuis stated that this would propose all single-family and she disagreed. She commented that she would like to see townhouses or similar development because of the adjacent uses. She commented that this would be spot zoning, and this would be the chance to correct that issue as the Commission previously recommended.

Commissioner Brewer commented that in recent years, all of the developers that have come forward with housing, with the exception of the unusually large homes near the library, do not want to build single-family homes. She commented that the developers seem to think there is not a market for that and prefer a development managed by an association. She asked the next course of action to make land attractive to development if the City finds out that as time goes by that nothing comes forward for single-family residential.

Community Development Director Borglund explained how the Comprehensive Plan, land use plan, and zoning work together. He commented that the direction of the Council was to reguide the property as low density residential and that was approved in the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that if a change were to be desired, an amendment would be needed to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Rech stated that the intent of the Comprehensive Plan is to guide future land use for the next 20 years. He stated that this area is surrounded on all sides by higher density residential, which speaks to the comments of Commissioner Bonthuis. He stated that in looking forward to the best future land use for the property, low density residential would not seem to be the best choice. He noted that many of these properties are owned by one individual and therefore could be sold to a developer to build an apartment building.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that if the zoning is changed to low density residential, a developer could come forward for a Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezoning in order to make an apartment building work.

Commissioner Rech commented that perhaps this island of single-family lots surrounded by higher density properties is not the best choice. He stated that the Commission previously recommended R-2 and asked if the Commission could make that same choice tonight.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that the action tonight is whether or not to rezone the property to match the Comprehensive Plan. He stated that the Commission could make a recommendation to approve or deny that rezoning.

Commissioner Brewer stated that if they go forward and say yes, the map would then match the Comprehensive Plan. She noted that the next step would be to wait and see whether development comes forward or not.

Commissioner Rech stated that he does not want to propose something that will continue to go back and forth between the Commission and the Council. He stated that if denying this change is not a viable solution, perhaps the best choice is to approve this and wait for a property owner to propose something else.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if the property at 1800 could sell for the development of a single-family home. She noted that all of the lots on that side appear to be too narrow to build single-family homes.

Community Development Director Borglund confirmed that may be the case.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that those lots would be of more value if zoned as R-2, which would still allow construction of a single-family home.

Commissioner Rech stated that the goal is to plan for future land use rather than current land use. He acknowledged the burdensome process to amend the Comprehensive Plan and zoning, which may not be approved by the City Council even if recommended by the Commission yet again.

Commissioner Nemec commented that she believes the Commission is trying to do the right thing for the future. She stated that if the Commission denied this request and recommended R-2, it is still possible that nothing may happen, and these homes may continue to exist for 20 years. She commented that the change to R-2 would at least provide for opportunity.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that the zoning and Comprehensive Plan need to match.

Commissioner Rech stated that if the Commission were to recommend denial, that recommendation would go to the Council which could overrule that denial, and the R-1 could still be adopted. He asked if findings of fact would be needed for denial.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that if recommendation of denial is given, he would suggest giving some supporting information as to why the action was denied.

Commissioner Bonthuis stated that she would prefer to recommend R-2 or R-3 and leave it to the decision of the Council. She commented that some of these lots are vacant, and some are rentals and had heard input that some property owners wanted R-2 or R-3. She stated that she is against spot zoning and did not believe that is the future they want. She asked the difference between R-2 and R-3.

City Planner Palmer explained the difference between the two zoning districts and provided examples. He commented that the lot sizes within this area would match better with R-2 and would allow for the single-family homes as well as other options. He stated that R-1 would block higher density development from coming in.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER RECH, TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, REZONING TO LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL; 1800 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE, 1801 2<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE, 1803 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE, 1805 2<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE, 1806 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE, 1807 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE, 1811 2<sup>ND</sup> AVENUE, 1813 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE, 1814 RIVER AVENUE, 1819 1<sup>ST</sup> AVENUE, UNADDRESSED PARCEL PID: 12-31-25-11-0135 AND INSTEAD RECOMMEND REZONING TO R-2.**

Further discussion: Commissioner Bonthuis commented that R-2 would allow single-family homes but would also provide additional options outside of multi-family residential. She commented that the Commission does not support spot zoning.

Commissioner Rech noted that these parcels are more apt to develop as R-2 in the future compared to R-1.

6 ayes – 1 nays (Brewer). Motion carried.

**Zoning Map Amendment; Rezoning to Main Street Mixed Use, East Main Street Subdistrict 2; 511 Monroe Street, 523 Monroe Street, 533 Monroe Street, 535 Monroe Street, 541 Monroe Street, 609 Monroe Street, 613 Monroe Street, 631 Monroe Street, 639 Monroe Street, 1900 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 1903 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 1908 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 1909 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

City Planner Palmer reported that in December 2021, the City Council adopted the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Part of the plan included adopting the 2040 Future Land Use Map. Four areas of the City were reguided from their previous land use under the 2030 Comprehensive Plan.

In order to implement the plan, the Zoning Map needs to be updated including a rezoning of each of the four areas. The second of the four areas reguided includes north of Monroe Street, between 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This area was reguided from Low Density Residential to Mixed Use.

Chair Kjonaas opened the public hearing at 7:51 p.m.

Eric John, 631 Monroe Street, commented that there are certain types of development that would seem to impact property values.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that he had a discussion with the assessor and what will drive the value is what someone is willing to pay for the property. He stated that there is not a plan for the development of this parcel as of yet.

Mr. John commented that he heard a rumor of shops with apartments above.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that there was a previous purchase agreement for commercial development but that did not include apartments above. He noted that if a development were to move forward, there would be a public hearing to consider the proposal.

Mr. John asked the purpose of rezoning the homes.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the change would make the zoning consistent and would provide options for future development. He stated that it would also provide more options for property owners that want to sell. He stated that the homes along Main Street were rezoned in 2007 and those homes remain.

City Planner Palmer commented that the HRA owned site would not be able to develop without a public hearing similar to tonight.

Jayd Piercy, 530 Monroe Street, asked where she could obtain a copy of the Comprehensive Plan.

Community Development Director Borglund provided instructions on how residents can access the plan on the City website.

Ms. Piercy commented that it was her understanding that there is an update to the Comprehensive Plan every ten years. She asked how it would be considered difficult to amend the plan if it changes every ten years.

Community Development Director Borglund confirmed that the plan is updated every ten years, but an amendment could be requested at any time.

Ms. Piercy asked why the property is requested to be rezoned. She commented that it would make sense that the residential stops where is currently is at the area that is now proposed to be rezoned. She did not want to see it continue to spread into the residential neighborhood.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that this would focus commercial along the transportation corridor.

