

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS

Tuesday, January 7, 2014 – 7:00 p.m.
City Hall Chambers - 8150 Barbara Avenue

Chair Hark called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Paul Hark
Pat Simon
Tony Scales
Bill Klein
Armando Lissarrague
Victoria Elsmore
Dennis Wippermann

Commissioners Absent: Harold Gooch (excused)
Annette Maggi (excused)

Others Present: Tom Link, Community Development Director
Allan Hunting, City Planner
Heather Botten, Associate Planner
Tom Kaldunski, City Engineer

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the December 3, 2013 Planning Commission meeting were approved as submitted.

CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS – CASE NO. 14-01X

Reading of Notice

There was no public hearing notice.

Presentation of Request

Allan Hunting, City Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. He advised that the Planning Commission is being asked to consider whether the proposed capital improvement project is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Tom Kaldunski, City Engineer, gave a brief overview of the proposed public improvement project to reconstruct College Trail, College Heights' neighborhood streets, and Barbara Avenue. He explained that College Trail will be improved with new bituminous surface from Broderick Boulevard to Cahill Avenue. This will include the addition of some curb, gutter and trails which is consistent with the needs identified in the trail gap study. The project will also include some minor utility work on the sanitary and storm sewers in the area, as well as a ponding improvement. New bituminous will also be put down in the College Heights area.

Chair Hark asked if curb or gutter would be installed in the College Heights neighborhood.

Mr. Kaldunski replied there would be no curb and gutter in this neighborhood. The City is also proposing a partial reconstruction of the south half, and a mill and overlay on the north half, of Barbara Avenue from 80th Street to the City Hall driveway. In addition, a sidewalk will be added along the west side of the road to provide access to the VMCC.

Chair Hark noted there were some concerns from the College Heights neighborhood in regard to

the potential addition of curb and gutter; however, it sounded as if none would be added.

Mr. Kaldunski agreed, stating the City has held two informational meetings with the neighborhood and has scheduled a third meeting for January 15.

Commissioner Simon asked if the Planning Commission would now be looking at projects individually rather than all at once in the CIP packet.

Mr. Hunting stated typically projects are looked at as part of the full CIP; however, once in awhile projects are broken out individually because of timing, etc.

Opening of Public Hearing

There was no public testimony.

Chair Hark closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Commissioner Klein, second by Commissioner Elsmore, to find Capital Improvement Project 2014-09D to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Motion carried (7/0).

Mr. Hunting advised that the City Engineer will inform City Council at the public hearing that the Planning Commission made a positive recommendation.

RYAN REINI – CASE NO. 13-54V

Reading of Notice

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider the request for a variance from the front yard setback to allow a 1,700 square foot garage 20 feet from the front property line whereas 50 feet is the required setback, for the property located at 11365 Albavar Path. 6 notices were mailed.

Presentation of Request

Heather Botten, Associate Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. She advised that the applicant would like to construct a 1,700 square foot accessory building on their five acre property 30 feet from the front property line whereas 50 feet is the required setback for accessory buildings larger than 1,000 square feet. The notice that was sent to the neighborhood referenced a 20 foot setback; however, the request is actually for a 30 foot setback from the property line, which would be approximately 45 feet from the road. The property is a wooded lot with topographical challenges, as well as a large pipeline/NSP easement. Additionally, the property is pie shaped and has about double the frontage of the other lots in this neighborhood. The property would be allowed to have two accessory buildings with a maximum of 2,400 gross square feet. If the structure was a home, or an accessory building 1,000 square feet or less, the minimum setback would be 30 feet. At this time the applicant is not asking for a CUP to have pole constructed/sheet metal siding. Overall the neighborhood is heavily wooded and the closest neighboring property would be over 250 feet away. Staff believes a practical difficulty can be found to exist on this property due to the large easements and the topographical challenges limiting the buildable area. Staff recommends approval of the request with the conditions listed in Alternative A. Staff received five emails from the surrounding neighbors; all opposed to the request.

Chair Hark asked if there were building setbacks from the easement.

Ms. Botten replied there were not.

Commissioner Klein asked if the land sloped heavily towards the NSP easement.

Ms. Botten replied in the affirmative. She advised that the flattest portion of the property was in the easement; however, they are unable to utilize that space.

Commissioner Wippermann asked why the applicant could not move the structure back towards the house in order to meet the 50 foot setback.

Ms. Botten replied they could but it would likely require retaining walls and moving a lot of fill.

Commissioner Scales asked if the applicant could build two smaller structures.

Ms. Botten replied in the affirmative, stating they could total up to 2,400 gross square feet in size.

Opening of Public Hearing

Ryan and Leah Reini, 11365 Albavar Path, advised they were the homeowners.

Corey Larsen, Lester Builders, advised he was the garage contractor.

Mr. Reini displayed photos showing the septic location, easements, steep topography, and heavily treed areas of his property. He advised that the largest building they would construct would be 1,700 square feet; however, it would more likely be 1,500 square feet to minimize tree removal.

Chair Hark asked the applicants what they planned to use the building for.

