

**Saint Paul Planning Commission &
Heritage Preservation Commission**
MASTER MEETING CALENDAR

WEEK OF AUGUST 30-SEPTEMBER 3, 2021

Mon (30) _____

Tues (31) _____

Weds (1) _____

4:30-6:00 p.m. Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee **Remote Meeting**
(Anton Jerve, 651/266-6567)

Religious Accessory Uses Zoning Study – Release proposed code amendments for public review. *(Bill Dermody, 651/266-6617)*

Special Notice: In light of COVID-19 health pandemic, it is not feasible for any member of Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee to be present at the regular location, and all available members of the Committee will attend this meeting via Skype by telephone or other electronic means.

It is also not feasible for members of the public to attend the meeting at its regular location due to the health pandemic and emergency. Accordingly, NO meeting will be held in 13th Floor Conference Room in City Hall Annex at 25 W. 4th Street in the City of Saint Paul.

To monitor this meeting please see our website for log in and call in information.

Via Microsoft Teams link (Note: Requires Microsoft Teams phone application, or Web browsers Google Chrome or Microsoft Edge. Note that Internet Explorer or Firefox will not work)

Thurs (2) _____

Fri (3) _____

8:30-11:00 a.m. Planning Commission Meeting **Remote Meeting**
(Luis Pereira, 651/266-6556)

Zoning..... SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications. *(Tia Anderson, 651/266-9086)*
NEW BUSINESS

#21-291-082 231 Front Rezoning – Rezone from B2 community business to T2 traditional neighborhood. 231 Front Avenue, NW corner at Marion Street. (*Menaka Mohan, 651/266-6093*)

**Comprehensive and
Neighborhood Planning
Committee**

1-4 Unit Infill Housing Zoning Study – Phase 1 Amendments – Review and release for public comment and schedule a public hearing for October 1, 2021. (*Michael Wade, 651/266-8703*)

Notice to Commissioners and the public:

The chair of the Planning Commission has determined that it is not practical nor prudent for the Planning Commission and its Committees to meet in-person or pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 13D.02. In light of the COVID-19 health pandemic, it is not feasible for any member of Planning Commission to be present at the regular location, and all members of the Planning Commission will attend this meeting by telephone or other electronic means.

It is also not feasible for members of the public to attend the meeting at its regular location due to the health pandemic and emergency. Accordingly, no meeting will be held in City Hall Conference Center Room 40 at 15 W. Kellogg Boulevard.

To monitor this meeting please see our website for log in and call in information.

Via Microsoft Teams link (Note: Requires Microsoft Teams phone application, or Web browsers Google Chrome or Microsoft Edge. Note that Internet Explorer or Firefox will not work)



Saint Paul Planning Commission

Notice to Commissioners and the public:

The chair of the Planning Commission has determined that it is not practical nor prudent for the Planning Commission and its Committees to meet in-person or pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 13D.02. In light of the COVID-19 health pandemic, it is not feasible for any member of Planning Commission to be present at the regular location, and all members of the Planning Commission will attend this meeting by telephone or other electronic means.

It is also not feasible for members of the public to attend the meeting at its regular location due to the health pandemic and emergency. Accordingly, no meeting will be held in City Hall Conference Center Room 40 at 15 W. Kellogg Boulevard.

Minutes July 9, 2021

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Saint Paul was held Friday, July 9, 2021, at 8:30 a.m. remotely or by telephone.

Commissioners Present: Mmes. Anderson, DeJoy, Grill, Kantner, Mitchell, Presley, Thomas, Underwood; and Messrs. Baker, Hood, Holst, McMurtrey, Moore, Rangel Morales, Reilly, Risberg, Syed, Taghioff, and Yang.

Commissioners Absent: None.

Also Present: Luis Pereira, Planning Director; Yaya Diatta, Department of Safety and Inspections, Allan Torstenson, Emma Siegworth, Tony Johnson, Menaka Mohan, Michael Wade, Addison Vang, and Sonja Butler, Department of Planning and Economic Development staff.

I. Chair's Announcements

Chair Rangel Morales had no announcements.