Ms. Piercy commented that if a business is developed in the area where homes currently exist, that would place business against residential.

Community Development Director Borglund commented that there is screening and transition that could be used to screen business from residential. He provided examples of different types of business that would be allowed.

Ms. Piercy commented that this would seem to encroach business into a residential neighborhood.

City Planner Palmer commented that it would be a change. He noted that in 2007 the homes along the corridor were rezoned and still exist.

Ms. Piercy replied that she does not have an issue with rezoning the properties along Main Street but does not want to see her neighborhood rezoned to allow business when she invested a lot of money into her home. She did not see the benefit to anyone in this change, other than business owners. She noted that there are still locations available on Main Street for business.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that if someone were to develop, more than one lot would most likely be needed to support the building, parking, and stormwater management.

Ms. Piercy commented that if a business is developed facing her property, the value of her property will drop.

Community Development Director Borglund commented that the assessor felt that these changes would not have a significant impact on property values. He commented that they did not fully analyze property values as zoning and property values are not reflective of each other.

Ms. Piercy commented that they moved into the home in 2017 and did a major renovation and the property values have increased in that area. She noted that investment into a property encourages others to invest in their properties as well. She stated that they do not have commercial traffic in their neighborhood and would prefer to keep it that way. She did not see a reason that these properties would need to be rezoned.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the intent was to provide consistency for the zoning of the block and to allow opportunity for future development.

Ms. Piercy commented that they have a great community in their area and believes that this did not consider the residents.

Barb Thurston, 542 Monroe Street, commented that she believes this is an unnecessary rezoning. She commented that staff and the Commission are looking at Main Street, whereas this neighborhood is Monroe on both sides and therefore rezoning one side would impact the other side. She commented that this does not fit when the previous direction was to down zone to R-1. She commented that there is plenty of space on Main Street that would allow for business development. She commented that business tends to have difficulty once past 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue on Main Street and did not believe having business on a secondary street would be more successful.

Scott Piercy, 530 Monroe, agreed with the comments of the last two speakers. He commented on Jackson Street which is commercial and does not feel like an area where homes would fit. He commented that they do not want to see that occur in their neighborhood.

As no one further wished to appear, Chair Kjonaas closed the public hearing at 8:12 p.m.

Commissioner Brewer commented that there is one aspect about this zoning change that has not yet been brought up. She stated that this is called Main Street business, but Monroe is not Main Street. She stated that this would create the potential for someone with property on Main Street to extend their business further south, using that southern portion for parking. She stated that ability to also move south would provide opportunity for a larger business to face Main Street. She stated that there are screening requirements, therefore the residential lots would look out at trees and bushes rather than an actual business or another home. She noted that the intention would be to have the business entrance on Main Street.

Commissioner Rech commented that 639 is owned by the HRA and therefore the zoning has to change to incorporate it into the corner lot. He stated that anyone that owns a business on Main Street could potentially come to the City to request rezoning of a property along Monroe to expand their business, therefore the change could occur on a piece-by-piece basis over time if this were not approved. He stated that the commercial lots along Main Street are very small and do not lend themselves towards all the things that could be developed, therefore this would provide additional options.

Don Carda, 508 Monroe, commented on the large impact traffic would have on the residents in this area, many of whom have young children. He referenced 1908 and 1909, noting that this has already been started. He commented that if this continues it creates more of circular development than a Main Street.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if anyone attended the open house when the area was reguided.

City Planner Palmer confirmed that a public hearing was held but there may not have been a direct mailing.



Commissioner Bonthuis commented that she is tempted to leave this as the existing zoning. She wished that these residents would have come forward during the Comprehensive Plan process. She noted that if someone on Main Street wishes to expand to the south, they can still bring forward that request. She stated that denial of this rezoning would protect Monroe.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN, TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT; REZONING TO MAIN STREET MIXED USE, EAST MAIN STREET SUBDISTRICT 2; 511 MONROE STREET, 523 MONROE STREET, 533 MONROE STREET, 535 MONROE STREET, 541 MONROE STREET, 609 MONROE STREET, 613 MONROE STREET, 631 MONROE STREET, 639 MONROE STREET, 1900 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 1903 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 1908 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 1909 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE.**

7 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

City Planner Palmer asked if 639 is desired to be included.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN, TO RETRACT THE MOTION.**

7 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT; REZONING TO MAIN STREET MIXED USE, EAST MAIN STREET SUBDISTRICT 2; 511 MONROE STREET, 523 MONROE STREET, 533 MONROE STREET, 535 MONROE STREET, 541 MONROE STREET, 609 MONROE STREET, 613 MONROE STREET, 631 MONROE STREET, 1900 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 1903 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 1908 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 1909 6<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE AND TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT REZONING 639 MONROE STREET TO MAIN STREET MIXED USE, EAST MAIN STREET SUBDISTRICT 2.**

7 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

Commissioner Bonthuis noted that this will still go forward to the City Council which will make the final decision.

City Planner Palmer noted that this item will go forward to the City Council for a first reading on November 21<sup>st</sup> and second reading on December 5<sup>th</sup>.

**Zoning Map Amendment; Rezoning to Main Street Mixed Use, East Main Street Subdistrict 3; 718 Jackson Street, 730 Jackson Street, 734 Jackson Street, 744 Jackson Street, 748**

**Jackson Street, 754 Jackson Street, 760 Jackson Street, 800 Jackson Street, 804 Jackson Street**

City Planner Palmer reported that in December 2021, the City Council adopted the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Part of the plan included adopting the 2040 Future Land Use Map. Four areas of the City were re-guided from their previous land use under the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. In order to implement the plan, the Zoning Map needs to be updated including a rezoning of each of the four areas. The third of the four areas re-guided includes south of Jackson Street, between 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 8 ½ Avenue. This area was re-guided from Medium Density Residential to Mixed Use.

Chair Kjonaas opened the public hearing at 8:25 p.m.

No comments.

As no one further wished to appear, Chair Kjonaas closed the public hearing at 8:26 p.m.

Commissioner Brewer commented that this would move the blue line north and turned the brown area orange to create a neat block of orange colored zoning. She commented that from a zoning point of view this creates an easily distinguished area. She commented that unfortunately there is no one present to speak about this proposed change.

City Planner Palmer stated that he did receive one phone call and the resident was concerned about their house being taken. He commented that this area also contains existing single-family homes, and the Comprehensive Plan proposed a change in land use. He stated that there would most likely be similar concerns in this situation.

