



**Variance Board Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, September 2, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.**

Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 13.D.021, Variance Board members, City Staff, and members of the public participated in this meeting electronically due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

1. Call to Order

Chair Sparby called to order the regular meeting of the Variance Board meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Variance Board.

2. Roll Call & Introductions

At the request of Chair Sparby, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Peter Sparby; Vice Chair Michelle Pribyl; and Member Michelle Kruzel.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, and Community Development Department Assistant Staci Johnson

3. Approval of Agenda

Senior Planner Lloyd indicated Item 5c. was deemed to be unnecessary and has been withdrawn by the applicant and can be removed from the agenda.

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kruzel to approve the agenda as amended.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes: August 5, 2020

MOTION

Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Pribyl to approve the August 5, 2020 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

5. Public Hearing

Chair Sparby reviewed protocol for Public Hearings and public comment and opened the Public Hearing at approximately 5:40 p.m.

a. PLANNING FILE 20-020

Consider a Variance to City Code §1004 (Residential Setbacks) to Allow a Garage Addition that would Encroach into the Required Front Yard Setback at 640 Eldridge Avenue.

Senior Planner Lloyd reviewed the variance request for this property, as detailed in the staff report dated September 2, 2020.

Member Pribyl indicated in the report it is noted there is a letter of support from a neighbor.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he received a phone call from a neighbor across the street indicating there was not any objection but other than that staff has not received any other comments from the public.

Member Pribyl noted in the packet there was an elevation shown with the garage and the garage had a pitched roof on it. She wondered if the applicant had considered a flat roof that might allow for more useable space which would keep it at a lower elevation in the front yard.

Mr. Lloyd suggested more of a rooftop deck type of structure. He explained as far as staff's position on the addition, this does meet City standards but is something staff could discuss with the applicant if the Variance Board would like that.

Chair Sparby asked if this will be ten feet off of Eldridge Avenue.

Mr. Lloyd explained the precise distance is not readily known because the survey has not been done yet and the homeowner has not been able to find the corner markers for both front corners. The owner did find the property corner that is less helpful. He showed the aerial photo from the packet and reviewed the property.

Chair Sparby wondered if the City would go more than ten feet for the variance because ten feet seems a reasonable amount to go to the right-of-way line but going much further than that it would appear to encroach on the right-of-way.

Mr. Lloyd explained staff would not necessarily recommend more than ten feet. The recommendation staff has made is sort of predicated on the location about ten feet from the front property line. The garage itself, at twenty feet deep is about as modest as a two-car garage can be. The draft resolution in the packet would indicate addressing the variance as potentially approving that twenty-foot depth and not directly affected by what the resulting setback is, which the City typically does. A condition could be attached to the approval that requires a new application or further consideration if the garage were to be less than ten feet from the property boundary.

Chair Sparby invited the applicant to make a presentation or answer questions.

Ms. Nicole Pierce, application, 640 Eldridge Avenue, reviewed the application with the Variance Board.

Chair Sparby offered an opportunity for public comment with no one coming forward.

Chair Sparby closed the public hearing at 5:55 p.m.

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, adoption of Variance Board Resolution No. 150 (Attachment D), entitled “A Resolution Approving Variances to Roseville City Code §1004 Residential Setbacks and §1004.05.A, Design Standards, at 640 Eldridge Avenue.”

Member Pribyl thought given the unique circumstances of this site and the fact that the garage is tucked down between retaining walls, the lack of other spaces to put a garage make this a reasonable proposal.

Member Kruzel thought what the application was trying to do makes sense.

Chair Sparby agreed and thought the applicant has been creative in trying to figure out something that works in the neighborhood. Certainly, there are difficulties that are based on that particular property and given some of the characteristics of the neighborhood he thought this will blend in well. He indicated he did support the motion.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Sparby reviewed protocol for Public Hearings and public comment and opened the Public Hearing at approximately 6:01 p.m.

b. PLANNING FILE 20-022

Consider a Variance to City Code §1004 (Residential Setbacks) to Allow a Rebuilt Detached Garage to Encroach into the Required Side Yard Setback at 2666 Matilda Street.

Senior Planner Lloyd reviewed the variance request for this property, as detailed in the staff report dated September 2, 2020.

Member Kruzel asked with the setback being what it is, is this kind of a common thing that has been done elsewhere in the City.

Mr. Lloyd explained this is not entirely unusual, but this does seem to be a more unique circumstance with the narrow lots and substandard lot area having ten thousand rather than eleven thousand square feet. The general idea of supporting modest, two stall garages is very much consistent with lots of variance approvals over

time. Many of the homes in Roseville were built when one car garages were more of the standard and over the years the household needs have changed, and the standard really is two cars. Because of the age of the community and when the properties were platted and structures built, there is not often much space where space is needed to expand a garage like this. He noted he heard from one person that was in support of this with no other comments from the surrounding homeowners.

Mr. Eric Gunderson, applicant, 2666 Matilda Street, reviewed the application with the Variance Board.

Chair Sparby offered an opportunity for public comment with no one coming forward.

Chair Sparby closed the public hearing at 6:18 p.m.

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, adoption of Variance Board Resolution No. 151 (Attachment D), entitled “A Resolution Approving a Variance to Roseville City Code §1004.01.A, Residential Setbacks, at 2666 Matilda Street.”

Member Pribyl felt this was a very reasonable proposal on a tight site with several trees. It is similar to other houses and garages in the neighborhood and seems to have little to no impact on the neighbors and it would be helpful to the residents that live there and for future residents.

Member Kruzel agreed and indicated she supported the plan that is in place.

Chair Sparby indicated he would support this as well along with the two-foot setback and it was reasonable going from a one car to a two-car garage.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

c. PLANNING FILE 20-023

Consider a Variance to City Code §1017 (Shoreland Setbacks) to Allow a Home Addition to Encroach into the Required Shoreline Setback at 3079 Sandy Hook Drive.

This item was removed from the agenda by the applicant.

6. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Kruzel, seconded by Member Pribyl, to adjourn the meeting at 6:20 p.m.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0
Motion carried.