II. Planning Director's Announcements

Luis Pereira announced that the Department of Planning and Economic Development is looking to hire a Deputy Director.

Mr. Pereira welcomed back Reconnect Rondo to the Planning Commission. Noted on the agenda Reconnect Rondo presented to the Commission almost two years ago, on July 12, 2019. This time

joined by Reconnect Executive Director, Mr. Keith Baker, along with their board chair Mr. Martin Anderson.

III. Zoning Committee

SITE PLAN REVIEW – List of current applications. (*Tia Anderson, 651/266-9086*)

NEW BUSINESS

#21-271-810 695 Grand Rezoning - Rezone from B2 Community Business District and EG East Grand Avenue Overlay District to T3 Traditional Neighborhood District without the EG East Grand Overlay District. 695 Grand Avenue, NW corner at St. Albans Street (*Emma Siegworth, 651-266-6657*)

Emma Siegworth gave a presentation that can be viewed on the webpage at:

<https://www.stpaul.gov/sites/default/files/2021-07/695%20Grand%20PC%20Presentation%2007.09.21.pdf>

Chair Rangel Morales announced that this is not a public hearing today; it is a conversation about the Zoning Committee recommendation and a chance to ask questions, understand the staff's position and understand those who voted for and against. The public hearing was held last Thursday, July 1st and the purpose for this Planning Commission meeting is to vote on the motion coming out of the Zoning Committee, which is to approve.

Commissioner Reilly voted against the rezoning at Zoning Committee, and he read the document with his reasons for doing so. This document is provided and [located here](#).

Commissioner Taghioff said that the project does overall merit a rezoning and supports the 2040 Comprehensive Plan and the District 16 Summit Hill Association Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner McMurtrey said that knowing that there is a substantial number of folks who voiced their opposition to this project, he wants a better sense of what those conversations have been with the community and if there are any aspects of the project that have addressed any of the concerns brought up by the community.

In response to Commissioner McMurtrey, Chair Rangel Morales said there has been a lot of community dialogue between the developer and members of the District Council. When they presented it on Thursday, they had a list of items that were changed based on community input.

Commissioner Baker agreed and said that there were changes in the overall scale and size of the project and the developer discussed the feasibility and cost issue with potentially making the building smaller.

Commissioner Grill said that the public comments generally addressed both the rezoning case and the conditional use permit and variances case. She said the T3 zoning meets a lot of the land use goals of the City, that a T project fits with in with the combination of business and RM zoning. She said that the regulations of the surrounding buildings that are already there, but for the overlay, allow for the same size and scale of the proposed building.

Commissioner Taghioff said that the public engagement process lasted almost five months with multiple public meetings. He said that the comments the Summit Hill Association received were mixed and the themes are not binary. There were comments of concerns about scale, but very few people were opposed to redevelopment altogether. He said that there is a stronger meeting of minds than is suggested by the count of comments, and the Summit Hill Association letter discusses the issues and tradeoffs well. The Board looked very carefully at the concerns and what has been done by the developer to address these

concerns. The focus of the board throughout has been to listen to address these concerns and secure real intangible site plan changes in response to them, which he feels has been done.

Commissioner Reilly said that it was disingenuous to suggest that a rezoning can be separated from the items (the conditional use permit and variances) because the reasons for the zoning district are to set up density and dimensional standards and use. The rezoning decision is different because it goes with the property and has nothing to do necessarily with the building itself, whereas the other items are directly associated with the building.

In response to Chair Rangel Morales, Ms. Siegworth said the major distinction between recommending approval of the rezoning to T3 and denial of taking the property outside of the overlay district was the policy in the Summit Hill District 16 Plan about adopting the overlay district which includes the height limits. Staff thought that because of that policy, rezoning to outside of the overlay district was not consistent with that plan and therefore that was not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Rangel Morales said that he found it conflicting to say that they should allow T3 zoning as if this overlay district doesn't exist. He said that the entire purpose of the overlay is to be more restrictive and the Summit Hill Association revisions to the overlay may allow for this type of zoning. If staff is recommending not to allow for removal from the overlay, he finds it conflicting to say that T3 zoning is allowed under the traditional zoning requirements as if there was no overlay. But because there is an overlay, they can't approve it under the overlay portion.