Commissioner Rech commented that this looks similar to the Monroe Street area but is different as the zoning is already medium density. He commented that at this point in time the idea that a business would want to expand backwards to Jackson Street would not really be reasonable as there are not existing businesses in that block. He agreed that it makes a contiguous zoning area but may not be the best zoning use for this period. He stated that perhaps it would make more sense for the 2050 plan.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked what occupies 2014 and 2016 as those properties are zoned differently.

City Planner Palmer identified the commercial shop and residential home, noting that zoning perhaps has not changed from the original zoning.

Commissioner Nemec commented that this feels a lot like the Monroe area and therefore she would be inclined to leave it zoned as is.

Commissioner Bonthuis stated that it is interesting because everything on Main Street was residential.

City Planner Palmer commented that staff has received a lot of phone calls for residents wanting to know how rezonings would impact their property. He stated that there are zoning changes which create nonconforming uses that still have not changed. He stated that there is no right or wrong, this is simply a vision for the future.

Chair Kjonaas commented that these strips off Main Street are only half a block off Main Street and perhaps in the future that would be desired property for Main Street expansion.

City Planner Palmer noted that the Comprehensive Plan is updated every ten years and therefore adjustments will continue to be made. He stated that the Metropolitan Council places a lot of importance on increasing growth and density and allocates those projections to each community.

Commissioner Rech stated that this is already zoned medium density and therefore a developer could come forward with a townhome development proposal. He was unsure the additional hoops that would be added if this were rezoned.

Commissioner Brewer commented that for the Comprehensive Plan update, she would suggest working more closely together between the verbal and mapped elements of the plan.

Community Development Director Borglund commented that they created a future land use map and now the zoning has to be updated to match the land use map.

Commissioner Brewer stated that the recommendations of denial are going against what has been adopted in the Comprehensive Plan, therefore it seems the Commission is contradicting itself.

City Planner Palmer explained the process that was followed to develop the land use map within the Comprehensive Plan. He commented that they are not necessarily contradicting themselves but working through the process.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that they go through these exercises to get to a point that makes sense.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL, TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT; REZONING TO MAIN STREET MIXED USE, EAST MAIN STREET SUBDISTRICT 3; 718 JACKSON STREET, 730 JACKSON STREET, 734 JACKSON STREET, 744 JACKSON STREET, 748 JACKSON STREET, 754 JACKSON STREET, 760 JACKSON STREET, 800 JACKSON STREET, 804 JACKSON STREET.**

7 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

**Zoning Map Amendment; Rezoning to B-4 Limited Business; 710 North Street, 711 Buchanan Street, 730 Buchanan Street, 732 Buchanan Street, 750 North Street, 801 North Street, 811 North Street, 815 North Street, 833 North Street, 2615 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 2625 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 2632 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 2646 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 2649 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Unaddressed Parcel PID: 06-31-24-13-0002, Unaddressed Parcel PID: 06-31-24-13-0112**

City Planner Palmer reported that in December 2021, the City Council adopted the 2040 Comprehensive Plan. Part of the plan included adopting the 2040 Future Land Use Map. Four areas of the City were reguided from their previous land use under the 2030 Comprehensive Plan. In order to implement the plan, the Zoning Map needs to be updated including a rezoning of each of the four areas. The last of the four areas reguided includes north of North Street, between 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue. This area was reguided from Industrial to Commercial.

Chair Kjonaas opened the public hearing at 8:45 p.m.

Joe Schneider, 811 North Street, commented that he has an auto repair business next to his neighbor that has an auto repair business. He stated that he has served the community for some time and questioned the difference between M-2 to R-4 and what that would mean.

City Planner Palmer replied that it would actually be proposed to change to B-4 and reviewed the definition as well as providing examples of what would be allowed.

Mr. Schneider stated that from his perspective this would be similar to him purchasing a sports car only to find out it is a compact car. He commented that he purchased his property because of the salvage yard and other auto related uses adjacent. He asked if the intent is to create a situation similar to Ramsey. He stated that he would prefer to leave the zoning as is because he sees this as a taking.

Commissioner Nemecek asked if the change in zoning would impact the businesses that exist today and who they could sell to.

Community Development Director Borglund commented that an auto repair shop could sell to another auto repair shop without issue but if the property were sold to another use, it would need to comply to the zoning.

Commissioner Rech commented that changing the zoning would not impact the business.

Mr. Schneider commented that he works with his son and would like to one day give that business to his son.

Commissioner Rech commented that could be done.

Mr. Schneider asked if he could sell to a machine shop.

Commissioner Rech explained that if the business is sold for another use, they would need to comply with the zoning requirements.

Mr. Schneider commented that he believes the zoning is more viable today as it provides him more rights for his business and property.

Community Development Director Borglund explained that the City has an adopted Comprehensive Plan and the action before the Commission is to consider rezoning that matches the adopted plan. He noted that land use changes over time.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that the resident could purchase the business from him and maintain the same type of business, but a machine shop would not be allowed as that is not an allowed use. She noted that there are a variety of uses that could still occur on the property under the proposed zoning.

Mr. Schneider commented that he likes the zoning the way it is and believes it holds more value the way it is.

Commissioner Rech asked if the reason for changing the zoning is that once completed, Highway 10 could bring in more business to the types of businesses allowed in the zoning district.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the focus was on transportation, traffic counts, and activity in the area.

Commissioner Rech commented that the resident's land may be more valuable as a highway business compared to an auto repair business. He noted that the intent is to identify the highest and best use of the property. He commented that the Kwik Trip went into the area, and this will provide more options should the existing businesses desire to sell in the future. He commented that it would seem more valuable to change the zoning rather than leaving it as is.

City Planner Palmer explained that the Comprehensive Plan is a community wide vision. He stated that if this were a blank canvas, they most likely would not have zoned this area as industrial because of the adjacent residential, railroad tracks, and Highway 10. He stated that because of those factors, B-4 limited business would seem to make the most sense.

Eric Kemp, 750 North Street, commented that he owns a vacant lot that was appraised in 2017 and then again in 2021. He noted that his value has increased, as have his taxes. He stated that he purchased his property because of the zoning and rail spur. He stated that the City is rezoning because they want these uses gone. He stated that another auto business is not going to purchase that property because the use will not comply with the zoning. He stated that the City did not contact any of these businesses about the potential rezoning. He stated that he has interest in his

properties and has been talking to staff but had not been alerted about this until he received the letter. He asked if the City is going to buy out those properties in order to get those uses out. He asked if there is a place where these businesses could be relocated in Anoka. He believes that the City has a plan that should be shared with these businesses. He commented that none of these businesses can go anywhere else in Anoka or surrounding communities and would have to be pushed out further, just as his business has been to Ham Lake. He commented that his real estate agent has stated that the B-4 zoning would make his property less valuable.

