city of saint paul
planning commission resolution
file number
date

WHEREAS, Minnesota Farmhouse Association, file # 15-180-927, has applied for a conditional use permit for an off-campus fraternity with variances for lot coverage (35% permitted, 36% proposed), and building height (40 ft. permitted, 45 ft. proposed) under the provisions of § 65.191; § 61.503; § 61.501; § 61.601; § 61.202(b) of the Saint Paul Legislative Code, on property located at 1505 Cleveland Avenue N, Parcel Identification Number (PIN) 20.29.23.14.0070, legally described as St Anthony Park North Lots 3 And Lot 4 Blk 1; and

WHEREAS, the Zoning Committee of the Planning Commission, on December 10, 2015, held a public hearing at which all persons present were given an opportunity to be heard pursuant to said application in accordance with the requirements of §61.303 of the Saint Paul Legislative Code; and

WHEREAS, the Saint Paul Planning Commission, based on the evidence presented to its Zoning Committee at the public hearing as substantially reflected in the minutes, made the following findings of fact:

1. Minnesota Farmhouse Fraternity is seeking a conditional use permit to rebuild their fraternity building located on site. A conditional use permit is required when a building containing a conditional use is torn down and a new building is constructed. The new building replaces the outdated structure and will house the same number of residents. The building is proposed to be three stories and approximately 45 feet tall along the Cleveland Avenue facade. Residences will be located on the second and third floors and supporting facilities will be located on the first floor and basement.
2. §65.191 lists three standards that fraternity uses must satisfy:
   (a) In residential and TN1 traditional neighborhood districts, a conditional use permit is required for off-campus fraternities and sororities. The Minnesota Farmhouse Fraternity Association has applied for a conditional use permit for this off-campus fraternity.
   (b) The use must be within two hundred fifty (250) feet of the campus boundary as established in the conditional use permit for the institution it serves. In RL—R4 residential districts, the use shall be on the campus. This condition is met. The use is 66 feet from the University of Minnesota campus boundary.
   (c) If it is outside of the campus boundary, the use must be located in an existing structure designed and built as a one- or two-family dwelling or new structure that meets the height, density and setback requirements for a two-family dwelling. This condition is met subject to the following variances for height (Finding 4) and lot coverage (Finding 5).

moved by _____
seconded by _____
in favor _____
against _____

3. §61.501 lists five standards that all conditional uses must satisfy:
   (a) *The extent, location and intensity of the use will be in substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan and any applicable subarea plans which were approved by the city council.* This condition is met. The use is consistent with the following policies from the *Comprehensive Plan*:

      1.40 Promote the development of housing that provides choices for people of all ages, including singles and young couples, families, empty-nesters, and seniors.

      1.42 Promote the development of housing in mixed-use neighborhoods that supports walking and the use of public transportation.

      The use is consistent with the following policies from the *District 12 St. Anthony Park Community Plan*:

      Range of Housing Choices. *Increase the range of housing types and affordability within the District to encourage a greater diversity of households and to be an affordable community for all people throughout their life and changing lifestyle needs.*

      60. Coordinate with the St. Anthony Park Community Council to develop a proposal for an appropriate mix of housing options in identified areas for a range of housing meeting the needs of empty nesters, independent seniors, and young families. Promote life cycle housing in new residential development. This may include affordability and housing needs study.

   (b) *The use will provide adequate ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion in the public streets.* This condition is met. The fraternity will continue to use the existing access from the alley.

   (c) *The use will not be detrimental to the existing character of the development in the immediate neighborhood or endanger the public health, safety and general welfare.* This condition is met. The use is existing and thus part of the existing character of the neighborhood, consistent with this location on an arterial street across from the University of Minnesota.

   (d) *The use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of the surrounding property for uses permitted in the district.* This condition is met. This application was triggered by reinvestment to an existing use and will contribute to the improvement of the surrounding area.

   (e) *The use shall, in all other respects, conform to the applicable regulations of the district in which it is located.* This condition is met subject to the following variances for height (Finding 4) and lot coverage (Finding 5).

4. For the requested height variance §61.601 states that the Planning Commission shall have the power to grant variances from the strict enforcement of the provisions of this code upon a finding that:
   (a) *The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning code.* This finding is met. The height variance is in harmony with the purpose intent and purposes listed in §60.103, included those pertaining to aesthetics and adequate provision of light and air.