In response to Chair Rangel Morales, Ms. Siegworth said that there are two kinds of paths to getting out of the overlay district: one is rezoning to outside of the overlay district and that staff found to be not consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the other way is to get out of it with variances, which is path that the applicant is taking and the application which will be at Zoning Committee next week.

In response to Commissioner Kantner, Ms. Siegworth said that rezoning out of the East Grand Avenue Overlay District is done just as any other rezoning, going through the process with the Planning Commission and then going to the City Council for a zoning amendment. She said she could not find any examples of rezoning out of an overlay district, but there are several examples of variances from overlay districts. However, there are not overlay districts that are as restrictive as the East Grand Avenue Overlay District.

In response to Chair Rangel Morales, Ms. Siegworth said the nearest T3 zoning district is at Dale and Selby, which is a few blocks north.

In response to Commissioner Reilly, Ms. Siegworth said the applicant originally had considered rezoning to T2, but their building required more height than T2 permits. In T2, 35 feet is permitted by right and a maximum height of 45 feet may be permitted with a conditional use permit. T3 zoning districts permits greater heights at 55 feet.

Commissioner Taghioff said that the conflict of districts is a normal condition for the neighborhood because there is a variety of underlying districts and the overlay district imposes further restrictions. He said that he agrees with the staff recommendation because when you zone out of the overlay district, it's really saying these rules no longer apply to me, which fatally undermines the legislative intent of the overlay district that is not only in the 2006 Neighborhood Plan as a visionary statement, but it was adopted as an official control. The variances are specific to the building and the developer is forced to prove that they can conform to the underlying spirit or legislative intent, while exceeding certain technical limits, which is why the SHA Board felt more comfortable with the developer achieving this through variances.

Chair Rangel Morales said he tends to agree with Commissioner Reilly because when you look at the site in isolation, it is not on a major transit corridor, the nearest T3 zoning is in the Selby-Dale area, which is not immediately nearby, and it doesn't seem like T3 makes sense. For him, it seems like for other Commissioners, not considering the variances made it easier for them to vote that this is appropriate rezoning, but to him, staff saying it meets the T3 intent and goals of the rest of the city, but it doesn't meet the overlay district does undermine the overlay district. Whether he agrees with the overlay is a different question. He thinks that the rezoning in and of itself does undermine the overlay district and if they have to consider the variances in order to get the rezoning, then that's a problem.

Commissioner Baker said he is hearing that what they are about to vote on should not happen this way and that the two cases (the rezoning case this week and the conditional use permit and variances case next week) should be together. He feels like there is now concern about their ability to vote on the cases separately.

Chair Rangel Morales said that he thinks it is possible to differentiate between the rezoning case and the conditional use permit and variances case and the two matters can be handled separately. It is hard for him to get to "this is appropriate on this overlay district" without considering the reasons that Commissioner Taghioff brought up. It may be possible that he turned his vote into a yes if he was to start considering the variances and how it all shapes into the area and whether it follows the spirit of the overlay district. But because they are asked to separate the cases, he doesn't think that the rezoning in and of itself would apply.

Ms. Siegworth said that the decision to vote on the rezoning could be pushed to occur when the decision for the variances and conditional use permit decision would occur, but rezonings often happen before plans for specific buildings are made. Rezonings also have to go to City Council for final decision, which is why it made sense to start this rezoning process before the variances and the conditional use permit case.

Commissioner Kantner said that she thinks it is important to keep these two issues separate. The zoning runs with the land and the variances run with the building. She thinks that the current B2 zoning does not make sense at this location. The B2 zoning is more restrictive zone than the overlay district, and if they rezone to T3, the most restrictive would be the overlay districts. T3 does raise the base level of what they would need variances for and it makes sense to keep these two issues separate.

Commissioner Reilly said that he agrees that they should take the cases separately. For him, the issue hinges on the type of structure that can be built on T3 versus T2, which is the major difference regardless of what happens with the actual structure itself down the road. It's what is possible, not what is probable or proposed or likely.

MOTION: Commissioner Baker moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the rezoning B2 to T3, and to deny the rezoning out of EG East Grand Overlay District. The motion carried 16-2 (Rangel Morales, Reilly) on a roll call vote.