Donald Clark, 730 Buchanan Street, stated that he has worked at his business for 17 years and recently purchased the business. His concern was that his business was sold under industrial zoning which would provide more options for his business, whereas residential would limit the use of his property and business. He stated that this area contains small businesses and it occurred to him that this potential rezoning would eliminate a lot of small businesses. He stated that many of the uses that would be allowed in the proposed zoning change are already available in Riverdale for those wanting those businesses. He commented that more and more small businesses are pushed out by larger corporate businesses. He stated that he does have concern that this change would limit the options for his business in the future. He stated that he likes the area the way it is and the community of small businesses that watch out for each other.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked the business that he bought.

Mr. Clark replied that his business is a fire/water restoration company and confirmed that he did not change the business use, only the name. He appreciated the opportunity to speak.

Commissioner Rech asked if that type of business would be allowed in B-4.

City Planner Palmer replied that he does not have every use memorized. He stated that whether permitted or legal non-conforming, the use exists and could continue to exist.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that 750 is currently vacant and if the zoning is left as is, a junkyard would be an allowed use.

City Planner Palmer confirmed that a junkyard would be allowed within an enclosed building.

Judy Rollo, 815 and 833 North Street, commented that she owns a towing service and impound lot on those properties. She commented that she does not want to see a change in zoning because they could not find anywhere else to go. She commented that no city wants more towing and impound lots. She stated that if they decide to sell, they would want the ability to sell their business in the current location. She did not believe the zoning should be changed unless there is a set plan in place.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that business site is very well kept, and all the vehicles are kept behind fencing.

Chair Kjonaas commented that is a case where a business was allowed to expand backward.

John Knaus, 732 Buchanan, commented that one of the business owners just did work to spruce up the front of their building. He did not believe that any of the residents in that area would have complaints about these businesses. He stated that there is a rumor that the concrete plant has repeatedly asked to renovate their property and has been denied as the City has wanted that business out for 30 years. He stated that he is probably the last remaining homeowner in the City of Anoka that has M-2 zoning for his home. He stated that he partially purchased the property because of the M-2 zoning with the perspective thought that he could have a business there. He believed the zoning should be left as is. He asked the underlying motive to change the zoning. He stated that while M-2 would allow the same uses within B-4, B-4 would eliminate the uses that already exist so there would not be a benefit.

Mike stated that he works at 2632 and has known this area to be the same for the last 50 years. He referenced the comment that a restaurant may go into this location but noted that there are similar restaurants of that nature that exist. He commented that this is the only area in Anoka where someone can work on a car. He stated that he has never heard of an indoor junkyard. He stated that the residential neighbors are not complaining, and they are not going to build townhouses in that area because of the railroad tracks.

As no one further wished to appear, Chair Kjonaas closed the public hearing at 9:17 p.m.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked who owns the lot behind 811.

Mr. Schneider commented that he owns that parcel as well because he has originally intended to expand his business.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if Mr. Schneider owns part of 801 as there are vehicles parked on that lot.

Mr. Schneider provided details on where access is to his business and where vehicles are parked. He referenced a recent code enforcement complaint he received related to vehicles parked in the front that do not run. He stated that his business is fixing vehicles that do not run.

Commissioner Rech commented that this discussion is related to future land use. He stated that with the Highway 10 improvement and other improvements in the area, he believes that B-4 would be the future for these properties. He commented that the current zoning is not the best use of the land in the future.

Commissioner Nemec stated that the existing businesses could stay that way for the next 20 years, even if the B-4 zoning were adopted. She stated that no one will force those businesses out and if they wanted to sell, they could sell to the same type of use without issue. She commented that she

struggles with this because she hears the comments of the business owners but noted that no one is forcing them to go anywhere.

Mr. Kemp commented that what would happen if this were rezoned is that when one of these businesses goes to sell to a similar business, another similar business would not want to purchase that because of the zoning.

Commissioner Campbell stated that Mr. Kemp stated that industrial property is rare and therefore if an auto repair business wanted to come in to one of the auto repair sites, they would be able to do so and maintain that use even if the zoning were changed. He stated that under that scenario, the opportunity would continue to be rare because the use could exist in that location.

Mr. Kemp stated that there is a reason for rezoning; to get those businesses out. He stated that the City should leave the zoning as it is and change it when a development offer comes forward. He stated that no one is going to buy a property that is not zoned for the allowed use.

Commissioner Rech commented that often the land is more valuable than the business that occupies the space. He noted that often a business is purchased, the building is torn down and something else is built.

Mr. Kemp commented that is one opinion but not the opinion of the business owners. He stated that it would be helpful for the businesses to know what the actual plan is. He commented that this rezoning would devalue the businesses.

Commissioner Nemecek asked what the next step would be if the Commission postponed this decision.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that this could be brought back as a regular meeting rather than a worksession in November but noted that a decision will need to be made.

Chair Kjonaas asked what would be different at that time.

Commissioner Brewer stated that the decision cannot just be postponed, there would need to be direction for what would be desired to make that decision at the next meeting. She noted that some reason would need to be provided for the delay. She commented that she has been on the Commission for over 25 years and this same process occurs every so often, but nothing ever changes. She stated that properties are often rezoned and nothing new comes into that area. She commented that this area is industrial and did not see a reason to upset the apple cart with the notion that something may come along, meanwhile the businesses are unsettled.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BREWER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN, TO RECOMMEND DENIAL OF THE ZONING MAP AMENDMENT; REZONING TO B-4 LIMITED BUSINESS; 710 NORTH STREET, 711**



**BUCHANAN STREET, 730 BUCHANAN STREET, 732 BUCHANAN STREET, 750 NORTH STREET, 801 NORTH STREET, 811 NORTH STREET, 815 NORTH STREET, 833 NORTH STREET, 2615 9<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 2625 9<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 2632 8<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 2646 8<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, 2649 9<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE, UNADDRESSED PARCEL PID: 06-31-24-13-0002, UNADDRESSED PARCEL PID: 06-31-24-13-0112.**

A roll call vote was performed:

Commissioner Brewer	aye
Commissioner Bonthuis	abstain
Commissioner Campbell	nay
Commissioner Coleman	aye
Commissioner Nemeč	abstain
Commissioner Rech	nay
Chair Kjonaas	aye

Chair Kjonaas noted that the motion failed with only three affirmative votes and therefore this will go on to the Council without a recommendation from the Commission.

