

**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 2nd day of June 2021, at 5:30 p.m.

The following Members were present: Pribyl, Kruzal and Schaffhausen; and none were absent.

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

VARIANCE BOARD RESOLUTION NO. 156

A RESOLUTION APPROVING VARIANCES TO ROSEVILLE CITY CODE §1004.08.B, RESIDENTIAL SETBACKS, AT 284 S McCARRONS BOULEVARD (PF21-006)

WHEREAS, the subject property is assigned Ramsey County Property Identification Number 13-29-23-42-0035, and is legally described as:

Parcel 1: That part of Lot 38, Block 1, Rolling Green, except the Westerly 90 feet thereof, measured parallel to the Westerly line of said Lot 38 and also except the East 30 feet thereof.

Parcel 2: That part of Lot 38, Block 1, Rolling Green, lying between two lines both running Southwesterly parallel to the Westerly line of said Lot 38 from points on the Northeasterly line of said lot distant respectively 25 feet and 90 feet Southeasterly from the Northwesterly corner of said lot.

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, Adam and Erica Schmit, owners of the property at 284 S McCarrons Boulevard, requested a variance to §1004.08.B to allow a proposed 22-foot home addition, which would encroach as much as 21.5 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 challenge caused by the elevation contours of the property of building a garage addition that conforms to the applicable zoning standards, when coupled with the infeasibility of modifying the existing garage stalls, represents a practical difficulty which the variance process is intended to relieve.
- b. The proposal is generally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because it because it represents a standard amenity on a residential property and embodies the sort of continued investment promoted by the Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies for residential neighborhoods.

- c. The intent of the standard front yard setback requirement in the zoning ordinances is somewhat uncertain in this neighborhood given the widely varying existing setbacks and rights-of-way along this portion of S McCarrons Boulevard.
- d. The proposal makes reasonable use of the subject property because the home addition would create a modest two-stall garage that is consistent with modern dimensional standards and the corresponding living space addition above the garage does not represent further deviation from zoning standards.
- e. The deficient dimensional standards and structural constraints of the existing garage and the significant topography of the property are unique circumstances that were not created by the landowner.
- f. Although the proposal would create a large encroachment into the front yard which would be atypical of the surrounding neighborhood the garage addition is clearly residential in nature, and there is already enough variation in the real and apparent front yard setbacks in this area that the variance, if approved, would not negatively alter the character of the surrounding residential neighborhood.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Roseville Variance Board, to approve the requested variance to §1004.08.B of the City Code, based on the proposed plans for the home addition, the testimony offered at the public hearing, and the above findings.

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

WHEREUPON said resolution was declared duly passed and adopted.

