MAHTOMEDI PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA
JUNE 10, 2020
6:30 P.M.

Meeting to be held via teleconference pursuant to Minn. Stat. Sec. 13D.021

Join Zoom Meeting via Zoom teleconferencing website:
https://tinyurl.com/MahtJunePC
You will be prompted to enter the meeting password: 963926
Or
Join Meeting Via Telephone:
Dial 1-312-626-6799
Enter Meeting ID#: 989 7803 4169  Password: 963926

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13, 2020 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS
   a. CONSIDER APPROVAL – Request from Nick and Carrie Ardito for a Variance for a rear yard setback reduction for the purpose of constructing an addition to the home at 421 Elsie Inn and described as PID 29.030.21.12.0076.

5. STAFF REPORT – None Scheduled

6. UPDATE - CITY COUNCIL AND OTHER COMMISSION ACTIVITIES AND INFORMATIVE ITEMS.

7. ADJOURNMENT
To: Members of the Planning Commission
From: Scott Neilson, City Administrator
Date: June 4, 2020
Subject: PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING JUNE 10, 2020

The meeting of the Mahtomedi Planning Commission will be held on **Wednesday, June 10, 2020, 6:30 p.m. via teleconference.** Please contact me at 651-426-3344 if you will not be unable to attend this meeting. In addition to reviewing the material below, please visit the site(s) that are subject to the business items and contact staff if you have any questions or require additional information prior to the meeting.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

The agenda, as presented or modified, is in order for adoption by the Commission.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

The minutes of the May 13, 2020 regular Planning Commission meeting are enclosed on pages 2-8 for your review. These minutes, as presented or modified, are in order for adoption by the Commission.
MAHTOMEDI PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA
JUNE 10, 2020
6:30 P.M.
Meeting to be held via teleconference pursuant to Minn. Stat. Sec. 13D.021

Join Zoom Meeting via Zoom teleconferencing website:
https://tinyurl.com/MahtJunePC
You will be prompted to enter the meeting password: 963926
Or
Join Meeting Via Telephone:
Dial 1-312-626-6799
Enter Meeting ID#: 989 7803 4169  Password: 963926

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

3. APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13, 2020 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

   a. CONSIDER APPROVAL – Request from Nick and Carrie Ardito for a Variance for a rear yard setback reduction for the purpose of constructing an addition to the home at 421 Elsie Inn and described as PID 29.030.21.12.0076.

5. STAFF REPORT – None Scheduled

6. UPDATE - CITY COUNCIL AND OTHER COMMISSION ACTIVITIES AND INFORMATIVE ITEMS.

7. ADJOURNMENT
Chairperson Alex Rogosheske convened the regular Planning Commission meeting telephonically at 6:30 p.m. with the following members in attendance: Chantell Knauss, Greg Maples, Dan Soler and Susan Stewart. Also in attendance were Planner Hannah Rybak, Engineer John Sachi, and Office Assistant Luann Tembreull.

ORGANIZATIONAL BUSINESS

Following Planning Commission appointments each year, the commission acts on organizational items. The Commission elects a Chair to work with staff in preparing the monthly agenda, facilitate the Commission meetings and act as a spokesperson for the Commission at appropriate times. The Commission also elects a Vice Chair to perform the same duties in the absence of the Chair. Over the past year, Alex Rogosheske served as Chair and Dan Soler served as Vice Chair.

Commissioner Soler moved, and Commissioner Stewart seconded the motion to appoint Alex Rogosheske to serve as Chair of the Planning Commission through April 2021 and Dan Soler to serve as Vice Chair of the Planning Commission through April 2021. The motion was unanimously approved by roll call vote: Yea – Knauss, Soler, Rogosheske, Maples, Stewart. Nay – None.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Commissioner Stewart moved, and Commissioner Maples seconded the motion to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was unanimously approved by roll call vote: Yea – Knauss, Soler, Rogosheske, Maples, Stewart. Nay - None

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 8, 2020 REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Commissioner Soler moved, and Commissioner Knauss seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2020 regular Planning Commission meeting as written. The motion was unanimously approved by roll call vote: Yea – Knauss, Soler, Rogosheske, Maples, Stewart. Nay – None.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

4a. CONSIDER APPROVAL – Request from Jon Wollak on behalf of James Flink and Diane Uecker-Flink for a variance to allow for an increase in allowable accessory structure size for the purpose of constructing an addition on to the existing detached garage at 1829 Park Avenue.

Planner Rybak provided a power point presentation and said the applicant is proposing to add on to the existing garage. The addition would include additional garage space and a covered staircase / breezeway area. The existing garage is 504 square feet. The staircase that is currently used to get from street-level to the home is fully outdoors. There is a grade change of almost nine (9) feet between the street and the front door to the home.
4a. (Continued)

The applicant has requested a variance of 167 square feet from the maximum allowable accessory structure size of 750 square feet to allow the detached garage to total 917 square feet.

