

NOT APPROVED
ANOKA PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
ANOKA CITY HALL
TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2023
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 Borgie Bonthuis, Karna Brewer, Nancy Coleman, Don Kjonaas, Shari Nemec, and Peter Rech

Planning Commissioners absent: Colin Campbell.

Staff present: City Planner Clark Palmer

Chair Bonthuis recognized Commissioner Don Kjonaas for his service to the Planning Commission and leadership during the past 15 years. She noted that he stepped down as Chair in December, but they hoped that he would continue to serve on the Commission for many years to come.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICERS

a. Parking Advisory Board

Chair Bonthuis noted that this item was tabled at the last meeting and requested a motion to remove the item from the table.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER RECH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KJONAAS, TO REMOVE THE ITEM FROM THE TABLE FOR CONSIDERATION.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

Chair Bonthuis stated that this item was tabled as she was the previous appointee to serve on the Parking Advisory Board but they were unsure if she could continue to serve in that capacity now that she has been appointed as Chair.

City Planner Palmer stated that there are no conflicts for a Chair to serve on that Board.

Chair Bonthuis stated that she would be willing to continue to serve on the Board.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER BREWER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, TO APPOINT BORGIE BONTHUIS TO THE PARKING ADVISORY BOARD.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- a. Approval of January 10, 2023 Regular Meeting Minutes

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KJONAAS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER COLEMAN, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 2023, REGULAR MEETING.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

- b. Approval of March 7, 2023 Work Session Meeting Minutes

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KJONAAS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, TO APPROVE THE MEETING MINUTES OF MARCH 7, 2023, WORK SESSION MEETING.

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

OLD BUSINESS:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A2023-001, Preliminary Plat, Conditional Use Permit and Site Plan Review; Silverstar Car Wash; 637 West Main Street

City Planner Palmer reported the applicant, Dan Nelson/Midwest Fidelity Partners, LLC is requesting approval of a preliminary plat, conditional use permit and site plan review for a proposed Silverstar Car Wash facility to be located at 637 West Main Street (former location of Pizza Hut) as well as for the preparation of a future development site located at 601 West Main Street (former Perkins Restaurant and Bakery). The future development at 601 West Main Street will be a later phase and at this time it has not been determined what the proposed structure(s) or

use may be; as part of this application the site will be platted, graded, and prepared for future development. The existing site consists of four parcels, which are proposed to be combined into two parcels.

City Planner Palmer stated that the development site is located within the B-1 Highway Business District. Car washes are listed as a conditional use in the zoning district, thus requiring approval of a conditional use permit. Additionally, per City Code, prior to the issuance of a building permit for a commercial development, approval of a site plan review is required. He reviewed the preliminary plat analysis and the conditional use permit analysis with related findings. He also reviewed the site plan review analysis including details on parking, refuse, landscaping/tree replacement, storm water, municipal water, and lighting.

Commissioner Kjonaas asked for details on the lighting for the north side of the parcel.

Jerry New, representing the applicant, provided details on the photometric plan and how that is developed. He stated that the numbers shown on the plan would be produced from the lights planned for the project.

Commissioner Rech commented on the lights that would be mounted to the building along with the pole lights.

City Planner Palmer provided additional details on the location of those lights as proposed.

Commissioner Rech asked the type of bulb and wattage for the lights.

Mr. New provided those detailed plans to the Commission. He confirmed that they could adjust the plan to meet the requirements of the City.

Commissioner Kjonaas asked if there is light bleeding over the property line.

City Planner Palmer commented that there may be and that is why staff is suggesting that the lighting plan be adjusted. He stated that staff wants to ensure that they would mitigate any impacts to adjacent properties as this site would be visible from the senior condo building.

Commissioner Brewer referenced proposed condition three, which provides examples of how the lighting could be addressed. She referenced the language used and asked if there might be hours of operation when the lighting could be lessened or whether the intensity of the lighting would be reduced from the start.

City Planner Palmer stated that the applicant could use a bulb that is not as bright, which would reduce the intensity.

Commissioner Rech provided additional comments after reviewing the detailed lighting

schematics. He stated that the pole lights may be the area to focus on in order to reduce the intensity of the lighting for the site. He asked if the City has a light meter that could be used to ensure the lighting complies.

City Planner Palmer confirmed that staff could consult for someone to complete that test or could purchase the proper equipment.