Commissioner Baker announced the items on the agenda at the next Zoning Committee meeting on Thursday, July 15, 2021.

IV. Informational Update from Reconnect Rondo – Update by Keith Baker, Executive Director, and Marvin Anderson, Board Chair, Reconnect Rondo.

Mr. Keith Baker and Mr. Marvin Anderson gave an update which can be viewed on the web page at: <https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/planning-and-economic-development/planning/planning-commission>

Commissioner DeJoy said that this presentation is inspiring as the Planning Commission has followed this vision from the start, she sees it really starting to take shape as a feasible master plan. She thanked Mr. Baker and Mr. Anderson for virtually walking them through this plan. The commitment to this development is so important and will certainly be part of the legacy in the City of Saint Paul. She is looking forward to more presentations as this develops further.

Commissioner Presley is a descendant of Rondo and know about the pain and loss, wealth, and the historical generational wealth that I-94 caused in the Rondo community where she lived and grew up in. She commends all the work of Reconnect Rondo having been involved in and a lot of the community engagement. She is working and consulting with the Rondo Roundtable to get it back up in a more organized. Commissioner Presley has a self-interest in this project being successful.

Commissioner Syed thanked Mr. Baker and Mr. Anderson for bringing this as he is a Rondo neighbor and has been for over 20 years. Again he thanked them for doing this work and looks forward to seeing this through.

Chair Rangel Morales thanked them for taking the time to provide them with an update as they have heard from them since the beginning and it is really inspiring to see the project develop. He wishes them the best and looks for future presentations from them and updates on the progress that they've made on the Reconnect Rondo Bridge Project.

Mr. Baker thanked the Chair and said he appreciates the opportunity to present and looks forward to updating the Planning Commission as things progress.

V. Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee

Menaka Mohan, PED staff said that they have no upcoming meetings scheduled. The Homeless Services Zoning Study has been delayed and there is nothing on the agenda for a couple of weeks.

VI. Transportation Committee

Commissioner Risberg said that the meeting on Monday, July 12th has been canceled and the next scheduled meeting is Monday, July 26, 2021 at 4:30p.m.

VII. Communications-Nominations Committee

Commissioner Underwood had no report.

VIII. Task Force/Liaison Reports

Commissioner DeJoy poste the website address for the updates of the Hillcrest Master Plan in the chat for those that want to get caught up. They have not met since the last Planning Commission meeting and their July 20th meeting is postponed, so their next scheduled meeting is August 17, 202. For updates: <https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/planning-and-economic-development/planning/hillcrest-golf-course-master-plan/hillcrest>

Commissioner Grill announced that the Riverview Stationary Task Force has a meeting on Tuesday, July 13th from 6:00-8:00 p.m. On the agenda is the local economic conditions, look at local market conditions, information on station technologies and an engineering update. If interested in listening in on that meeting the information available on the ramseycounty.us website under Riverview Corridor.

IX. Old Business

None.

X. New Business

None.

XI. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:31 a.m.

Recorded and prepared by
Sonja Butler, Planning Commission Secretary
Planning and Economic Development Department,
City of Saint Paul

Respectfully submitted,

Approved _____
(Date)



Luis Pereira
Planning Director

Wendy Underwood
Secretary of the Planning Commission



Saint Paul Planning Commission

Notice to Commissioners and the public:

The chair of the Planning Commission has determined that it is not practical nor prudent for the Planning Commission and its Committees to meet in-person or pursuant to Minnesota Statutes, Section 13D.02. In light of the COVID-19 health pandemic, it is not feasible for any member of Planning Commission to be present at the regular location, and all members of the Planning Commission will attend this meeting by telephone or other electronic means.

It is also not feasible for members of the public to attend the meeting at its regular location due to the health pandemic and emergency. Accordingly, no meeting will be held in City Hall Conference Center Room 40 at 15 W. Kellogg Boulevard.

Minutes July 23, 2021

A meeting of the Planning Commission of the City of Saint Paul was held Friday, July 23, 2021, at 8:30 a.m. remotely or by telephone.