Planner Rybak stated the following regarding the consistency of the request:

1. That the applicant’s request to create a more functional situation for accessing their garage is reasonable. The property owners have difficulty using the existing unenclosed staircase in the winter, as ice tends to build up and they become very slippery. This creates a hazardous situation for accessing the home.

2. That the unique conditions in this case is the steep grade change between the access point of the driveway, garage and home. The staircase is the only mechanism that can be used for this property.

3. That it is reasonable to allow flexibility in this regard.

4. That granting the variance is not detrimental and it does not alter the essential character of the locality and that the variance is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the City’s Ordinance.

5. That the variance will not impair adequate light and air or result in additional congestion or harm public safety and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

The City Engineer noted that he has reviewed the application and since the applicant noted that there will be no change in the grading of the site, the erosion control will be handled as part of the building permit process.

Planner Rybak stated that based on the criteria in this report and submitted plans, staff recommends approval of the requested variance as submitted.

Chairperson Rogosheske opened the public hearing to the audience for commentary.

Applicant, James Flink stated that he has slipped and fallen on the outdoor stairs, and that is why he would like to construct a cover over the stairs. He said he is open for any questions from the commission.

Bob Anderson, 75 Rose Street stated that he recommends the approval of the request.

Steve Wolgamot, 1837 Park Avenue stated that he is in support of the request as well.

Hearing no further comments, the public hearing was closed.
4a.  (Continued)

Chair Rogosheske stated that he likes the proposed variance for the safety concerns and that the neighbors approve.

Based on the criteria in this report, staff recommends approval, as submitted, of the requested variance to allow for a 917 square foot accessory structure at 1829 Park Avenue.

Upon motion by Commissioner Maples, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, the Commission recommends the City Council approve a resolution approving a variance to allow for an increase in allowable accessory structure size for the purpose of constructing an addition on to the existing detached garage at 1829 Park Avenue as outlined in Exhibit C. The motion was approved by roll call vote: Yea – Knauss, Soler, Rogosheske, Maples, Stewart. Nay - None
CITY OF MAHTOMEDI
WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA
RESOLUTION NO. ______

RESOLUTION APPROVING VARIANCE FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE SIZE FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTION AN ADDITION TO THE DETACHED GARAGE ON THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1829 PARK AVE., PID 20.030.21.22.0024

WHEREAS, the City of Mahtomedi received a request from the Applicant, Jon Wollak on behalf of the property owners, James Flink and Diane Uecker-Flink, on March 7, 2020 for a variance from the maximum allowable accessory structure size to allow for an addition to the existing detached garage at the property located at 1829 Park Ave., PID 20.030.21.22.0024. The property is legally described as follows:


WHEREAS, the Applicant has requested a variance of 167 square feet from the maximum allowable accessory structure size for the purpose of building an addition onto the existing detached garage; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the request based on the related documents shown in the Applicants’ Application at their regular meeting on May 13, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City Council acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, reviewed and considered the reports, documents, testimony, and other materials presented; and
WHEREAS, the City Council, acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, can approve a variance if it finds that the standards for granting a variance as described in Chapter 11, Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.20, C., 1 through 8 of the Mahtomedi City Code have been met.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi approves the variance request of 167 square feet from the maximum allowable accessory structure square footage based upon the following findings of fact:

The requested variance is consistent with all the standards for granting a variance as described in Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.20, C., 1 through 8 of the Mahtomedi Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the City Council finds that the requested variance is justified for the following reasons:

1. The grade change between street level and the entry point of the home is unique to the property and presents practical difficulties that require an exception from the ordinance to allow better access to the property;

2. The purpose of the variances is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the value or income potential of the parcel of land;

3. The difficulties are presented by the parcel are not posed by the property owner;

4. Granting the requested variance would not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other land or improvements in the vicinity of the parcel;

5. The proposed variance is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Ordinance;

6. Allowing the requested variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or increase the congestion of the public street, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood; and

7. The variance is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi on May 19, 2020.

__________________________________________
Judson Marshall, Mayor

Attested:
Jerene Rogers, City Clerk
4b. CONSIDER APPROVAL – A request from Darren Taylor for a minor subdivision, conditional use permit and variances at 141 Rose Street and 165 Tamarack Street.

Planner Rybak stated that the applicant is requesting a minor subdivision to accommodate a lot line adjustment between the two subject parcels. Currently, each property contains a single-family residence. The house on each property is a century old and in need of repair/replacement.