   (b) *The variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is a met as established in Finding 3(a). The height variance does not alter the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

(c) *The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties in complying with the provision; that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the provision. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.* This finding is met. Because this is an existing use that meets the conditions required for a fraternity, it would be impractical to find another location for the use that would meet all zoning requirements. The applicant is replacing and upgrading the existing program of the fraternity. Although the building meets the three story standard for the site, it exceeds the height requirement because of the taller floors. The building is designed to have 10 foot floor to ceiling heights on the second and third floors to allow for lofted beds which creates more usable space within the resident's rooms. The first floor is designed for 11 foot floor to ceiling height to be proportionate to the large communal living spaces. The higher ceiling heights allow the building to meet market expectations and help to ensure the long-term viability of the building.

(d) *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.* This finding is met. Existing topography of the site, lot coverage standards, market expectations and industry practices all contribute to the need for a height variance.

(e) *The variance will not permit any use that is not allowed in the zoning district where the affected land is located.* This finding is met. The use is allowed in the district with a conditional use permit. The proposed project meets the requirements for the conditional use permit.

(f) *The variance will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.* This finding is met. The pitched roof line will lessen the impact of the height to the immediate neighbor to the south. Other buildings on the block are 2-3 stories with pitched roofs. Immediately to the north is a water tower approximately 106 feet tall.

5. For the requested lot coverage variance, §61.601 states that the Planning Commission shall have the power to grant variances from the strict enforcement of the provisions of this code upon a finding that:

(a) *The variance is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning code.* This finding is met. The lot coverage variance is in harmony with the intent and purposes listed in §60.103, including those pertaining to aesthetics, adequate light and air, overcrowding of land, and congestion of population.

(b) *The variance is consistent with the comprehensive plan.* This finding is a met as established in Finding 3(a). The lot coverage variance does not alter the consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

(c) *The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties in complying with the provision; that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the provision. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.* This finding is met. The applicant has established that there are practical difficulties with reducing the interior space to allow for the programmed space to function. Similarly, the exterior open covered porch has been sized to its minimum dimension for functionality, to allow for circulation while being used for outdoor seating. Because of the openness of the porch it will not increase the bulk of the building.

(d) *The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner.* This finding is met. The applicant has reported that neighbors have requested that the building look as "residential" as possible. The applicant also reported that the association board members and alumni have requested that the project look like a traditional farm house with a porch wrapping the building. The proposed large open

porch is an architectural amenity that would provide visual porosity and break up the massing of the building. It is not substantially different than a patio with a structure such as a pergola or umbrellas, which would not count toward the lot coverage requirement. The landowner has established the benefits to having this semi-public transition space with views to the public right of way, such as improved public safety by having additional "eyes on the street."

(e) *The variance will not permit any use that is not allowed in the zoning district where the affected land is located.* This finding is met. The use is allowed in the district with a conditional use permit. It meets the requirements for the conditional use permit.

(f) *The variance will not alter the essential character of the surrounding area.* This finding is met. The additional lot coverage (1%) will not be obvious from Cleveland Avenue. The additional coverage is to allow a large open porch that would provide visual porosity and break up the massing of the building.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Saint Paul Planning Commission, under the authority of the City's Legislative Code, that the application of Minnesota Farmhouse Association for a conditional use permit for an off-campus fraternity with variances for lot coverage (35% permitted, 36% proposed), and building height (40 ft. permitted, 45 ft. proposed) at 1505 Cleveland Avenue N is hereby approved subject to following additional condition:

1. Final site plans approved by the Zoning Administrator for this use meeting lot coverage variance of 36% and otherwise be in substantial compliance with the plans submitted and approved as part of this application.

Sheet No. A1	Drawn by: SAF Checked: SAF Date: 8/17/15 Revisions: #1 8/20/15 #2 10/27/15 #3 11/3/15 #4 11/18/15	Scheme B-9.2 Site Plan	Carlsen Frank Architects 524 Selby Ave. Saint Paul, MN 55102 651 227-4576 www.carlsenfrank.com	FarmHouse Fraternity 1505 Cleveland Ave. Saint Paul, MN 55108 651 646-3196 www.minnesotafh.org

MacalesterGroveland
COMMUNITY COUNCIL

320 South Griggs Street
St. Paul, MN 55105
www.macgrove.org

Phone: 651-695-4000
Fax: 651-695-4004
E-mail: mgcc@macgrove.org

December 4, 2015

Mike Richardson
City Planner
Planning & Economic Development
25 W. 4th St., Suite 1300
Saint Paul, MN 55102

Dear Mike,

On November 24th, the Housing and Land Use Committee ("HLU") of the Macalester Groveland Community Council ("MGCC") held a public meeting, at which it considered the application for a Conditional Use Permit, Reference No. 042823420027, concerning the property located at 30 Fairview Ave. The applicant's representative appeared to speak to the application and to answer questions.