Commissioners Present: Mmes. Anderson, DeJoy, Kantner, and Messrs. Baker, Hood, Holst, Moore, Rangel Morales, Reilly, Syed, and Taghioff.

Commissioners Absent: Mmes: *Grill, Mitchell, *Presley, Thomas, *Underwood, and Messrs. *McMurtrey, *Risberg, and Yang.

*Excused

Also Present: Luis Pereira, Planning Director; Yaya Diatta, Tia Anderson, Department of Safety and Inspections, Emma Siegworth, Addison Vang, Menaka Mohan, Allan Torstenson, Tony Johnson, and Sonja Butler, Department of Planning and Economic Development staff.

I. Chair's Announcements

Chair Rangel Morales had no announcements.

II. Planning Director's Announcements

Luis Pereira would like to recognize one of the members of his team, Addison Vang. Addison has been with the City since 2019, he is a City Planning Technician. However, he will be leaving the city to begin a new career opportunity at the UW Extension, in a position focused on food systems and

broadband access. While at Planning and Economic Development he really has done a great job working on subdivision, plat review and especially on HUD environmental review. He has worked closely with a variety of different city staff, PED, and other departments in his role as well as some of the city's community development organizations. Mr. Pereira appreciates all of the work Addison has done and will personally miss him.

Next, they finally have a date on the calendar with the Mayor, City Council President, Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair on August 5, 2021 to discuss the Commission's request for an Inclusionary Zoning Study.

III. PUBLIC HEARING: Amendments to Open Space Lot Specific Standards for the Ford Site Public Realm Master Plan -Item from the Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee. (*Menaka Mohan, 651/266-6093*)

Menaka Mohan, PED staff gave a full presentation at the June 11, 2021 Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Mohan as well as Tia Anderson, Department of Safety and Inspections, and Melanie McMahon, Mayor's Office are available to answer any questions the commissioners may have.

Chair Rangel Morales read the rules of procedure for the public hearing. Notice of the public hearing was published in the Legal Ledger on Monday, July 12, 2021 and mailed to the citywide Early Notification System list of recipients and other interested parties.

The following people spoke:

1. Kate Hunt, 2081 Highland Parkway, St. Paul, MN. Ms. Hunt asks the Planning Commission to reject the proposed resolution amending definitions of open space and building lot coverage at Highland Bridge. She would like to know how the residents of Highland Park benefit from this resolution. The developer, Ryan Companies, they benefit. The answers are clear as the 32 pages of baffling justification for this resolution. A simple idea: shouldn't open space just be the lot space where the building isn't located?
2. Howard Miller, 2081 Highland Parkway, St. Paul, MN. Mr. Miller said that they are being told that other measures are in place to protect the soft edges of the development that the floor area ratio will limit having too much building mass. If the definition of open space ostensibly is the portion of the lot where the building is not, at that is eliminated, how is the FAR to be measured? As the area increases the proportion of lot space used for landscaping parking etc. goes to the height of the building. That is what we're talking about, this allows for unbridled development.
3. Kathy McGuire 2203 Fairmont, St. Paul, MN. Ms. McGuire said that the revered Ford Master Plan is very clear about the priority and definition of open space at the Ford site. She quoted from the Ford Master Plan several pages: 9 open space, PG13 and the genesis of the plan was community engagement. Page 27 the unique characteristics, page 28 Ford site will be developed over time to become a vibrant, mixed use urban neighborhood. Ms. McGuire opposes this resolution.
4. Julie Kaupa, 1763 Juliet, St. Paul, MN. Ms. Kaupa has concerns about having so many years of discussion and planning and then making changes at the last minute to forfeit an open space is a big concern to her.

