



**Variance Board Meeting**  
**City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive**  
**Minutes – Wednesday, December 5, 2016 – 5:00 p.m.**

- 1    1.    **Call to Order**  
2            Chair Murphy called to order the Variance Board meeting at 5:00 p.m. and reviewed the role and  
3            purpose of the Variance Board.
- 4    2.    **Roll Call & Introductions**  
5            At the request of Chair Murphy, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.
- 6            Members Present:        Chair Robert Murphy; Member Chuck Gitzen; and Alternate Member  
7            Julie Kimble
- 8            Members Absent:        Vice Chair James Daire
- 9            Staff Present:    City Planner Thomas Paschke
- 10   3.    **Review of Minutes**  
11            Commissioners had an opportunity to review draft minutes and submit their comments and  
12            corrections to staff prior to tonight’s meeting, for incorporation of those revisions into the draft  
13            minutes.
- 14            **MOTION**  
15            **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble to approve meeting minutes of**  
16            **November 2, 2016 as presented.**
- 17            **Ayes: 3**  
18            **Nays: 0**  
19            **Motion carried.**
- 20   4.    **Public Hearings**  
21            Chair Murphy reviewed protocol for Public Hearings and public comment.
- 22            a.        **PLANNING FILE 16-031**  
23                    Request by Stan Koch & Sons Trucking for VARIANCES to Roseville City Code, Section  
24                    1006, and (Employment Districts) to allow parking and storm water management  
25                    improvements on a non-conforming motor freight terminal at 2500 County Road C
- 26                    Chair Murphy opened the Public Hearing for Planning File 16-031 at 5:04 p.m.
- 27                    City Planner Paschke reviewed the requested variances for this property, as detailed in  
28                    the staff report dated December 5, 2016. Mr. Paschke advised that the variance requests  
29                    were related to parking placement supporting the expansion of the employee-customer  
30                    parking lots toward Walnut Street; allowing the addition of semi-trailer parking/storage for  
31                    thirty-one trailers to be in front of the dock facility (building) abutting Walnut Street; and  
32                    allowing future replacement of the dock facility with additional semi-trailer storage also in  
33                    front of the office building, subject to conditions as conditioned in lines 82 – 87 of the staff  
34                    report (page 3) of today’s date; revised as part of the agenda packet materials and  
35                    revised accordingly in the VB draft resolution made a part of the meeting packet materials  
36                    as a bench handout.
- 37                    At the request of Member Kimble, Mr. Paschke addressed proposed parking  
38                    configuration (staff report, line 53) related to the dock directly south of the office building  
39                    and part of the parking remaining in front of the building, and thus the variance in order  
40                    for the applicant to be able to utilize it for that purpose. As noted by Member Kimble and  
41                    confirmed by Mr. Paschke, Condition 3 of the revised draft resolution was intended so  
42                    that the applicant would not need to return for another variance.
- 43                    At the request of Chair Murphy, Mr. Paschke reported that there were no intended  
44                    additional access points, with the intent to utilize the existing access points on site.  
45                    However, Mr. Paschke clarified that no variance would be required.
- 46                    Chair Murphy referenced line 92 of the staff report related to storage and parking and the  
47                    additional definition of “motor freight terminal” and asked what would be lost if the  
48                    definition for “semi-trailer parking” was used in its place.

**Variance Board Meeting**  
**Minutes – Wednesday, December 5, 2016**  
**Page 2**

49 Mr. Paschke advised that planning staff considered the two uses to be slightly different;  
50 with storage intended for a much longer term, while most motor freight terminals provided  
51 parking usually for less than 72 hours. Mr. Paschke stated that staff's preference was to  
52 call that difference out both ways, as city code addressed them differently, particularly in  
53 the context of the most recent text amendments. Mr. Paschke noted that the intent was to  
54 not just call it "parking," but to differentiate between storage and other parking  
55 connotations related to other sections of city code accordingly.

56 Chair Murphy stated that he was attempting to note that parking a trailer in use or  
57 intended to be used in a reasonable period of time when the next load of freight comes in  
58 as opposed to semi-trailers being stored for months or years at a time. Chair Murphy  
59 noted his concern with past progressions from a motor freight terminal use to trailer  
60 storage resulting in deteriorated trailers on site, and his interest in finding a way for that  
61 not to happen.

62 Mr. Paschke agreed, but clarified that city code doesn't distinguish it as such (e.g.  
63 storage on site versus freight on and off a site such as at the Fed Ex freight site off  
64 County Road B-2 and Terminal Road) and shorter or longer boxed trailers. Mr. Paschke  
65 stated that the whole goal is to consider their similarity but call them out differently as  
66 staff monitors these sites or responds to complaints; with staff then able to enforce the  
67 sites based on rules currently in place. While hours may vary, Mr. Paschke noted that it  
68 would still be considered "temporary" parking.

69 At the request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Paschke confirmed that the 72-hours were  
70 consistent in other areas of city code as well.

