



**Variance Board Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, June 6, 2018 – 5:30 p.m.**

1. Call to Order

Chair Daire 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 Daire, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair James Daire; Vice Chair Chuck Gitzen; and Member Julie Kimble and Alternate Member Peter Sparby

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke and Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd

3. Approval of Agenda

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Organizational Business

a. Elect Variance Board Chair and Vice-Chair

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble, to appoint James Daire as Chair.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Chair Daire, to appoint Chuck Gitzen as Vice Chair.

Ayes: 3
Nays: 0
Motion carried.

5. Review of Minutes: April 4, 2018

Member Kimble indicated she will abstain, as she was absent from the April meeting.

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Chair Daire to approve the April 4, 2018 meeting minutes.

Ayes: 2 (Daire, Gitzen)
Nays: 0
Abstentions: 1 (Kimble)
Motion carried.

6. Public Hearing

Chair Daire reviewed protocol for Public Hearings and public comment and opened the Public Hearing at approximately 5:35 p.m.

a. PLANNING FILE 18-007

Request by Tom and Mary Steiner for a variance to City Code § 1004.08(B) “Dimensional Standards” for Low Density Residential (One-Family) District (LDR-1), to permit a new detached garage within the required side yard setback. Senior Planner Lloyd reviewed the variance request for this property, as detailed in the staff report dated June 6, 2018. He noted the property address is 1401 Roselawn Avenue. The request is for a variance is to the minimum side yard setback requirement for rebuilding an existing detached garage. The standard size of garage door was about 6 feet for an overhead door. That falls short of the 7-foot standard of garage doors today. Rebuilding this garage in this footprint would necessitate a larger garage. That additional height would remove it from the legal non-conformity protections in existence. In addition to the greater height, the applicant wants to make it a few feet wider and a foot longer. The result would be a 24-foot x 41-foot garage, which keeps it at the maximum size of garage, of approximately 1,000 square feet. The staff report has provided some suggested findings that the staff has been able to make regarding the proposed variance. Staff is recommending approval. Because there was uncertainty about the distance between existing garage and the actual boundary, it is recommended the garage be built at least one foot from the boundary. The variances have typically been limited to at least one foot from the property boundaries. The City has not approved variances for less than that. If it turns out that the garage is already farther than one foot from the boundary, whatever the current distance is would be the minimum setback.

Member Gitzen noted that the diagram shows 41 feet but the narrative shows 42 feet.

Senior Planner Lloyd responded that the site plan and narrative were prepared with the original application, and since then staff had been in communication with the

applicant about the maximum size limit and the proposal was revised. That is noted in red, but there was not enough room to say that in the narrative.

Member Gitzen asked about the house footprint.

Senior Planner Lloyd indicated he does not know the answer to that. He does not recall if the house itself was small enough. If the smaller figure happens to be 85% of the house footprint, then that 85% of the house foot print would be the limiting factor. That may have been a factor here.

Chair Daire asked if the 85% of the house square footage has been determined.

Senior Planner Lloyd responded he is not sure.

Tom Steiner, the applicant, thanked Mr. Lloyd for his work. He also noted that he initially put in 43 feet x 24 feet, and it was brought up to his attention that it had to be 1,008 square foot. So, the last discussion was a 42 feet x 24 feet. The house footprint is 1,380 square foot, and 1,008 is less than 85% of that. In terms of the property line, he has found the property line by locating the stakes with a metal detector. There are a lot of trees, which makes is difficult. He found the back and the front stakes. The garage seems to be 20 inches to 24 inches off the property line. It is at least 18 inches but his best guess is 2 feet. He noted the design will be similar. He has discussed the garage with the neighbor, and he is fine with it.

Member Gitzen suggested a 2-foot setback, and it sounds like it would not be a major impediment to building the garage.

Chair Daire asked if the existing slab/foundation is reusable.

Mr. Steiner stated the slab is cracked and is 60+ years old. He plans to rip it down entirely.

Chair Daire asked whether the 41 feet minus the wall thickness is going to permit parking nose-to-tail.

Mr. Steiner indicated he would like the extra foot or two so it is easier to squeeze two cars in there right now, though he does park two cars in there now.

Chair Daire closed the public hearing at approximately 5:53 p.m.

Member Gitzen stated he would like the additional area to get around the garage, and it sounds like that is the plan.

Chair Daire summarized the garage length is 42 feet and a width of 24 feet.

MOTION

Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Gitzen, adoption of

Variance Board Resolution No. ____ (Attachment D), entitled “A Resolution Approving a Variance to Roseville City Code §1004.08.B, Residential Setbacks, at 1401 Roselawn Avenue (PF18-007).”

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

Chair Daire noted there are 10 business days in which someone can appeal the variance, which would be Monday, June 18th.

b. PLANNING FILE 18-009

Request by William Defiel for a variance to City Code § 1004.08(B), “Dimensional Standards” for Low Density Residential (One-Family) District (LDR-1), to permit building a home addition within the required side yard setback.

Senior Planner Lloyd indicated this proposal is for 326 South McCarrons Blvd and is seeking a variance to the side yard setback requirement to accommodate extensive renovations and additions to the existing home. This would add a second story to part of the structure, which is already less than the 5-foot setback from the western side of the boundary and also to add a second-story balcony on the front, which also in part extends into the 5-foot setback area. This is a situation where the property itself is quite a bit smaller than the subdivision code says it ought to be, but the parcel was platted in 1939 and the house was built in 1903. The existing size of the lot is a legal, non-conforming condition. The existing legal non-conforming status of the home would allow it to be rebuilt in its current configuration and expanded in ways that do not increase the non-conformity in that area. Because of the greater height of the structure and the addition of the second-story balcony, these are going outside of the legal non-conformity protection and trigger the variance application. He also noted that the proposal will increase the impervious surface of the property to above the 25% threshold, at which there is a requirement through public works and engineering office to mitigate the storm water from that extra hard surface. That is an administrative process that is not part of the variance request. He continued that staff does recommend approval of the requested variance.

Member Kimble asked about comments from neighbors.

Senior Planner Lloyd indicated he has not heard anything from neighbors.

Chair Daire invited the applicant forward.

William Defiel, 326 S McCarrons Boulevard, indicated he and his wife bought the house a couple years ago and have been trying to clean up the house. They like the area and are thinking of expanding in order to put down roots for the long haul.

Chair Daire asked about the professional nature of the application.

Mr. Defiel indicated he has been thinking about this for a while. He has a couple good high school friends who are architects, and they have been handling the design process. He displayed a photo of the current house and described the new plans.

Member Kimble asked about the neighbor on the west.

Mr. Defiel indicated his neighbor is supportive of the plans. He noted that he has worked with the neighbor have been working together on an easement vacation for the back of the property towards the park.

Member Gitzen asked the easement vacation.

Mr. Defiel responded it is split somewhat evenly, if he understands the plan correctly.

Chair Daire noted the plan is to leave the storage building.

Mr. Defiel responded that depends on the vacation easement and where the property line intersects. That is the next City project variance.

Chair Daire indicated he spent some time sitting at the house, studying the character of the house. He noted that the new decks on the first and second floor on the lake side are in character with what is on both sides. The view is to the lake. He is in favor of the variance request.

Chair Daire closed the public hearing at approximately 6:09 p.m.

MOTION

Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble, adoption of Variance Board Resolution No. ____ (Attachment D), entitled “A Resolution Approving a Variance to Roseville City Code §1004.08.B, Residential Setbacks, at 326 South McCarrons Boulevard (PF18-009).”

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

7. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Gitzen, seconded by Member Kimble, to adjourn the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.