City Planner Palmer provided additional details related to the proposed architecture. Staff recommends approval of the request actions subject to the condition noted within the staff report.

Chair Bonthuis referenced condition three as drafted and was concerned that the language did not include “as measured from the ground”.

City Planner Palmer explained that the base with the pole would need to stay under the total height mentioned. He confirmed that he could add the additional language, if desired.

Commissioner Nemec asked if there has ever been a situation where the Council has approved similar architectural design.

City Planner Palmer confirmed that Taco Bell, which is directly adjacent to this site, received approval for similar materials.

Commissioner Brewer asked and received confirmation that all three requests are before the Commission tonight. She referenced the engineering report which describes the process for reuse of the water in the car wash. She asked what occurs with the remainder of the water that is not reused.

Mr. New provided details on the reclamation system and sediment tanks the car wash would use, as well as the requirements from the Metropolitan Council.

Commissioner Brewer stated that one of the key factors of the business is that it is supposed to save water.

Mr. New confirmed that companies save about \$100,000 in water fees annually by using this type of reclaim system.

Commissioner Kjonaas asked for details on traffic circulation for the site and how it would interact with Highway 10.

City Planner Palmer replied that this is a contained site with three access points and would not directly connect to, or impact, Highway 10. He stated that staff has been working with the applicant to develop utility and grading plans in conjunction with the Highway 10 project.

Commissioner Brewer noted that the plans show three lanes that filter into one lane going into the car wash.

Chair Bonthuis referenced the vacuum locations and stacking of vehicles. She asked if that number of vacuums and stacking is necessary and how it is determined as to which vehicle gets to move forward.

Graham with Silverstar explained how vehicles would access the site and go through the process. He noted that the wash process takes about two minutes. He stated that once people exit the wash they can pull aside to dry and vacuum or choose to leave the site.

Chair Bonthuis asked if there is signage for where vehicles should enter/exit.

Applicant confirmed that they do install signs for entrance and exit.

Commissioner Brewer noted the narrative which mentioned heated concrete and asked where that is located.

Applicant replied that the heated concrete goes 13 feet from the building.

Chair Bonthuis opened the public hearing at 8:00 p.m.

Ron, American Club resident, stated that many residents from the building are interested in the details for this project. He noted that they are concerns with lighting as that could impact the residential building. He had some concern with the holding tanks as that material would become hazardous waste and would need to be pumped out. He had concern with the reclamation system, as it was stated that 70 percent of the water is reused but the reused water is only used on the tires and undercarriage so that math would not seem to work. He stated that the residents would like to see the area developed but noted that something like Aldi would be more desirable. He had concern with the noise that would be generated from vacuums. He asked how the site would be maintained and monitored to ensure the requirements continue to be met. He stated that they like Anoka because of the design standards and this would deviate from those standards.

Chair Bonthuis stated that the residential building would look upon the north elevation and had staff display that elevation as proposed.

Jack Wagner, American Club resident, commented that there is a lot of traffic in that area with the residential building, golf course, clinic, and Highway 10 traffic. It was noted that the residents will look out onto the traffic. It was suggested that perhaps the City should wait until the highway project is complete as there could be a more desirable use at that time.

Karen, American Club resident, agreed with the comments of the previous speaker related to traffic. She stated that there are already apartments, the golf course, and the senior building as well as the traffic coming from the highway onto the roundabouts.

Mr. Wagner asked if there would be a holding pond on the property.

Mr. New commented that they would have retention tanks under the parking lot rather than a holding pond.

As no one further wished to appear, Chair Bonthuis closed the public hearing at 8:08 p.m.

Chair Bonthuis referenced the remaining piece of land that would be left for future development and asked if that would be the same size as the Perkins property was.

City Planner Palmer clarified the new property line as proposed.

Chair Bonthuis stated that it would seem that the likelihood of the remaining parcel being developed into a restaurant or small grocery store would seem unlikely because of the lack of parking area.

City Planner Palmer stated that the concept included a drive-thru lane, therefore perhaps it would be fast food related but that is yet to be determined.

Chair Bonthuis referenced grease and oil from vehicles and how that would be handled.

Mr. New commented that there is storage for sediment and separate storage for the grease and oil that comes from the vehicles.

Commissioner Kjonaas asked why the access is not moved west.