165 Tamarack Street is very undersized, containing a lot area of less than half of the lot size that the current Zoning Ordinance requires. 141 Rose Street exceeds the minimum required lot size. Both parcels are in the R1-E zoning district and within the Shoreland District. The Applicant’s intent is to reconfigure the two properties to provide two reasonably sized lots for residential redevelopment.

The two subject parcels have a total of 18,473 Square Feet. The following adjustments to the minimum lot standards have been requested to allow the lot reconfiguration, through the minor subdivision process. They are requesting:

1. A variance of 1,900 square feet from the minimum required lot area of 10,400 square feet in the Shoreland District for proposed Parcel 1.
2. A variance of 427 square feet from the minimum required lot area of 10,400 square feet in the Shoreland District for proposed Parcel 2.
3. A variance of 22.76 feet from the minimum required lot width of 80 feet in the Shoreland District for proposed Parcel 1.
4. A variance of 16.95 feet from the minimum required lot area of 80 feet in the Shoreland District for proposed Parcel 2.
5. A conditional use permit to allow for the same reductions to standards (1-4 above), but within the R1-E District. The lot standards of 10,400 square feet in area and 80 feet in width apply to both the Shoreland and R1-E Districts.

The Applicant’s intent is to prepare the properties for new homes by reconfiguring the lot lines. A concept plan has been provided showing that reasonable homes, which meet the coverage and setback requirements of the applicable districts, could be constructed on the resulting properties. Demolition of the existing homes may likely be performed by the future purchaser of the lots, not the Applicant.

Planner Rybak noted that in reviewing the Minor Subdivision, the following is in accordance with the City Ordinance:

1. Meets the two (2) lot proposal.
2. Meets criteria for lot division in this location
3. Meets criteria for a Conditional Use Permit and Variances approval
4. Meets criteria of the proposed division by being prepared by a registered land surveyor which shows both the original lots and proposed subdivision.
4b.  (Continued)

The site plan shows concept homes, which could be built on the property. The Applicant intends to sell the lots for future development, so plans for the homes would be evaluated at the time of building permit applications. The concept home plans show that a reasonable home could be built, respecting the impervious surface coverage limit. Since there is no increase in the number of lots, staff recommends that no parkland dedication fee be required.

In reviewing the variance, criteria is met in regards to the request for reduced lot width and area, given in the context of the existing lots. As they sit today, there is one parcel that is severely undersized, but still serves the use of a single-family home. The other parcel, also containing a single-family home, is larger than what the applicable zoning districts require. The desire to create more evenly sized lots in this situation is reasonable. The use of the properties will not change; two single family homes exist, and two single-family homes are proposed.

Also met, are the unique conditions in regards to the sizes of the historically platted lots and topography of the site. The Applicant has proposed an east/west orientation in order to work with the existing grades of the properties. The variance of lot area would allow an existing lot that is uniquely tiny to come much closer to conformance with zoning district size standards. No additional home sites are being created.

The existing homes do not meet current setback requirements. Bringing two existing properties into better conformance with ordinance requirements serves the intent of the proposed variance. The resulting new homes would be scaled appropriately to the size of the lots, meet all setbacks and would not increase the density over what exists today. The use of the properties would remain the same, which is consistent with the low-density residential designation of the Comprehensive Plan.

In reviewing the Conditional Use Permit, the reconfiguration of the properties still conforms to all single-family home ordinance standards, except for the width and area of the lots which the Conditional Use Permit has been requested.

The configuration of the lots is logical in the context of the area and the proposed homes will meet setback requirements. The conditional use permit request is consistent with the objectives of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan. The Applicant’s proposal is in keeping with the City’s goal of responsible and reasonable redevelopment of aging properties within the Historic District.

The applicant has provided a tree inventory along with the application which the City Forester has reviewed along with visiting the site. It was noted that a significant number trees would need to be removed to construct the new homes, but the removal and tree replacement will be evaluated at the time of a grading or building permit. The required replacement rate for heavily wooded properties in 1:3.
Engineer Sachi stated that due to the grade changes that affect both new parcels, the preliminary grading for the entire site must be done at one time. While minor grading can be done to accommodate each individual home site, the overall site grading must be done at one time, once erosion control is in place. Along with the minor subdivision agreement, dedicated drainage easements must be outlined as part of the agreement.

Rain gardens, as shown within the application, will be required as part of the building permit for each individual lot. The existing services are not being re-used. The property owner must indicate where they would like the new services installed and the cost for these services will be assessed as part of the 2021 reconstruction of the roadways.

Planner Rybak noted that the applicant reached out to neighboring property owners and received signatures in support from Julie and Lucille Schultz of 132 Rose Street. (see Attachments A and B)

Upon a question from Commissioner Knauss, Engineer Sachi stated that drainage from both of these properties will drain out onto Tamarack Street.