City Planner Palmer advised this will go before the City Council on November 21, 2022.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Next work session will be Tuesday, November 15, 022 at 5:00 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT:

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**

7 ayes - 0 nays. Motion carried.

Time of adjournment: 9:33 p.m.

Submitted by: Amanda Staple, *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

NOT APPROVED  
**ANOKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORKSESSION MEETING  
ANOKA CITY HALL  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 2022  
5:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER:

The worksession meeting of the Anoka Planning Commission was called to order at 5:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Don Kjonaas, Karna Brewer, Borgie Bonthuis, Colin Campbell, Shari Nemec, and Peter Rech

Planning Commissioners absent: Nancy Coleman.

Staff present: City Planner Clark Palmer and Community Development Director Doug Borglund

DISCUSSION – HOME OCCUPATION REGULATIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICTS

City Planner Palmer recapped the discussion on this topic from the October worksession. He provided the existing text and compared that to the amended proposed text. He noted that although there are not many substantial differences, the proposed changes would make the text clearer to the reader.

Commissioner Rech commented that he likes that this would be more comparable to the other neighboring communities as well.

Commissioner Brewer commented that because staff reviewed the existing text, the Commission was able to understand the abbreviated text, but that may not be true for all. She asked if there was any input from other city planners on how effective the language was.

City Planner Palmer commented that he found the language in the code for the other cities and did not speak with other city staff members. He commented that it is common for cities to use the same language in their ordinances.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that the existing language is much too long.

Commissioner Nemec asked if there is a risk to excluding the language “fabricated off the premises” being allowed or not allowed.

City Planner Palmer reviewed the permitted home occupations noting that some of those would result in products fabricated onsite.

Chair Kjonaas provided examples of different home occupations that he is aware of that do not involve retail sales.

Commissioner Rech commented that perhaps additional language is added to specify “made on the premise” to read “...products made on the premises, not sold in a wholesale...”

Commissioner Brewer noted that the examples of Chair Kjonaas were more of assembly.

Chair Kjonaas noted that those examples did not involve retail sales.

City Planner Palmer asked if there would be any concern with assembly.

Commissioner Rech noted that assembling is often related to manufacturing and therefore that could be a concern.

City Planner Palmer stated that perhaps fabricated is used instead of made, in the suggestion of Commissioner Rech.

Commissioner Rech noted that fabricated sounds more industrial and would prefer made.

Community Development Director Borglund suggested the word crafted.

Commissioner Brewer stated that perhaps they move forward with something and if there are issues, they could make further amendment.

Commissioner Nemec suggested leaving the language as proposed and adding a footnote that lists permitted and prohibited home occupations.

Community Development Director Borglund noted that the intent of the language is to prevent someone from turning their home into a store. He stated that a person could deliver things or use mail order rather than having customers come to their home exclusively.

Commissioner Rech stated that he supports the amended language as proposed. He noted that if there are issues, amendments can always be made.

Commissioner Nemec agreed. She noted that more detailed information is found in the permitted and prohibited home occupations and therefore this should be a simple statement.

City Planner Palmer noted that this will come before the Commission at a regular meeting and will follow at the City Council with two readings.

DISCUSSION – PROPOSED ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT ADDING EVENT CENTER USE FOR B-6 NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL ZONING DISTRICT

City Planner Palmer stated that an application was received to amend the B-6 district to allow an event hall, which is referred to as an event center in the other zoning districts. He identified the different B-6 districts and the site that the applicant is interested in. He noted that the request would generally be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, but the Commission should evaluate whether the use would be consistent with other assembly uses allowed in the B-6 district. He reviewed the different assembly uses allowed in the zoning district and provided a letter submitted by the applicant about the intended use. He provided additional details on parking requirements and how the applicant would propose to meet the requirement and also highlighted challenges with on-street parking in this location.

Commissioner Rech asked if the landlord could restripe for additional parking.

City Planner Palmer commented that if the zoning amendment were approved, staff would recommend that the use be allowed as a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), as that would allow additional review and the ability to add conditions. He noted that staff would want to see a formal shared parking agreement with the school as the applicant had proposed.

Commissioner Nemec noted that perhaps the center would mainly function on weekends when the school would be closed.

City Planner Palmer noted that although events would typically occur on weekends, there could be weekday events as well. He stated that the school would also be open on a Friday when the school is open. He stated that the first step would be to determine whether the B-6 district would be suitable for event halls. He noted that the letter recognizes that there are other assembly uses allowed within the district. He was unsure where else an event hall type use could be located within the B-6 district.

Commissioner Rech noted that retail uses have people coming and going in a short amount of time. He asked if the applicant is aware of the hours of the other businesses.

City Planner Palmer stated that staff did express concern with parking.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if there is a distance requirement for business serving alcohol from schools, noting the two nearby schools.

City Planner Palmer did not believe so. He stated that there will be a public hearing at the December 6<sup>th</sup> meeting to consider the proposed text amendment.

Commissioner Rech referenced the allowed assembly uses and noted that a church could have a large crowd. He asked if the adjacent church has sufficient parking.

City Planner Palmer commented that he was not aware of any issues.

Commissioner Bonthuis stated that she would be curious of the opinions of the other businesses in that strip mall.

Commissioner Nemec commented that perhaps there would be opportunity to contract with other businesses to secure more shared parking.

City Planner Palmer stated that the applicant would need to think through it and propose its plan to the City. He stated that if the Commission does not believe this use would be a good fit for the zoning district, there would need to be findings of fact to support that. He noted that this use could be considered higher intensity as the uses in this district are intended to be low intensity.

DISCUSSION – RECAP OF PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING REGARDING  
REZONINGS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF 2040 COMP PLAN

City Planner Palmer stated that he placed this item on the agenda to allow any discussion following the last meeting.

Chair Kjonaas commented that he walked out of that meeting disappointed in himself. He stated that the Commission has spent a long time discussing those areas and made recommendations for the Comprehensive Plan and did not recommend to have the zoning and Comprehensive Plan match. He stated that perhaps the Commission should have recommended approval for the zoning to match the Comprehensive Plan and earmarked that for reconsideration in the next Comprehensive Plan. He asked the next steps.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that if the Council agrees with the Commission, a Comprehensive Plan amendment would be needed to reguide those areas which would involve a public hearing.