MOTION: *Commissioner Holst moved to close the public hearing, and to refer the matter to its Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee, Planning Staff will hold the record open for additional written testimony until 4:30p.m. Monday, July 26, 2021. Commissioner Syed seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously on a roll call vote.*

IV. Zoning Committee

SITE PLAN REVIEW –

NEW BUSINESS

#21-269-061 695 Grand CUP with variances – Conditional use permit for 59' 10" building height. Variances for front setback from Grand Avenue (10' maximum, 18' proposed for middle section of the building), building footprint (25,000 sq. ft. maximum, 30,500 sq. ft. proposed), total building size above ground, including parking (75,000 sq. ft. maximum, 124,000 sq. ft. proposed), and building height (three stories and 36' maximum, five stories and 59' 10" proposed). 695 Grand Avenue, NW corner at St. Albans Street. (*Emma Siegworth, 651/266-6657*)

Emma Siegworth gave a presentation that can be viewed on the web page at:
<https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/planning-and-economic-development/planning/planning-commission>

In response to Commissioner Moore, Ms. Siegworth said that there are no side setback requirements at the east property line, so the building could be built right along the property line. However, the building is proposed to be set back 3' or greater, so it more than meets the requirements.

In response to Commissioner Holst, Ms. Siegworth said that the zoning code is written to allow conditional use permits for certain uses and heights. Variances deal more with the specifics of the site and hardships that are made because of a unique circumstance on the site.

Chair Rangel Morales said he finds it confusing that they're saying that the purpose of a variance is supposed to be tied to the property and the zoning for this property is so restrictive that they're going to use that zoning in and of itself to justify the variance. He said at the discussion of the rezoning case, it seemed like the developer commented that they could go smaller. It seemed like this was a completely economic consideration that there's nothing necessarily impractical with the land itself other than they just want to build as big as they do.

Commissioner Baker said at the last Zoning Committee meeting he asked the applicant if he could build smaller. The response was there were many items taken into consideration and changed based on the community's feedback and that it was not just a financial matter there were other elements that they explained that went into play in being able to not with a smaller building.

Ms. Siegworth added that in a letter to the Summit Hill Association, it was discussed that if the applicant were to do a shorter building at four stories, it may not be able to achieve the positive benefits to the community and might result in residential units replacing the retail space on the ground floor, partially enclosed parking, reduced setbacks that could reduce the transition to the surrounding buildings, reduced building material quality, removal of the public plaza and outdoor seating, and reduce the number of larger units, which the Summit Hill Association wants to allow for people in the neighborhood to stay as they age and want to downsize from their Victorian houses.

Commissioner Taghioff said there are four things that are relevant for constituting practical difficulties: the sheer size of the lot, the fact that it is a corner lot and the lot slopes in grade, and the economic considerations, which can be taken into account. This lot is 240 feet long and the problem with that is the overlay district imposes a fixed lot size limit of 25,000 square feet, which would not affect most lots in the neighborhood and would not prevent a comparable T2 or T3 zoned building from covering the entire lot, aside from an atypical, oversized lot. The corner lot also creates practical difficulties, like complying with the design standards and the lot slopes from west to east down 6 feet and that changes the measurement for heights and puts certain restrictions on the site planning in terms of where the parking entrances are located.

Commissioner Reilly said he is struggling with the concept of using the zoning code itself as a justification for practical difficulty and the practical difficulty associated with the large size of the site. He said that the applicant keeps mentioning that the goals of the 2040 Comprehensive Plan require that they could construct a building that contains a mix of uses, but that is false. All four T districts state in the zoning code, a compatible mix of commercial and residential uses within buildings, but also within sites and blocks, and Grand Avenue is inherently a mixed-use corridor. He voted to deny the rezoning to T3 and said that it feels like they're squishing something in that doesn't fit and changing the rules so that it can fit.

Commissioner Hood said that this is a tough project and it's a tough area to get development. The developer has done a fantastic job engaging with Summit Hill Association and they have gained the support from them, which is not always an easy thing to do. He said he trusts the staff report and the Summit Hill Association and would support moving this forward.

Commissioner Taghioff said in reading the 2006 District 16 Neighborhood Plan, it was clear to him that there were mixed and sometimes conflicting priorities for Grand Avenue. The vision statements and the policies show there was a lot of concern for preserving local ownership and businesses, restricting formula businesses, enhancing the streetscape, ensuring active, vibrant street level uses, making sure that the street didn't look auto-centric, design guidelines, and neighborhood uses. He said that he thought that it was felt that the fixed guidelines were really about stopping big box stores along Grand Avenue and that the proposed building encapsulates everything the neighborhood said they wanted back in 2006, is in keeping with the neighborhood plan, and maintains the rhythm and historic nature of the avenue.