SHC representative, Jennifer Haskamp stated that the recommended conditions are reasonable, but the challenge is for Mr. Taylor since he will not be the one developing the property.

Chairperson Rogosheske opened the public hearing for comment. Hearing none, the public hearing was closed.

Planner Rybak, therefore, recommends approval of the minor subdivision, variance and conditional use permit requests subject to the following conditions:

1. The existing homes must be demolished prior to the recording of the minor subdivision.
2. Tree preservation and replacement plan must be approved prior to the issuance of any grading or building permits.
3. The future homes to be constructed on the resulting parcels must meet all setback, height, building coverage, and impervious surface coverage requirements, as prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance.
4. All preliminary grading must be done in accordance with submitting grading plans and the work must be done on the entire parcel and all erosion control installed prior to commencement of the grading. Rain garden installation, in accordance with the submitted grading plan, will be required to be installed as part of the building permit for each lot.
4b. (Continued)

5. The applicant should indicate where they would desire the new sewer and water connections to be placed per Parcel 1 and these services will be assessed to Parcel 1 as part of the City’s 2021 Historic District Phase 4 East project.

6. If the applicant desires new sewer and water connections for Parcel 2, the desired location for these connections should be submitted and these services will also be assessed to Parcel 2 as part of the City’s 2021 Historic District Phase 4 East project.

7. The Applicant must enter into a minor subdivision agreement with the City.

Upon motion by Commissioner Maples, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, the Commission recommends the City Council approve a resolution as amended approving a minor subdivision, conditional use permit and variances at 141 Rose Street and 165 Tamarack Street to accommodate a lot line adjustment between the two subject parcels in order to reconstruct single-family residences as outlined in Exhibit C with the addition of #7 “The Applicant must enter into a minor Subdivision agreement with the City”. The motion was approved by roll call vote: Yea – Knauss, Soler, Rogosheske, Maples, Stewart. Nay - None
May 4, 2020

Lucille Schultz  
132 Rose Street  
Mahtomedi, MN 55115

RE: 141 Rose Street and 165 Tamarack Street

Dear Ms. Schultz,

I am contacting you on behalf of Darren Taylor, the property owner of the subject properties. We are working Darren to reconfigure the lot lines of the property which requires a minor subdivision, CUP and Variance from the City. Enclosed, please find a copy of the proposed lot line rearrangement which changes the lot orientation from east-west to north-south. The hope is that a builder or prospective homebuyer will purchase the lots, demolish the homes, and construct a new single-family home on each lot.

In normal circumstances, we would have stopped by to ask for your support, but because of our current pandemic we are unable to do that. Instead we are asking for your support which you can indicate by signing this letter or sending one of us an email. Please return your response by May 12th, if possible. If you have any questions, or would like to discuss the proposed project please do not hesitate to contact me, or Darren at the following:

Jennifer Haskamp
jhaskamp@swansonhaskamp.com
651-341-4193

Darren Taylor (Owner)
kiwidigger@gmail.com
651-335-5756

If you support our application, please indicate by signing this letter and return it using the envelope provided. Alternatively, you may submit an email to either of us indicating the same.

Thank you!

I have no objection to the proposed minor subdivision, CUP and variances at the subject properties.

Signature:  
On behalf and with permission of Lucille Schultz

Printed Name: Julie A. Schultz  
Date: 5/7/2020
May 4, 2020

Lucille Schultz
327 Juniper Street
Mahomedi, MN 55115

RE: 141 Rose Street and 165 Tamarack Street

Dear Ms. Schultz,

I am contacting you on behalf of Darren Taylor, the property owner of the subject properties. We are working Darren to reconfigure the lot lines of the property which requires a minor subdivision, CUP and Variance from the City. Enclosed, please find a copy of the proposed lot line rearrangement which changes the lot orientation from east-west to north-south. The hope is that a builder or prospective homebuyer will purchase the lots, demolish the homes, and construct a new single-family home on each lot.

In normal circumstances, we would have stopped by to ask for your support, but because of our current pandemic we are unable to do that. Instead we are asking for your support which you can indicate by signing this letter or sending one of us an email. Please return your response by May 12th, if possible. If you have any questions, or would like to discuss the proposed project please do not hesitate to contact me, or Darren at the following:

Jennifer Haskamp
jhaskamp@swansonhaskamp.com
651-341-4193

Darren Taylor (Owner)
kiwidigger@gmail.com
651-335-5756

If you support our application, please indicate by signing this letter and return it using the envelope provided. Alternatively, you may submit an email to either of us indicating the same.

Thank you!

I have no objection to the proposed minor subdivision, CUP and variances at the subject properties.

