



Doc No **A04759428**

Certified, filed and/or recorded on
Jun 11, 2019 10:31 AM

Office of the County Recorder
Ramsey County, Minnesota
Tara J Bach, County Recorder
Christopher A. Samuel, County Auditor and Treasurer

Deputy 307

Pkg ID 1302020M

Document Recording Fee Abstract	\$46.00
<i>Document Total</i>	\$46.00

**EXTRACT OF MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE
VARIANCE BOARD OF THE CITY OF ROSEVILLE**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, a regular meeting of the Variance Board of the City of Roseville, County of Ramsey, Minnesota, was held on the 7th day of November 2018, at 5:30 p.m.

The following Members were present: Vice Chair Chuck Gitzen and Member Julie Kimble; and Chair James Daire and Alternate Member Peter Sparby were absent.

Variance Board Member Kimble introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

VARIANCE BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 139

A RESOLUTION APPROVING A VARIANCE TO ROSEVILLE CITY CODE §1004.08.B, RESIDENTIAL SETBACKS, AT 1276 ELDRIDGE AVENUE (PF18-029)

WHEREAS, the subject property is assigned Ramsey County Property Identification Number 15-29-23-12-0057, and is legally described as Lots 14 and 15, Block 5, Midway Hills Rearrangement of Como Garden Lots, of Ramsey County, Minnesota; and

WHEREAS, City Code §1004.08.B (Residential Setbacks) requires principal structures to be set back a minimum of 30 feet from front property lines; and

WHEREAS, Randall Neprash and Sara Barsel, owners of the property at 1276 Eldridge Avenue, requested a variance to §1004.08.B to allow a proposed home addition to encroach up to 13 feet into the required front yard setback; and

WHEREAS, City Code §1009.04 (Variances) establishes the purpose of a variance is "to permit adjustment to the zoning regulations where there are practical difficulties applying to a parcel of land or building that prevent the property from being used to the extent intended by the zoning;" and

WHEREAS, the Variance Board has made the following findings:

- a. The restricted space available as a result of the nonconforming parcel width represents a practical difficulty which the variance process is intended to relieve.
- b. The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because it represents the Comprehensive Plan's goals of residential reinvestment and accommodating the changing housing needs of the community's current and future residents through all stages of life.
- c. The proposal is generally in harmony with the purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance. Although the request represents a significant encroachment of the principal structure into the standard front yard setback, the design and location of the proposed addition is quite similar to the kind of open front porch that is encouraged by the zoning code. In this case, there is also a substantial number of mature trees, large shrubs, and perennials in and around the location of the proposed home addition; therefore, the proposed addition would not have the effect of reducing the sight lines at the adjacent intersection.

- d. The proposal puts the subject property to use in a reasonable manner because the ADA accessibility of the proposed addition is essential to the applicant's ability to continue residing in the home once she begins using a wheelchair or scooter. Additionally, if the applicant's future wheelchair use will limit her mobility to the first floor of the house, the existing basement and second story of the house would become unusable to her, so expanding this first floor area will also contribute to the applicant's ability to continue residing in the home.
- e. The existing (and potentially nonconforming) location of the house and the substandard size of the lot were established long before the applicant acquired the property, resulting in unique circumstances that were not created by the landowner.
- f. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality because, while the proposed home addition would project substantially farther forward than other homes in the neighborhood, the property would remain clearly residential in nature and a considerable portion of the proposed addition is likely to be screened by the existing landscaping.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Roseville Variance Board, to approve the requested variance to §1004.08.B of the City Code, allowing the proposed 10-foot home addition at 1276 Eldridge Avenue to encroach up to 13 feet into the required front yard setback, based on the proposed plans, the testimony offered at the public hearing, and the above findings with the following condition.

The applicant shall engage a surveyor prior to construction to verify the existing setback of the principal structure to ensure that the home addition will not stand less than 17 feet from the front property line.

The motion for the adoption of the foregoing resolution was duly seconded by Variance Board Member Gitzen and upon vote being taken thereon, the following voted in favor: Kimble and Gitzen; and none voted against;

WHEREUPON said resolution was declared duly passed and adopted.

Variance Board Resolution No. 139 – 1276 Eldridge Avenue (PF18-029)

STATE OF MINNESOTA)
) ss
COUNTY OF RAMSEY)

I, the undersigned, being the duly qualified City Manager of the City of Roseville, County of Ramsey, State of Minnesota, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the attached and foregoing extract of minutes of a regular meeting of said Roseville Variance Board held on the 7th day of November 2018.

WITNESS MY HAND officially as such Manager this 7th day of November 2018.


Patrick Trudgeon, City Manager