At the meeting, three neighbors living in the vicinity spoke in opposition to the project.

After speaking with the applicant, considering neighborhood feedback, consulting the Macalester Groveland Long Range plan, and assessing the merits of the application, the HLU unanimously passed the following resolution:

*****The Housing and Land Use Committee of the Macalester-Groveland Community Council, does NOT support granting the modifications to Conditional Use Permit, Reference No. 042823420027*****

Important to the HLU's passage of said resolution, were the following considerations:

- Two of the three conditions for a drive-thru at this property are not met by the current proposal. Specifically, a distance of 60 feet between the drive-thru and neighboring residences is required as well as a separation between the drive-thru and a public street. Neither of these requirements are met.

- The drive-thru crosses the sidewalk causing unsafe pedestrian access to the building. This is especially concerning as Fairview Ave is a designated bike route which will draw more non-motorized traffic.

- The location of the loading dock on the north side of the property will necessitate delivery trucks backing over multiple parking spaces. From this, we can infer that most deliveries will occur at night when those parking spaces are not occupied. This will cause disruption in a dominantly residential neighborhood.

- Grand Ave is characterized by more independently-owned businesses than national chain stores. Granting modifications to a CUP to accommodate a use that is out of character with the Avenue received broad opposition from community members.

If you have questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Liz Boyer
Executive Director
Macalester-Groveland Community Council

cc (via email): Councilmember Chris Tolbert, City of Saint Paul
Brian Alton, McClay-Alton

SUPPORT

Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)

From: Tom Johnson <tom@jflorist.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 6:17 PM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: CVS Grand Ave

Attn: Mike Richardson
Saint Paul City Planner,

We would like to be on the record in support of the conditional use permit for CVS in getting a drive thru.

Being in same Grand avenue location for our 80th year in business we have seen the avenue change around us. Our biggest fear is the area declining and buildings being vacant. It is hard to understand why anyone would be in opposition to this improvement of this location of a company moving into a property already commercially zoned.

When we heard CVS was coming into the neighborhood all of our staff was thrilled of the news. When someone uses the drive thru of a pharmacy many times they have a sick child or loved one coming back from the doctors office picking up a prescription. What reasonable person would want them to get the person out of the car with the sick kid in the winter.

This CVS will be a big asset to this neighborhood and add value to every homeowner and in no way diminish the character of this neighborhood. As our company goes into the 4th generation we need the city to partner with all the businesses keeping the area up and make this area desirable and convenient to live in.

I'm always proud to tell everyone we are located in Saint Paul. Lets keep the area going strong.

Best Regards,

Tom Johnson President
A. Johnson & Sons Florist
1738 Grand Ave
Saint Paul
651-695-3225

Support (w/ no Loading in N)

Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)

To: robert schestak
Subject: RE: CVS in old Whole Foods space

From: robert schestak [mailto:rschestak@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2015 9:19 AM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: CVS in old Whole Foods space

PS. Our address is 1788 Summit. We have lived here for 23 years. RS

On Wed, Dec 9, 2015 at 8:03 PM, robert schestak <rschestak@gmail.com> wrote:
Thank you for the CVS document. I want to comment that I am not opposed to the location of a drive- through, especially if it is a make or break deal. I want to emphasize that the location of the drive-through was based on the concern of noise, traffic, pollution and congestion on the NORTH side (alley side) of the building. In your document there was no mention of a loading dock/delivery space. We are opposed to this being located on the alley side of the building adjacent to our properties for the same reasons. This needs to be clarified and until then please note this objection at the December 10th hearing.
Robert J. Schestak

From: Anne Geisser [mailto:ageisser@umn.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 2:16 PM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: CVS Pharmacy permit

OK Mike...let's see if this works.