[Signature]
Lucille Schultz
Printed Name
Date 5/10/20

www.swansonhaskamp.com
CITY OF MAHTOMEDI  
WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA  
RESOLUTION NO. __________


WHEREAS, the City of Mahtomedi received a request from the Applicant, Darren Taylor, for a minor subdivision, four variances and a conditional use permit to reconfigure the property lines between the two parcels in order to reconfigure two existing lots on the properties located at 141 Rose St. & 165 Tamarack St., legally described as follows:

LOTS 16 AND 17, BLOCK 2, MAHTOMEDI HEIGHTS, WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA, ALSO ALL THAT PART OF LOT 18 IN SAID BACK LYING SOUTH AND WEST OF A LINE DRAWN PARALLEL TO AND 10 FEET NORTHEASTERLY FROM THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT, MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES TO MAHTOMEDI HEIGHTS, WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA

ALL THAT PART OF LOT 18, BLOCK 2, MAHTOMEDI HEIGHTS, LYING NORTH AND EAST OF A LINE DRAWN PARALLEL TO AND 10 FEET NORTHEASTERLY FROM THE SOUTHWESTERLY LINE OF SAID LOT, MEASURED AT RIGHT ANGLES, ALL ACCORDING TO THE PLAT OF SAID MAHTOMEDI HEIGHTS ON FILE AND OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE REGISTRAR OF DEEDS, WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA

WHEREAS, the Applicant has requested a minor subdivision, four variances and a conditional use permit to allow for a minor subdivision of the property to reconfigure the two existing residential lots for future redevelopment; and

WHEREAS, the proposed subdivision will not result in any new residential lots, therefore no park dedication fee is necessary; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the request based on the related documents shown in the Applicants’ Application at their regular meeting on May 13, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, can approve a variance if it finds that the standards for granting a variance as described in Chapter 11, Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.20, C., 1 through 8 of the Mahtomedi City Code have been met.

WHEREAS, the City Council, acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, can approve a conditional use permit if it finds that the standards for granting a conditional use permit as described in Chapter 11, Section 8.21 C.1 a through f of the Mahtomedi City Code have been met.
WHEREAS, the City Council can approve a minor subdivision if it finds that the standards for minor subdivisions as described in Chapter 11, Section 11.02, Subdivision 10, E: Minor Subdivision of the Mahtomedi City Code have been met; and

WHEREAS, the City Council acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, reviewed and considered the reports, documents, testimony, and other materials presented.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi approves the following variance requests: a 1,900 sf. lot area variance for Parcel 1; a 427 sf. lot area variance for Parcel 2; a 22.76 ft. lot width variance for Parcel 1, and a 16.95 ft. lot width variance based upon the following findings of fact:

The requested variance is consistent with all the standards for granting a variance as described in Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.20, C., 1 through 8 of the Mahtomedi Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the City Council finds that the requested variance is justified for the following reasons:

1. The configuration of the parcels, their existing size and location within the Shoreland District present practical difficulties to compliance with the ordinance;

2. The proposed use of two single family lots is reasonable for the zoning district;

3. The purpose of the variances is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the value or income potential of the parcel of land;

4. The difficulties presented by the parcels are not posed by the property owner;

5. Granting the requested variances would not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to other land or improvements in the vicinity of the parcel;

6. The proposed variances are in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Ordinance;

7. Allowing the requested variances will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or increase the congestion of the public street, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood; and

8. The variances are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi approves the Applicants' Conditional Use Permit for reductions to the lot width and area requirements of the R1-E Historic Mahtomedi District.
The requested conditional use permit is consistent with all the standards for granting a conditional use permit as described in Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.21, C., 1, a through f of the Mahtomedi Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the City Council finds that the requested conditional use permit is justified for the following reasons:

1. The proposal conforms to the District and conditional use provisions and all general regulations of this Ordinance.

2. The proposal does not involve any element or cause any conditions that may be dangerous, injurious, or noxious to any other property or persons, and complies with the performance standards in Provision D: Performance Standards herein.

3. The proposed development is sited, oriented and landscaped to produce a harmonious relationship of buildings and grounds to adjacent buildings and properties.

4. The proposed development produces a total visual impression and environment which is consistent with the environment of the District and neighborhood in which it is located.

5. The proposed development provides organized vehicular access and parking to minimize traffic congestion in the district.

6. The proposal promotes the objectives of this Ordinance and the overall Comprehensive Land Use Plan of the City.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi approves the Applicants’ minor subdivision request based on the following findings of fact:

1. All required information for a minor subdivision has been supplied.

2. Along with the variance and conditional use permit requests, the minor subdivision meets the requirements for Minor Subdivision Approval;

3. The lot to be divided is in a location where conditions are well defined;

4. The proposed division was prepared by a registered land surveyor;

5. The minor subdivision request is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan; and

6. The minor subdivision is consistent with the City’s Subdivision Regulations and Zoning Ordinance for property in the R1-E – Historic Mahtomedi Zoning District.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the applicant must meet the following conditions for variance, conditional use permit and minor subdivision approval:

1. The existing homes must be demolished prior to the recording of the minor subdivision.

2. A Tree Preservation and Replacement Plan must be approved by the City Forester prior to the removal of any trees and issuance of any grading or building permit.