Chair Rangel Morales said that it looks like a great building, but he's wondering if the correct way to proceed is to redo the overlay district to determine what type of building the community wants. He is not saying that the building does not belong there, but he feels like they have jumped a few steps if the process is to be respected. He said that there are a lot of other buildings or lot sizes that meet this within the overlay district, such as the Chipotle building, the building in front of the Chipotle building, or the CVS property that are large in size that still didn't go as high and as big as this.

MOTION: Commissioner Baker moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the conditional use permit and variance subject to additional conditions. The motion carried 9-1 (Reilly) on a roll call vote.

#21-275-968 402 Front Supportive Housing CUP – Conditional use permit for supportive housing facility for up to 17 residents with modification of the required distance from other congregate living facilities (1320 ft. required, 950 ft. proposed). 402 Front Avenue, between Western Avenue North and Arundel Street. (Menaka Mohan, 651/266-6093)

Commissioner Baker reported that the applicant is proposing to construct the two-story supportive housing facility for up to 17 residents on Front Avenue. The site plan that there are six guestrooms provided living and dining areas, bathrooms, laundry facilities and a garage. Staff found that all conditions were met for the conditional use permit, except for one which states the facility shall be a minimum distance of 1,320 feet from any of the other following congregate living facilities with more than six adult residents. There were two people who spoke in favor of the application and no one spoke in opposition of the application during the public hearing. There were no letters of support and one letter in opposition of the application. The District Council recommended approval of the project. The Zoning Committee voted 6-0 to approve staff's recommendation for the conditional use permit for supportive housing facility.

MOTION: Commissioner Baker moved the Zoning Committee's recommendation to approve the conditional use permit subject to an additional condition. The motion carried unanimously on a roll call vote.

#21-277-255 1945 Rome Lot Split Appeal - Appeal of lot split approval by the planning administrator. 1945 Rome Avenue, between Howell and Wilder. (*Kady Dadlez, 651/266-6619*)

Commissioner Baker announced that this case has been laid over to the July 29, 2021 Zoning Committee meeting.

Commissioner Baker announced that this is his last Planning Commission meeting. He is transitioning off because he is moving outside of the city limits. Mr. Baker said that he appreciated the work. He loves the Zoning Committee the cases, dialogue between our colleagues and the back and forth. He has learned so much since being on the Planning Commission. He thanked everyone and said he appreciates the opportunity to have been on the Planning Commission.

IV. Comprehensive and Neighborhood Planning Committee

Commissioner Holst said that at their last meeting they had a presentation from staff about requesting an Industrial Zoning Study throughout the City of Saint Paul. Also, they selected two Vice Chairs, Commissioner Presley, and Commissioner Holst.

Chair Rangel Morales noted that based on Commissioner Grill's comments that she would be stepping down as chair and eventually either Commissioner Holst or Presley will be Chair and Vice Chair. Commissioner Holst said correct.

V. Transportation Committee

Commissioner Syed announced that their next meeting on Monday, July 26, 2021 is canceled.

VI. Communications-Nominations Committee

No report.

VII. Task Force/Liaison Reports

Commissioner DeJoy reported that the Hillcrest Community Advisory Committee did not meet in the month of July and their next scheduled meeting is August 17th.

VIII. Old Business

None.

IX. New Business

Chair Rangel Morales commented about Commissioner Baker, saying that his friendship and guidance throughout his time in the Commission has been invaluable. He has at numerous times stepped up to help better navigate the role of chair and better serve as the chair. Chair Rangel Morales is very thankful for Commissioner Baker and is going to deeply miss him and his contributions. This is a huge loss and he wishes him the best.

Chair Rangel Morales asked if anyone else would like to say any comments and he see's that a lot of people have already commented on the chat.

X. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Recorded and prepared by:
Sonja Butler, Planning Commission Secretary
Planning and Economic Development Department,
City of Saint Paul

Respectfully submitted,



Luis Pereira
Planning Director

Approved _____
(Date)

Wendy Underwood
Secretary of the Planning Commission