City Planner Palmer stated that if the Council chooses to go forward, it could rezone those areas to match the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Brewer asked if this would go before the Council prior to the new members being sworn in.

City Planner Palmer confirmed that the first reading will occur in November and the second reading in December.

Commissioner Nemec asked if there was public engagement prior to this point.

City Planner Palmer confirmed that there was a series of public engagement opportunities throughout the Comprehensive Plan process.

Commissioner Nemec noted that this was the first opportunity for the zoning and Comprehensive Plan to be tied together.

City Planner Palmer commented that direct mailings were not sent to property owners in the Comprehensive Plan process. He explained that the Comprehensive Plan is a vision of the City for the future and citizens are not typically asked how they would like to be zoned. He noted the series of changes in zoning and guiding that have occurred over time during different renditions of the Comprehensive Plan. He recognized that some people want their property to be left alone but noted that the City still needs think about its future.

Commissioner Rech asked what the City Council can do with the recommendation from the Commission.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the Council would either need to rezone the properties to match the Comprehensive Plan or leave the zoning and propose amendment to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if there is something that could be done about the number of vehicles at the auto repair business on North Street. She noted that there are other locations in Anoka that allow auto repair that are vacant but would not have space for that number of vehicles.

Commissioner Nemec commented that she was frustrated at that meeting because no matter how well the information was explained by staff and the Commission, some people will still not understand or want to listen. She stated that she was disappointed by the attitudes of some people at the meeting and the inability or capacity to learn something.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that it was frustrating that one person kept attempting to speak for another, rather than letting that person speak for themselves.

City Planner Palmer commented that in his discussion with that speaker, it appeared that he could not grasp that something different could be developed in that area. He recognized that change is difficult for some people to grasp. He recognized the changes that have occurred in Anoka over time, noting that in the past there was a focus on higher density which is why there are clusters of four and eight plex buildings.

Community Development Director Borglund noted that cities have to continue to evolve over the years.

City Planner Palmer commented that if it were a blank canvas, Anoka never would have zoned North Street in the manner it is. He noted that there is typically not much speculative development

when the zoning does not allow for the proposed use, therefore having the appropriate zoning in place does open up those opportunities. It was noted that a business could continue to exist even if the zoning is changed and could even be sold to a similar business, but it would also allow the business to sell to another business that would conform with the new zoning; therefore, providing more opportunity.

Chair Kjonaas commended staff for the excellent job they did at that meeting.

Community Development Director Borglund

ADJOURNMENT:

Time of adjournment: 6:31 p.m.

Submitted by: Amanda Staple, *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*

NOT APPROVED  
**ANOKA PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING  
ANOKA CITY HALL  
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2022  
7:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER:

The regular meeting of the Anoka Planning Commission was called to order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Planning Commissioners present: Chair Don Kjonaas, Karna Brewer, Borgie Bonthuis, Nancy Coleman, Colin Campbell, and Shari Nemec

Planning Commissioners absent: Peter Rech.

Staff present: City Planner Clark Palmer and Community Development Director Doug Borglund

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

NEW BUSINESS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS ON NEW APPLICATIONS:

**A2022-024 Planned Unit Development, Preliminary Plat, and Site Plan Review; Grocery Store Development; Northwest Corner of 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Bunker Lake Boulevard (Property ID: 30-32-24-34-0007)**

Community Development Director Borglund reported the applicant, Ryan Companies, has submitted a request for approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD), Preliminary Plat, and Site Plan Review to develop a vacant 14-acre lot at the NW corner of Bunker Lake Boulevard and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue NW. The proposed project generally consists of platting the single lot into two separate parcels and constructing one retail building on the north half of the site. The proposed retail building will be an 80,000 square foot single-tenant grocery store. The remaining lot south of the grocery store will be available for future development and retail tenants. The site is currently zoned "B-5 Regional Business". The project proposes to add a PUD overlay to the existing zoning



district. Ryan Companies will develop a multi-phase commercial development anchored by a freestanding grocery store on a portion of the overall site, which will be phase I of the development. The grocery store will be under a long-term lease structured with Ryan Companies as the landlord.

Community Development Director Borglund provided an overview comparing the request to the zoning and Comprehensive Plan, reviewed the existing features of the site, and provided details on timing and phasing. He reviewed the Preliminary Plat and PUD requests.

Commissioner Brewer referenced the multiple tenant sign, noting that this user would be the largest on the site and asked if there were requirements on the amount of space a business would have on that shared signage.

Community Development Director Borglund provided more details on general signage. He provided more details on the requested flexibility through the proposed PUD. He also reviewed the Site Plan Review request providing details on the proposed site grading/drainage, utilities, trails and pedestrian connections, exterior building/site lighting, landscaping, refuse/screening/outdoor storage, snow removal/storage management, architecture/exterior materials, and signage. He noted that a neighborhood meeting was hosted by the applicant on November 16, 2022. Approximately 20 residents attended, and he summarized the comments received as well as the related responses from staff.

Commissioner Brewer referenced the shrubs mentioned along 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue which appear to be between the sidewalk and street and asked if that is correct.

Community Development Director Borglund identified the location of the trail compared to the landscaping.

Commissioner Brewer commented that the previous preference of the County to not have shrubs that close to the road and asked if the County has been consulted.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the County has reviewed the plans and provided no comment on that.

Commissioner Brewer commented that the commissions spent months discussing what they would not want to see developed on that corner. She stated that the justification for this PUD eliminates almost all those previous preferences for the site. She stated that the City has provided a way for a developer to have almost all of the uses that were previously not desired for that site. She stated that the desire for that site was to have businesses that would not interfere with adjacent residents enjoying their yards. She stated that it seems quite logical that a grocery store would need a drive-up now days and she does not object to that plan. She was bothered by the time that was spent creating a compatible plan for that corner that has been tossed out. She stated that everything in the proposal is being approved based on what would be developed on the north end without knowing what will come on the south.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the plan shows a multi-tenant building, a carwash, and a restaurant. He explained that many things have changed since the B-5 district was created. He noted that because of the pandemic, land use has changed. He stated that the delivery of products to customers has changed while the City's ordinance has not.

Commissioner Brewer commented that noise does not change, noting the noise from a drive-up speaker. She stated that she is sure that this proposal will move forward and noted that she does not object to a grocery store but is disappointed with the time they spent planning for something on this site that would be compatible with the neighborhood which was then just tossed away.