3. The future homes to be constructed on the resulting parcels must meet all setback, height, building coverage, and impervious surface coverage requirements, as prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance.

4. All preliminary grading must be done in accordance with the submitted grading plan and the work must be done on the entire parcel and all erosion control installed prior to commencement of the grading. Rain garden installation, in accordance with the submitted grading plan, will be required to be installed as part of the building permit for each lot.

5. The applicant should indicate where they would desire the new sewer and water connections to be placed for Lot 1 and these services will be assessed to Parcel 1 as part of the City’s 2021 Historic District Phase 4 East project.

6. If the applicant desires new sewer and water connections for Parcel 2 then the desired location for these connections should be submitted and these services will also be assessed to Parcel 2 as part of the City’s 2021 Historic District Phase 4 East project.

Adopted by the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi on May 19, 2020.

Judson Marshall, Mayor

Attested:

Jerene Rogers, City Clerk
6. **UPDATE - CITY COUNCIL AND OTHER COMMISSION ACTIVITIES AND INFORMATIVE ITEMS.**

 Copies of the recent City Council and other City Commission minutes may be found on the City’s website.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

 There being no further discussion, Commissioner Soler moved, and Commissioner Stewart seconded the motion to adjourn the regular Planning Commission meeting at 7:45 p.m. The motion was unanimously approved by roll call vote: Yea – Knauss, Soler, Rogosheske, Maples, Stewart. Nay – None.

 Respectfully submitted by Luann Tembreull, Office Assistant.

 **APPROVED:**

 ALEX ROGOSHESKE  
 CHAIRPERSON

 **ATTESTED:**

 LUANN TEMBREULL  
 OFFICE ASSISTANT
4a. **CONSIDER APPROVAL** – A request from Nick and Carrie Ardito for a Variance for a rear yard setback reduction for the purpose of constructing an addition to the home at 421 Elsie Inn.

**ACTION TO BE CONSIDERED:** To recommend the City Council approve or deny a request from Nick and Carrie Ardito, 421 Elsie Inn, for a variance to allow for a rear yard setback reduction for the purpose of constructing an addition to their home.

**FACTS:**
- The City is in receipt of an application from Nick and Carrie Ardito for the request outlined above.
- The application has been reviewed by City staff and consultants and is in order for consideration at this time.

**BACKGROUND:**
- City Planner’s report on pages 20 - 23
- Location map on page 24
- Application on pages 25 - 28
- Draft resolution approving a variance on pages 29 + 30
CITY OF MAHTOMEDI MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Commission Members
   Scott Neilson, City Administrator

From: Hannah Rybak, City Planner
       Erin Perdu, AICP, City Planner

Date: June 4, 2020
       Planning Commission Regular Meeting for June 10, 2020

Request: Request for approval of a variance of fourteen (14) feet from the
          minimum required rear yard setback of forty (40) feet for a
          principal structure at the property located at 421 Elsie Inn PID:

GENERAL INFORMATION

Applicant/Owner: Nick & Carrie Ardito

Location: 421 Elsie Inn

Existing Land Use / Zoning: Single-Family Residential; zoned R1-D Low Density Residential

Surrounding Land Use / Zoning:
   North: Single-Family Residential; zoned: PUD & R1-D Low Density Residential
   East: Single-Family Residential; zoned R1-D Low Density Residential
   South: Single-Family Residential; zoned R1-D Low Density Residential
   West: Single-Family Residential; zoned R1-D Low Density Residential

Comprehensive Plan: The 2040 Comprehensive Plan guides this property for Low Density Residential land use.

Deadline for Agency Action:
   Application Date: 05-06-20
   60 Days: 07-05-20
   Extension Letter Mailed: N/A
   120 Days: 09-03-20

CONSIDERATIONS RELATING TO THE REQUEST

1. Overview. The Applicants are requesting a variance from the rear yard setback requirement for the purpose of constructing an addition on to their home. Their property is located on a cul-de-sac, which results in the lot being classified as a “corner lot”. Per zoning ordinance definitions, the home’s front yard is along the east property line, with the corner side yard running along the south property line. The setbacks of the existing home support this determination. The Applicants were under the impression that their south property line was
the "front," and that they would have no issues constructing an addition on to the west side of their home. Given that the west side is actually the "rear" property line, they would need variance approval to add on in that area, as the existing home meets the require rear yard setback exactly, sitting forty (40) feet from the property line.