TO: Zoning Committee, Planning Commission
FROM: Anne Geisser
RE: CVS Pharmacy-Conditional Use Permit

I have read the staff report on the CVS request for a conditional use permit for drive-through service at Grand and Fairview Avenues. I concur with the decision to deny this permit submitted by PED staff and the District Council.

I am a resident on the south side of Summit Avenue and share the alley with the proposed tenant. I wish all of you could walk around the area to observe all of the traffic: pedestrian, car, and bike. In addition to the residents and visitors who shop and do business here, the area at Grand and Fairview also draws large numbers of students on foot from two colleges--Macalester and St. Thomas. This intersection is congested. Other businesses at the corner and in the area draw large numbers of people and cars.

The design of the site submitted to accommodate the drive-through is not consistent and compatible with this city neighborhood and how it operates. Drive-throughs exist in different environments because they represent different life styles than those who live, work, and recreate in this area. The design for access to the drive through involves cars crossing a sidewalk that is heavily used by pedestrians. Exiting from that site now can be dangerous. The exit to Grand is very close to the traffic light which means cars have to wait in the lot in order to get onto the street. Not to mention trying to make a left hand turn onto Grand. The plan is dangerous and not workable or neighborhood friendly. It really doesn't add anything to the neighborhood; in fact it changes it--not in a good way.

However, a major concern I have with this plan has to do with two other issues not being discussed because CVS didn't ask for any special conditional use for their changes. The most significant change involves the movement of the loading dock. To make room for installing a drive-through on the Grand Avenue side of the property, the loading dock will have to be moved to the alley side of the building. That is totally unacceptable.

Twenty years ago when Whole Foods moved in, a representative of the company met with a Summit Avenue resident to discuss moving the loading dock from the alley side of the building to the other side. The conversation dealt with the amount of noise, dirt, and disruption at all hours generated by the number of trucks making deliveries at the store for those who lived in the houses on Summit as well as the many tenants who lived in the apartments on Grand. Whole Foods said they wanted to be "good neighbors" so they relocated the loading dock and put up the fence. My assumption was that the loading dock would remain permanently on that side since it seems to work well for both sides. I could never support such a move because it creates too much of a disturbance to the area as well as changing the living environment. I can't see how this issue cannot be discussed in tandem with the issue of the drive-through since the loading dock is part of the the overall plan.

The other issue has to do with adding a second retail user. Again, approval of the conditional use permit automatically accepts a second retail use without further information about it. I assume that the second retail use would also require the use of the loading dock.

Because I believe these additional issues are very significant to this site, I ask that they be reviewed at this time because there is no other point in this process for that to happen.

Thank you for the opportunity to present my position on this important matter.

From: Anne Geisser [mailto:ageisser@umn.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 3:12 PM

To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: Re: CVS Pharmacy permit

The letter is from:

Anne F. Geisser
1770 Summit Avenue
Saint Paul, MN 55105

Mike, I did this both ways. I just typed my name and address so it can be attached to my letter. I also was able to add that information to the top of the letter. I wasn't sure which would work so I decided to do both figuring one would.

On Dec 7, 2015, at 5:22 PM, "captainahab1945@gmail.com" <captainahab1945@gmail.com> wrote:

My neighbor, Robert Schestak, recently sent you an email regarding a variance proposed for CVS's new Store at the corner of Grand and Fairview Avenues. At that time he was unaware that CVS would wish to move their loading dock to the alley. I have since told him of that plan.

I have spoken to each of our neighbors lining the alley on Summit Avenue. We are completely against any plan that would allow a loading dock in the alley between Summit and Grand. Whole Foods has been a good neighbor for decades and agreed to have the loading dock moved from the alley to the grand Avenue side before they opened their store. You may be aware that the property has been the home of at least four grocery chains. I fought for many years to have the loading dock moved. I also asked for a fence to border the alley, the removal of a curb cut on the alley, and for construction of noise abatement for their air-conditioning equipment on the roof. These were hard-won victories which we do not wish to see undone.

If CVS needs a loading dock, there is an excellent one already on Grand Avenue. We also urge the council to reject a proposed drive-through. There are already six drug stores located within two miles, only one of which has a drive-through: the Walgreens at Randolph and Snelling.

All of us wish the council will deny the variance asked for by CVS.