71 At the further request of Member Gitzen, Mr. Paschke addressed parking as it related to  
72 the dock facility and if and when that was removed along with the overall site. Mr.  
73 Paschke advised that the site plan includes only a small parking area in front of the  
74 building as it related to city code, allowing two rows and space to maneuver vehicles and  
75 allowing some distance between others. Mr. Paschke clarified that staff was not opposed  
76 to the applicant using that area for parking, but per their site plan, these variance  
77 requests addressed that area as well to avoid the necessity of the applicant returning in  
78 the near future for just the dock aspect of the site.

79 Addressing his concern that the requests appeared to be open-ended from his  
80 perspective, Mr. Paschke assured the Board that staff would continue to review and  
81 monitor the site as applicable permits came forward, all under staff review and required to  
82 meet city code provisions in all aspects.

83 Mr. Paschke displayed a photo of the site provided by Robert Buss with the applicant  
84 Stan Koch & Sons Trucking, providing a rendering of how the site might look after  
85 removal of the dock area.

86 Specific to the retention pond, Member Kimble asked if that was being built due to  
87 flooding on site or for another reason.

88 Mr. Paschke responded that those drainage improvements were part of the applicant's  
89 conversion of the site, currently non-paved or dirt, and additional paving will require  
90 additional storm water management on site. Mr. Paschke noted this was the applicant's  
91 preliminary engineered design to address that site drainage for required compliance with  
92 the city and watershed district in addressing that additional runoff before it leaves the site.

93 **Applicant Representative(s)**

- 94 • **Ann Steingraeber of Winthrop & Weinstein on behalf of a Roseville property**  
95 **owner, Koch Trucking**
- 96 • **Robert K. Buss, Stan Koch & Sons Trucking, Inc., 42000 Vahlberg Drive,**  
97 **Minneapolis, MN (looking to purchase 2500 County Road C)**

98 Mr. Buss showed two renderings as previously displayed by Mr. Paschke, both  
99 immediate and later as trees intended for screening mature.

100 Chair Murphy closed the public hearing at 5:19 p.m.; no one spoke for or against.

101 Member Gitzen opined that the improvements to the site, especially from Walnut Street,  
102 would provide a nice aesthetic improvement; and therefore spoke in support of granting  
103 the variance.

104 Member Kimble concurred.

105 Chair Murphy agreed, noting the screening would be a nice amenity.

106 **MOTION**

107 **Member Kimble moved, seconded by Member Gitzen to approve VB Resolution No.**  
108 **127 (Attachment D as revised) entitled, “A Resolution Approving a VARIANCES to**  
109 **Roseville City Code, (Section 1006.05.E (Parking Placement) at 2500 County Road**  
110 **C (PF16-031);” subject to comments, findings and conditions as outlined in the**  
111 **staff report dated December 5, 2016 revised as follows:**

112 **Variance subject to approval of the Conditional Use and vice versa**  
113 **(Parking Placement)**

- 114 **1. The expansion of the employee/customer parking lot east towards Walnut**  
115 **Street**
- 116 **2. The addition of a single row of semi-trailer storage / parking for up to 31 semi-**  
117 **trailers to be located directly east of the dock facility; and**
- 118 **3. The future replacement of the dock facility with additional semi-trailer storage**  
119 **/parking.**

120 **The foregoing Variances shall be subject to the following conditions:**

- 121 **1. The applicant shall work with the Planning Division on a final**  
122 **landscape/screening plan. This plan must be submitted and approved by the**  
123 **Planning Division as a component of the site improvement permit. The**  
124 **landscape/screening shall address both County Road C and Walnut Street**  
125 **views.**
- 126 **2. Any site improvements shall meet all the other requirements of the Zoning**  
127 **Code, except those that are approved via the variance process.**
- 128 **3. Approval of a Conditional use by the Roseville City Council**

129 **Ayes: 3**

130 **Nays: 0**

131 **Motion carried.**

132 Chair Murphy reviewed the appeal process and deadline.

133 **b. PLANNING FILE 16-032**

134 Request by Julie McFarlin for a VARIANCE to Roseville City Code, Section 1017  
135 (Shoreland Districts) to allow an open deck to be converted into an enclosed porch within  
136 the required shoreline setback; and to allow the resulting impervious coverage to exceed  
137 the required limit on the property at 515 Heinel Drive

138 **NOTE: This public hearing can be opened and immediately closed, as the hearing**  
139 **was noticed, but the proposed improvements were subsequently determined to be**  
140 **permitted by the pertinent zoning regulations, eliminating the perceived need for a**  
141 **variance.**

142 Chair Murphy opened and closed the Public Hearing for Planning File 16-032 at 5:21  
143 p.m.; no one spoke for or against.

**Variance Board Meeting**  
**Minutes – Wednesday, December 5, 2016**  
**Page 4**

- 144 **5. Adjournment**
- 145 **MOTION**
- 146 **Member Gitzen moved, seconded by Member Kimble to adjourn the meeting at**
- 147 **approximately 5:22 p.m.**
- 148 **Ayes: 3**
- 149 **Nays: 0**
- 150 **Motion carried.**