The addition would be constructed along the east wall of the existing home. It is proposed to be fourteen (14) feet by twenty-eight (28) feet, totaling 392 square feet of additional living space.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ordinance Requirement</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard setback</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
<td>26 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North side setback</td>
<td>8 feet</td>
<td>40 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South (corner) side setback</td>
<td>30 feet</td>
<td>34 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building coverage</td>
<td>25% max</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Ordinance Authority.**

*Chapter 11, Section 11.01, Subdivision 11.4, Section C, 4 provides setback requirements for principal structures in the R1-D District.*

*Chapter 11, Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.20, Section C provides for variances from the terms of the Zoning Ordinance if the City Council finds failure to grant the variance will result in practical difficulties on the applicant.*

3. **Consistency of the Request with the Standards for Granting a Variance**

1. *Practical difficulties as opposed to mere inconvenience.*

   The 'practical difficulties' test requires that the property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner. This factor means that the landowner would like to use the property in a reasonable way, but cannot do so under the rules of the ordinance.

   The practical difficulty in this case is the existing configuration of the house within the context of the lot. The home was originally constructed right up to the minimum required setback on the east, west and south sides. It is placed almost exactly in the middle of the property. The only area where an addition could be constructed without the need for a variance would be on the north side. This is not feasible because an addition would have to connect to either the garage or a porch, which is not a reasonable location for additional living space. **Criterion met.**

2. *Conditions unique to the land.*

   The conditions upon which the applications for the variance are based are unique to the parcel of land and are not applicable, generally, to other property throughout the City.

   The unique circumstance on this property is the way that definitions of the different yards (front, rear, etc.) are applied to this cul-de-sac property. The rear yard functions more like a side yard in the context of the neighborhood. There is public open space to
the north of the property, which provides additional separation from the homes further to the north. **Criterion met.**

3. **Purpose is not solely financial.**

   The purpose of the variance is not based exclusively upon a desire to increase the value or income potential of the parcel of land.

   The purpose of the variance is to allow an addition to provide more usable space within the home. This request is not solely financial. **Criterion met.**

4. **Difficulties are posed by the Ordinance, not the property owner.**

   The difficulties are posed by imposing the yard definitions strictly on this property. The property owner had assumed that the north property line was the rear property line, as it functions as a rear yard. The existing configuration of the home also contributes to the difficulties. **Criterion met.**

5. **Granting the variance is not detrimental and it does not alter the essential character of the locality.**

   The granting of this variance would not be detrimental and would not alter the character of the locality. The total building coverage, along with the addition, would be 16.5%. This is nearly 10% under the maximum allowable building coverage in the R1-D District. The house, with the addition, is reasonably sized and matches the other homes in the area. **Criterion met.**

6. **Variance is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Ordinance.**

   The proposed variance is in keeping with the spirit and intent of the setback regulations, which is to provide adequate separation between structures. Reducing the required rear yard setback for this addition would not cause this home and the neighboring home to be situated too close to one another. Additionally, the property is bordered by open space to the north. **Criterion met.**

7. **Variance will not impair adequate light and air or result in additional congestion, fire danger or harm to public safety.**

   **Criterion met.**

8. **Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.**

   The requested variance does not alter the use of the property, for a single-family home. **Criterion met.**

4. **Engineering Considerations:**

   None.

5. **Neighbor Comments:**

   The Applicants provided documentation of support for the project from the following neighboring property owners:

   410 Elsie Inn.          411 Elsie Inn
RECOMMENDATION

Based on the fact and submitted plans, staff recommends approval of the requested variance at 421 Elsie Inn, as submitted.

POTENTIAL ACTION

1. Request Additional Information and Continue the Meeting. The Applicant appears to have provided enough information for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation to approve or deny the request. Should the Planning Commission request additional information from the Applicant, the Planning Commission should continue the meeting until a later time.

2. Approval (with or without conditions) of the Request. In the event of a decision for approval (with or without conditions), the Planning Commission may refer to Exhibit C.

3. Denial of the Request. In the event of a decision to recommend denial, the Planning Commission should clearly state its reasons for denial, and direct staff to prepare a resolution of denial.

ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit A: Location Map
Exhibit B: Application & Plans
Exhibit C: Draft Resolution – Approving Setback Variance
STREET ADDRESS OF PROPERTY: 421 Elsie Inn, Mahtomedi

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Lot 7, Block 1, Briar Creek, Wash. cty.