City Planner Palmer stated that the site as designed would maximize the use of the site and provide space for parking. He noted that the intention would be to have shared access.

Commissioner Rech stated that he is not happy with the percentages of efface versus brick as proposed. He stated that it seems to be out of line with what they have been trying to do, as brick has been a signature design element of Anoka. He stated that he would like to recommend a change in the percentage of materials used.

Chair Bonthuis agreed. She stated that even if there were deviations on another building, that building goes north/south whereas this building goes east/west which makes it more visible.

Commissioner Rech stated that he would want the requirements for Main Street design to be better met.

Chair Bonthuis noted that when fake brick is used, people see the seams.

Commissioner Rech commented that this company has made very attractive looking brick facades, recognizing that would add to the cost.

Commissioner Kjonaas stated that there is a history of holding the line on brick and was unsure why they would change for this, especially when it is on West Main Street.

Commissioner Rech noted that this site is elevated and right on the edge of that strip of development, therefore it is very visible.

Commissioner Nemec asked if the Commission could postpone action tonight.

City Planner Palmer confirmed that there would be time under the 60-day review clock to postpone and direct the applicant to update the plans for review. He noted that a recommendation could also be made tonight contingent upon the listed conditions.

Commissioner Nemec commented that this site is visible from the highway. She stated that she misses having Perkins, which was a gathering location, and if this is developed there would not be sufficient parking to support a restaurant use. She stated that she would prefer to see a restaurant with ample parking on the corner with a more aesthetically pleasing use adjacent.

Chair Bonthuis agreed and noted that would also receive more business in the winter months. She stated that the Commission can only review what is before them and the site is not City owned.

City Planner Palmer commented that the Code does allow for car washes. He stated that if they want control of the site, the City would have to own it or be under contract for it.

Chair Bonthuis expressed concern with the engineering letter and the items noted as missing within that report. She stated that with those details missing and the lighting concerns there would be a lot that needs updating.

City Planner Palmer stated that if the Commission has concerns, direction can be provided to the applicant to update those items and provide additional details for consideration.

Commissioner Brewer asked if there is anything within the design standards that prohibits stucco.

City Planner Palmer stated that is allowed as an accent material up to 25 percent within this zoning district.

Commissioner Brewer commented that it would seem that more expense would be put into the machinery and function of the car wash rather than the exterior. She asked if there would be a

way to assist the business in making the exterior better looking. She stated that if the issue is with the use, rather than the design, she did not believe that postponing would be the right choice.

Commissioner Nemeč commented that she does not believe this is the right use for this site, which is highly visible from Highway 10.

Commissioner Rech noted that the use is allowed.

Chair Bonthuis asked if the Commission would prefer to make a recommendation of denial, or postpone the matter asking for additional details.

Commissioner Rech commented that he would prefer to postpone because they would want the engineering issues resolved, the lighting issues resolved, and the design updated to better match the design standards. He noted that the lighting is currently more than nine times what would be allowed.

City Planner Palmer stated that the applicant can be asked to consider the design element and it will be their choice as to whether they submit a revision. He stated that postponement would most likely trigger an extension of the 60-day review but noted that is available.

Commissioner Rech noted that the ultimate decision will be of the City Council as the Commission is simply a recommending body.

Commissioner Kjonaas stated that the Commission should be honest with the applicant. He stated that if the driving force is design, that should be stated but if the use is not desired that should be made clear as well.

Commissioner Rech recognized that a restaurant or grocer would likely generate more traffic than a car wash.

MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER RECH, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER NEMEC, TO POSTPONE ACTION ON THIS APPLICATION DIRECTING THE APPLICANT TO PROVIDE UPDATED INFORMATION ON LIGHTING THAT WOULD MEET THE CITY STANDARD, THE CONCERNS EXPRESSED FROM ENGINEERING, AND A DESIGN THAT BETTER MEETS THE ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS OF THE BUSINESS DISTRICT.

Further discussion: City Planner Palmer noted that in order to address the concerns of the residents present tonight perhaps the landscaping plan could be updated to better screen from the residential property.

Chair Bonthuis agreed that the applicant should also update the landscaping plan to address those comments.

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
April 4, 2023
Page 9 of 9

6 ayes – 0 nays. Motion carried.

MISCELLANEOUS:

None

ADJOURNMENT:

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

6 ayes - 0 nays. Motion carried.

Time of adjournment: 8:35 p.m.

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