Sincerely,
Gary Riedl (and neighbors)
1800 Summit Ave.
651-785-5631

Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)

From: Joan <joanpasiuk@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 08, 2015 3:37 PM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: CVS Pharmacy conditional use permit

Mike,
I support the staff recommendation to deny a conditional use permit that would allow drive-through service at the proposed CVS Pharmacy at Fairview and Grand Avenues. I cite several facets of the proposed project that do not satisfy substantial compliance with the Saint Paul Comprehensive Plan.

Note: Grand Ave is designated as a mixed-use corridor in the comprehensive plan.

1.21 Balance the following objectives for Mixed-Use Corridors through the density and scale of development: accommodating growth, supporting transit use and walking, providing a range of housing types, and providing housing at densities that support transit.

1.45 Maintain and enhance retail commercial areas throughout the city by promoting standards that make them vital and attractive: • Access to a broad range of goods and services; • An anchor for surrounding residential neighborhoods; • Safety for pedestrians; and • Architectural elements that add interest at the street level.
The proposed design presents safety concerns for pedestrians.

1.47 Ensure that streets in compact commercial areas conform to the certain criteria: use of traditional urban building form, streetscape amenities, and traffic calming measures.
The proposed design does not provide streetscape amenities or traffic calming measures.

1.52 Prioritize the development of compact commercial areas accessible by pedestrians and transit users over commercial areas more readily accessed by automobile. Discourage new and expanded auto-oriented uses.
1.53 Encourage changes to the design of existing auto-oriented commercial buildings and areas with elements of traditional urban form to minimize impacts on the pedestrian realm.
The proposed design expands auto-oriented use.

I encourage denial of the permit request. Thank you for your attention to this comment as part of the review process.
Joan Pasiuk
1984 Jefferson

Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)

From: Peggy Larson <peggylarson@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, December 06, 2015 11:22 PM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: CVS Drive Through

Hello Mr. Richardson, and Planning Commission,

I am writing to let you know that I strongly oppose the drive through plans for CVS pharmacy on the corner of Fairview and Grand. this would have a very negative effect on the neighborhood, I think, causing unnecessary traffic, noise, and disturbance to a mainly residential neighborhood.

We do not like the idea of a chain of this type on that corner, and the lot is not of a size that can adequately accommodate a dive through without disturbance.

It is wrong to permit such a drive through, when the property cearly does not meet the rules, and I do not accept modifications to permit them.

sincerely,
Peggy Larson

1797 Lincoln Ave.
St. paul.

Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)

From: Anne Geisser <ageisser@umn.edu>
Sent: Monday, December 07, 2015 1:28 AM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: CVS Pharmacy permit

Good morning, Mike.

I wanted to give you an update regarding neighbors' input. I was able to contact a few of my neighbors and some will be appearing at the hearing on Thursday. However, many of them have asked for copies of the proposal which explains the request and would have a map enclosed depicting where the drive through would be constructed. I believe you indicated you would send me a link to that information, but I never received it. One of my neighbors went on line this weekend and was unable to find it. Does that mean it hasn't been posted? That seems odd since the hearing is scheduled for Thursday and the public should have access to it prior to the hearing. Hopefully, it will be available on Monday and you could forward that to me and I'll transmit that information to my neighbors since you won't have their email addresses.

Also, during our conversation, you indicated that movement of the loading dock would not be part of this hearing. However, it was a concern by everyone I spoke with. No one wants the delivery area moved back to the alley side of the building. I'm sure you'll hear comments about that at the Zoning Committee hearing. I also learned that it was one of the neighbors who met with a representative of Whole Foods twenty years ago when the market opened. The company agreed to move the loading dock to the Grand Avenue side of the building and construct the fence that is there because they "wanted to be good neighbors."

Thank you for your assistance and discussing this issue with me. I will submit an email letter to you prior to the hearing.

Anne Geisser

Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)

From: angelagust@googlemail.com
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 8:51 PM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: File #15-180-427 opposing comments

Dear Sir,

I am a homeowner at 1803 Lincoln Avenue and am emailing to voice my strong opposition to the conditional use permit for drive through service that is being requested by CVS Pharmacy at 30 Fairview Ave S, NE corner of Grand Avenue.

As a nearby homeowner of 2 yrs, I have witnessed traffic increasingly worsen in the surrounding streets and am concerned about the further increase in traffic congestion a drive-through would cause. Not only would this be a nuisance to pedestrians, but also for the homeowners and other small businesses in the area. We already have the issue of students and others who drive too fast down our neighborhood streets, and we must be concerned for safety.