OWNER: Name Nick & Carrie Arditi  Address 421 Elsie Inn
Phone: Home 651-426-5624  Business 651-426-5600  FAX —

APPLICANT: (if other than owner)
Name __________________________  Address __________________________

Phone: Home ____________________  Business ____________________  FAX ____________________

TYPE OF STRUCTURE: ___ single unit  ___ double unit  ___ multiple unit
GARAGE: ___ single  ___ double  ___ addition

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDINGS, ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS (INCLUDE BUILDING PLANS):
One-story addition to west side of house, set back approx. 4 ft. from front, roof line to match existing.

PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE OVERALL PROJECT INCLUDING ITS HEIGHT AND DIMENSIONS:
14 feet across (front of house), 28 feet deep (front to back)

STATEMENT OF THE PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY/REASONS FOR THIS VARIANCE. ATTACH LETTERS, PHOTOGRAPHS OR OTHER EVIDENCE IF APPROPRIATE:

We didn't build but are 2nd owners of house situated on an irregular lot where side yard is considered our back. Logical space to add additional living space + symmetry to structure.

IF POSSIBLE, OBTAIN THE SIGNATURES OF ALL ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNERS:

All signatures via text messages due to Covid.

SUPPORT:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>GIVEN</th>
<th>NOT GIVEN</th>
<th>UNDECIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josie Tobeck</td>
<td>411 Elsie Inn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Murray</td>
<td>450 Elsie Inn</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Slagle</td>
<td>175 Wildwood Ct.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Graszaoru</td>
<td>160 Wildwood Ct.</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley De Night</td>
<td>410 Elsie Inn</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(SEE OTHER SIDE)

Lot area: 13,939.2 SF  
Exisiting building: 1,905 SF  
Proposed Addition: 341.25 SF  
New total building: 2,247 SF
As the applicant, I agree to reimburse the City for all expenses incurred by the City in employing planning, engineering, legal and other professional consultants in reviewing this application. Such costs shall be paid by me, the applicant, regardless of the outcome of the review and prior to commencing any work on the project. In addition, to the best of my knowledge, the above statements are true and correct.

Owner's Signature

Date 5/1/20

Applicant's Signature

Date 5/1/20

Fee Received: $2,250
Receipt #: 41429
PC Approve: 
PC Deny: 
CC Approve: 
CC Deny: 

October 2012
H:Forms:Variance Application Form
CITY OF MAHTOMEDI  
WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA  
RESOLUTION NO. _________

RESOLUTION APPROVING A VARIANCE TO ALLOW FOR A REDUCTION IN THE REQUIRED REAR YARD SETBACK FOR THE PURPOSE OF CONSTRUCTING AN ADDITION TO THE HOME AT THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 421 ELSIE INN, PID 29.030.21.12.0076

WHEREAS, the City of Mahtomedi received a request from the Applicant and Property Owners, Nick and Carrie Ardito, for a variance to allow for a reduction in the required rear yard setback on the property located at 421 Elsie Inn on May 6, 2020, legally described as follows:

LOT 7, BLOCK 1, BRIAR CREEK, WASHINGTON COUNTY, MINNESOTA

WHEREAS, the Applicant has requested a variance of fourteen (14) feet from the required rear yard setback of forty (40) feet within the R1-D District; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed and considered the request based on the related documents shown in the Applicants’ Application at their regular meeting on June 10, 2020; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the requested variance; and

WHEREAS, the City Council acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, reviewed and considered the reports, documents, testimony, and other materials presented; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, acting as the Board of Adjustments and Appeals, can approve a variance if it finds that the standards for granting a variance as described in Chapter 11, Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.20, C., 1 through 8 of the Mahtomedi City Code have been met.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi approves the Applicants’ variance request based on the following findings:

1. The requested variance is consistent with all the standards for granting a variance as described in Section 11.01, Subdivision 8.20, C., 1 through 8 of the Mahtomedi Zoning Ordinance. More specifically, the City Council finds that the requested variances are justified for the following reasons:

   a) The Ordinance has created a practical difficulty for the property owner
   b) There are conditions unique to the land that are not applicable to other parcels in the City
   c) Granting the variance request is not detrimental and it does not alter the essential character of the locality
   d) The variance will not impair adequate light and air or result in additional congestion, fire danger or harm to public safety

   I
Adopted by the City Council of the City of Mahtomedi on ____________, 2020.

Judson Marshall, Mayor

Attested:

Jerene Rogers, City Clerk
MEETING DATE: June 10, 2020

AGENDA ITEM 5, 6 & 7

5. STAFF REPORTS – None Scheduled

6. UPDATE – CITY COUNCIL AND OTHER COMMISSION ACTIVITIES AND INFORMATIVE ITEMS.

A copy of the recent City Council and other City Commission minutes may be found on the City’s website. If Commission members have questions regarding these or other City activities, staff will be happy to respond to them.

7. ADJOURNMENT