Chair Kjonaas agreed that they spent a lot of time but noted that if the original plan were followed, there would not be houses on the north end or near the library. He stated that as things evolved, the City evolved as well, which allowed those neighborhoods to be created. He stated that there has been a desire for a grocery store in this area and therefore he sees that as a need.

Commissioner Brewer acknowledged that and the fact that commercial property helps to fund residential. She acknowledged that has happened in the past as well, where residential was allowed to creep which reduced the size of the industrial park.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that there will be trees in the parking lot and asked if those would be irrigated.

Patrick Daly, Ryan Companies, commented that any landscaping would be irrigated.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if there are plans to have a coffee shop in one of the retail spaces and whether that was supported at the neighborhood meeting.

Mr. Daly replied that they received mixed feedback from the neighborhood meeting, but coffee was a use that would be welcomed based on that input. He noted that as retail and the nature of convenience has become priority, a drive-up window would be a necessity for a coffee shop.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if the applicant is definite that the proposed uses for the retail on the south would come forward.

Mr. Daly replied that he would defer to staff on the mechanics. He stated that they have the plan that they are moving forward with on the first phase in the grocery store and have provided concepts for the southern portion of the site. He noted that portion of the site would come back in the future for additional consideration. He stated that they are attempting to expand the allowed uses on the southern site in order to secure the grocery tenant. He stated that part of the attraction to the site from the grocery tenant would be ensuring that the outlots are developed complimentary in order to assist in driving sales. He stated that in the changing market the face of retail has changed and there are limited types of businesses that are building new locations. He stated that

they do not want to have vacant spaces that remain for years into the future, but a site that develops seamlessly.

Commissioner Bonthuis noted that it was mentioned that the rooftop equipment would be screened from the street and asked if it would also be screened for the neighborhoods.

Community Development Director Borglund provided details on the location of the rooftop equipment and the screening that would be provided on all sides.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that the number of stalls seems to be high.

Mr. Daly replied that they are meeting the requirements of the City for parking based on the size of the building.

Community Development Director Borglund noted that lesser parking could be provided with additional proof of parking, that could be constructed in the future if there is additional need.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if the grocer would need that amount of parking. She also noted that the ratio of handicap stalls to regular stalls seems low at eight spaces.

Mr. Daly replied that they build a lot of grocery anchored developments. He stated that he has not yet had a chance to discuss potential reduction of parking with the tenant but would be happy to have that conversation and perhaps reduce the parking with the proof of parking concept.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked the division of the trees between evergreen and deciduous. She stated that while she likes variety, evergreens are needed for screening if that is the intent for the neighborhood.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that staff could work with the applicant to change out the types of planting to increase screening.

Commissioner Nemec asked if Ryan Companies has worked with this grocery tenant in the past.

Mr. Daly confirmed that they have a long relationship with the tenant and the tenant is established in the metro.

Commissioner Nemec asked if the neighborhood meeting was well attended, and the overall response received from the residents on a grocer and other potential outlot users.

Mr. Daly commented that many neighbors are present tonight and noted that he does not want to speak for them. He stated that staff provided a summary of the comments received from that neighborhood meeting. He stated that the residents realize that it is the vision of the City to have a grocer on the site and the concerns raised were typical relating to traffic, noise, lighting, etc. He

stated that they are doing the best they can to create an environment that would enhance the neighborhood rather than detract. He stated that there would be value added by providing these amenities but recognized that there are some externalities that come with the use such as trash and delivery trucks that cannot be avoided.

Commissioner Nemec asked if it is a done deal for the municipal liquor store to relocate to this site.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that it is not a done deal but something the City is exploring.

Chair Kjonaas opened the public hearing at 8:10 p.m.

Chuck [REDACTED], 4347 Parkview Circle, commented that as he understands there would not be landscaping between the trail/sidewalk and the road. He stated that in his experience in that area there is no survival percentage for any of the deciduous trees. He commented on the trees that he has had to remove because they did not have irrigation. He stated that the trees should almost be 100 percent conifers as they have the highest percentage of survival in this area. He asked that the Commission consider that any planting should be irrigated, or it should not exist as it will die without irrigation and will become a blight on the property. He stated that during the initial neighborhood meeting he made a suggestion to block off 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue from the commercial area in order to avoid commercial traffic through that area. He stated that exiting this space from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue onto Bunker Lake Boulevard is cumbersome and dangerous. He stated that if the development is not blocked off, people will go through the neighborhood into the phase one development to use the traffic light as that is the safest way to exit this space. He recognized that there is a desire from the Fire Chief to have multiple accesses but noted that there are many developments in the area that only have one access. He stated that people will not obey a sign that says no through traffic. He asked if Ryan Companies has considered whether there is space for truck traffic as proposed. He noted that if the trucks cannot make that turn, they will most likely try to take 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He commented that he does support a grocery store on the site and believes it is a needed amenity for the community. He referenced the building elevation drawings and stated that they did a great job with the parapet walls and mechanical screening on the roof. He stated that perhaps there could be verbiage requiring trash enclosures for the future retail uses.

Community Development Director Borglund noted that trash enclosures are required by ordinance.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if the resident believes that customers will come into the site from the traffic light near the high school.

Mr. [REDACTED] replied that when people discover the difficulty in getting onto Bunker Lake Boulevard from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, they will most like go through the neighborhood to use the traffic light.

Commissioner Bonthuis agreed that it can be difficult to get onto Bunker from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Mr. [REDACTED] commented that the median plantings should be removed between the library and proposed development because it becomes a blight.

Peter [REDACTED], 4371 Parkview, commented that it is his understanding that the grocer would be open 24 hours and asked if that would also apply to the pharmacy and drive-up. He stated that the back area behind the store would be open for traffic to access the drive-thrus for grocery pickup and pharmacy service.

Mr. Daly provided details on how customers would access the drive-thru area. He stated that they did a truck study to ensure the turns could be made by trucks. He noted that trucks would need to use an identified access exclusively to ensure they do not go through the neighborhoods.

Mohamad [REDACTED], 4369 Parkview Circle, recognized the changing times and need to evolve with the times. He realized that the City compromised to allow the residential and would not be compromising again for commercial. He stated that when he moved to his home, he realized something would be developed but was not expecting that he would be looking at a dumpster and hearing the noise from that dumpster. He believed that the plans should consider measures for privacy of the residents as this will be a store that will be open 24 hours. He stated that the adjacent homes did not sign up for this development. He stated that they are trying to forget the noise and smells that could come with these types of development. He stated that a 2010 traffic study is being referenced when the flexibility is required because of changing times and therefore believes that information should be up to date.