We also have other pharmacies in near proximity including a small, independently owned pharmacy on the corner of Snelling and St. Clair. I did not purchase my home in Macalester-Groveland to be surrounded by bland chains and I fear a CVS will alter the character of the neighborhood.

I am also extremely concerned about the impact a CVS Pharmacy and drive-through will have on area crime rates. There is much data around pharmacy crime and given that this is one of the few remaining great family neighborhoods in St. Paul, I am strongly opposed to allowing any variances or otherwise that could increase crime in our neighborhood.

Here are some links related to the pharmacy crime issue - including one specifically related to CVS pharmacies:

http://wishtv.com/2015/09/08/cvs-employees-express-concern-over-pharmacy-robberies/

http://www.nbcnews.com/id/43536286/ns/us_news-crime_and_courts/t/epidemic-pharmacy-robberies-sweeping-us/

Please contact me if you would like any additional comments. As a very nearby resident and homeowner, I urge you to please consider the impact this will have on the neighborhood and deny the request for a conditional use

permit. There is already enough traffic and congestion in the area and we certainly do not need another pharmacy in the area, let alone a drive through.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely,
Angela Gust

Sent from my iPad

Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)

From: Ann Dyste <ann.k.dyste@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 03, 2015 8:46 PM
To: Richardson, Mike (CI-StPaul)
Subject: File #15-180-427 - Comments in opposition

Dear Sir,
I am a homeowner at 1803 Lincoln Avenue and am emailing to voice my strong opposition to the conditional use permit for drive through service that is being requested by CVS Pharmacy at 30 Fairview Ave S, NE corner of Grand Avenue.

As a nearby homeowner of 2 yrs, I have witnessed traffic increasingly worsen in the surrounding streets and am concerned about the further increase in traffic congestion a drive-through would cause. Not only would this be a nuisance to pedestrians, but also for the homeowners and other small businesses in the area. We already have the issue of students and others who drive too fast down our neighborhood streets, and we must be concerned for safety.

We also have other pharmacies in near proximity including a small, independently owned pharmacy on the corner of Snelling and St. Clair. I did not purchase my home in Macalester-Groveland to be surrounded by bland chains and I fear a CVS will alter the character of the neighborhood.

I am also extremely concerned about the impact a CVS Pharmacy and drive-through will have on area crime rates. There is much data around pharmacy crime and given that this is one of the few remaining great family neighborhoods in St. Paul, I am strongly opposed to allowing any variances or otherwise that could increase crime in our neighborhood.

Here are some links related to the pharmacy crime issue - including one specifically related to CVS pharmacies:

http://wishtv.com/2015/09/08/cvs-employees-express-concern-over-pharmacy-robberies/

http://www.nbcnews.com/id/43536286/ns/us_news-crime_and_courts/t/epidemic-pharmacy-robberies-sweeping-us/

Please contact me if you would like any additional comments. As a very nearby resident and homeowner, I urge you to please consider the impact this will have on the neighborhood and deny the request for a conditional use permit. There is already enough traffic and congestion in the area and we certainly do not need another pharmacy in the area, let alone a drive through.

Thank you for listening.

Sincerely Yours,
Ann Dyste
--
Ann Dyste
mobile 612.790.0813
ann.k.dyste@gmail.com

CVS

Details on operation per Brian Alton message 12/3/15 12:00 PM

RE: 15-180427

STORE HOURS

Anticipate that store hours would be similar to the other CVS on Grand

Store: 7AM until 10PM, 7 days per week

Pharmacy/Drive-Through:	8AM – 9PM M-F
	8AM – 6PM Sat
	10AM – 6PM Sun

SPEAKER BOX

There would not be a separate box, but there would be a microphone and small speaker at the window. The volume would not be loud, as there is potentially sensitive information communicated there.

MR

ZF# 15-180-427
CVS Pharmacy

Dear Members of the Zoning Committee,
I am the owner of the property at 30 South Fairview. I support the conditional use permit for a CVS store at the property. After Whole Foods moves out, a CVS is the best use of the property. It is not possible to put in another grocery store and there are no other viable tenants. I want to make sure the property is improved.
The drive through will be a major improvement from the eyesore that exists along Grand Avenue now. The area will be better off without having trash and garbage and truck loading right next to Grand Avenue.
Please approve the conditional use permit as requested.
Thank you.
Bob Olson