Jenny [REDACTED], 4373 Parkview Circle, agreed with the previous speakers and agreed that access to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue should be closed off. She expressed concerns with noise and issues with traffic. She referenced the berm and fencing that exists, noting that their decks are above that and therefore they will see the site and desire tall evergreens in attempt to mitigate the view of the grocery store.

Chair Kjonaas asked if the trees on the berm are irrigated.

Commissioner Bonthuis replied that they are not as they are on private land.

Michelle and Gary Smith, 4271 Parkview Lane, commented that they live in phase one on the road where traffic would choose to use to get to the signal. She commented on the traffic that goes through the neighborhood during busy times like fourth of July. She stated that while she would enjoy a grocery store, she is concerned with the related traffic. She noted that they already have issues with speeding traffic.

Gary Smith asked if there would be a way to put a cul-de-sac on Parkview Lane to prevent the connection.

Chair Kjonaas noted that they could take that into review.

Community Development Director Borglund noted that if 6<sup>th</sup> and Parkview are cut off, no one would be able to go anywhere.

Mr. Smith commented that he would prefer to cut off Parkview. He stated that perhaps a soundwall could be used to block the view of the back of the store from the adjacent residents. He noted that could help to block both the view and noise.

As no one further wished to appear, Chair Kjonaas closed the public hearing at 8:35 p.m.

Community Development Director Borglund commented that as proposed the landscaping plan would include about 50 deciduous trees, 28 evergreens, 312 deciduous shrubs, and 172 evergreen shrubs.

Commissioner Bonthuis commented that there are more deciduous than evergreen and asked how likely it is that those could be changed on the north side to mitigate for the neighborhood.

Mr. Daly confirmed that change could be made to improve the landscaping along that side.

Community Development Director Borglund confirmed that staff could work with Ryan Companies on that area. He stated that spruce could be put in that area, but it will take time to grow.

Commissioner Bonthuis acknowledged the sandy soil conditions that would better support evergreens. She acknowledged that plans will come in the future for the southern lot but noted that if the approvals are given at this time for different uses, their hands would be tied in the future.

Community Development Director Borglund stated that an overlay district would allow the uses within the different business zoning districts as permitted by ordinance.

Chair Kjonaas stated that one of the biggest concerns of the residents is 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and asked if City staff could review that prior to moving forward to the Council.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that they have looked at that but that would push all traffic, even for the nature preserve, to Parkview Lane. He stated that would also limit emergency access to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Bonthuis asked if another access was discussed previously for fire trucks.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the Commission did discuss whether or not to allow the looped road and decided to allow it. He noted that the trail was designed to allow emergency access. He stated that potential access was discussed for access at the signal, but it was decided to allow the looped road instead for the residential area.

Commissioner Brewer commented that this is two years in the making and how to make this vacant land into something useful for the community. She stated that apparently there is only one way to get a grocery store on the site, by using a PUD. She stated that the PUD is a tool that allows something to be developed that would not typically go on that site. She stated that the City continues to compromise and use this tool on smaller properties to allow development that would not typically be allowed.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BREWER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PUD, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. The PUD is found acceptable and meets the finding of fact to justify the PUD.
2. Approved plans shall be consistent with standards approved under the PUD.
3. A final PUD development plan shall be submitted reflecting any recommended changes from the preliminary PUD plan approval.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE PRELIMINARY PLAT, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. All comments and concerns of the City Engineer shall be met.
2. A final plat shall be submitted to the City of Anoka Planning Department and approved by the City Council within 12 months of preliminary plat approval and reflecting any necessary changes from the preliminary plat approval.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

Commissioner Bonthuis suggested additional conditions for the next action and asked if there is anything that could be done to review the traffic as mentioned by the residents.

Community Development Director Borglund replied that the Commission could recommend that those concepts be explored. She realized that cutting off either of those streets would eliminate an access for emergency vehicles.

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE SITE PLAN, SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

1. The applicant shall enter into a development agreement with the City of Anoka.

2. The developer shall provide a letter of credit in the amount of 1.25 times the estimated cost of all site improvements including but not limited to grading, parking lot improvements, landscaping, storm water ponding, roads, and utilities.
3. All comments and concerns of the City Engineer shall be met.
4. All comments and concerns of the Fire Department shall be met.
5. The developer shall comply with the Anoka County Highway Department approval and permit. The Anoka County Highway Department permit must be obtained prior to any issuance of a building permit.
6. The developer shall comply with the LRRWMO approval and permit for the drainage, grading and erosion control. The LRRWMO permit must be obtained prior to any site activity and/or issuance of a building permit.
7. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits and approvals from State agencies. Copies of permits and approvals shall be provided to the City.
8. A sign permit shall be obtained for all building and site signage.
9. All wall mount lighting on the exterior of the building should be shielded and downward directed to meet minimum lighting levels on site as required by City Code. All parking lot pole style lighting shall be shielded and downward directed to reduce glare and impact on adjacent properties.
10. The applicant shall revise plans to reduce the size of the north pond by approximately 20 feet from the north property boundary and expand the south pond to maintain stormwater capacity onsite. This will also allow the addition of a three-foot berm for additional screening for the NW residents.
11. The applicant shall revise plans to include a three-foot berm and the plantings suggested for additional screening at the NW corner of the property. The evergreen shrubs and trees will help provide year-round screening and the deciduous shrubs will provide seasonal visual interest.
12. Revised plans shall be submitted as required by City staff.
13. Replace deciduous trees with evergreens except in parking lots.
14. The parking lot plantings shall be irrigated.
15. There shall be more than eight handicap parking stalls.
16. The 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue intersection at Bunker Lake Boulevard shall be reviewed as well as Parkview Lane.

Further discussion: Commissioner Brewer suggested that a wide variety of trees be planted in attempt to avoid future problems from invasive species and disease.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

Commissioner Brewer referenced the staff report which mentions responses to PUD requests and asked that the word “yes” be eliminated as it is grammatically incorrect.



Commissioner Bonthuis encouraged the residents present tonight to attend the City Council meeting for this case. She noted that if the residents had not provided input tonight, she would not have considered that intersection.

Community Development Director Borglund advised this will go before the City Council in January.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Next regular meeting will be Wednesday, January 4, 2023 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

ADJOURNMENT:

**MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BONTHUIS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER CAMPBELL, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.**

6 ayes - 0 nays. Motion carried.

Time of adjournment: 8:53 p.m.

Submitted by: Amanda Staple, *TimeSaver Off Site Secretarial, Inc.*