Mr. Reini replied to store recreational vehicles, a workshop, etc.

Ms. Reini advised it would not be for commercial use.

Mr. Larsen advised there was no other feasible location on the lot because of steep grades, etc.

Chair Hark stated perhaps the applicants could compromise and move the proposed building towards the existing shed. He noted there were no other garage structures that close to the road in the neighborhood.

Mr. Reini stated the terrain got difficult in that area and would require retaining walls and additional fill.

Commissioner Scales stated although it would require additional tree removal and fill, in his opinion it could be moved further back.

Ms. Reini stated they would like to retain the mature trees on both sides of the driveway.

Commissioner Wippermann asked what exterior materials would be used on the building.

Mr. Reini replied it would be a metal Lester building style.

Mr. Larsen advised there was a metal-sided Morton building four houses down.

Commissioner Elsmore asked if the applicants had considered reducing the size of the building to

1,000 square feet.

Mr. Reini replied they would prefer a larger building.

Commissioner Scales stated that people often buy larger lots so they can get larger buildings.

Commissioner Lissarrague advised that he met with the applicants on their property and discussed a possible alternative.

Mr. Reini replied that the alternative discussed (building the structure behind the existing shed) would require much more work, fill and tree removal.

Ms. Reini advised they were willing to explore a compromise regarding the building size and distance from the road.

Commissioner Lissarrague advised that six neighbors were contacted and five have stated they were in opposition.

Ms. Botten advised that the five objection letters were not necessarily from the abutting neighbors.

David Gaydos, 11660 Albavar Path, stated that all the lots in the neighborhood were challenging; however, many have built accessory structures while complying with the setback requirements. He felt that having a building that size that close to the road would create a visibility and safety issue, would have a warehouse look, and would set an undesirable precedent. He noted that the Morton building referenced earlier was different from this request in that it was at least 50 feet from the property line and was barely visible from the road.

Cynthia Lawton-Abery, 11380 Albavar Path, asked if screening could be required.

Ms. Botten advised that City Code does not require screening; however, the Planning Commission could add that as a condition.

Joe Hess, 11370 Albavar Path, stated he lived directly across the street from the subject property and was opposed to the request. He advised that he purchased his property because of its rural setting and setbacks and was concerned about the precedent this request would set.

Len Sederstrom, 11450 Albavar Path, asked the Planning Commission to deny the request as it would result in a warehouse look and set an undesirable precedent. He asked for clarification of where the 50 foot setback was measured from.

Ms. Botten replied the 50 foot setback would be measured from the property line.

Mr. Gaydos noted that Ms. Reini referenced a 1,500 square foot building versus a 1,700 square foot, and asked if they needed to know the specific building size being proposed tonight.

Chair Hark replied that anything over 1,000 square feet triggered the 50 foot setback requirement.

Mr. Reini asked if a loft would be considered part of the total square footage.

Ms. Botten replied in the affirmative, stating all usable space would be factored into the gross square feet.

Ms. Lawton-Abery pointed out that the applicant stated they would use metal siding; however,

neighborhood covenants require that the siding match the house.

Chair Hark advised that the Planning Commission does not get involved with neighborhood covenants.

Commissioner Simon asked if they had a homeowners association.

Ms. Lawton-Abery replied they did not.

Commissioner Lissarrague stated to his knowledge there were a couple different associations in the neighborhood but unfortunately the covenants were very loose.

Chair Hark closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Wippermann advised that a couple different alternatives have been mentioned this evening and although the project cost would likely increase, the Planning Commission could not consider economic considerations as a factor. He stated he did not feel the request met the variance guidelines.

Commissioner Klein stated he could not support a 30 foot setback.

Commissioner Scales asked what the setback would be for a 1,000 square foot building.

Ms. Botten replied 30 feet from the property line.

Commissioner Scales asked how far apart the buildings would have to be if they built two 1,000 square foot structures.

Ms. Botten replied they would need a six foot separation if they did not have extra fire walls, etc.

Commissioner Scales believed the applicants could relocate the building to meet setbacks.

Chair Hark was concerned about the precedent this would set and believed it could change the character of the neighborhood.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Commissioner Klein, second by Commissioner Wippermann, to deny the request for a variance from the front yard setback to allow a 1,700 square foot garage 30 feet from the front property line whereas 50 feet is the required setback, for the property located at 11365 Albavar Path, due to the precedent it would set and alternative locations being available that would meet the setback requirements.

Motion carried (7/0). This item goes to the City Council on January 13, 2014.

KEH&H (Morries Mazda) – CASE NO. 13-56V

Reading of Notice

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider the request for KEH&H (Morries Mazda) to allow up to 50% of a wall surface to be comprised of metal paneling, whereas 33% is the maximum allowed, for the property located at 10 Mendota Road. 5 notices were mailed.

Presentation of Request

Allan Hunting, City Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. He advised that Morries Mazda will be moving into the old Volkswagen dealership, currently Lamettry Collision, and renovating it to match the Mazda dealership architecture. The variance consists of allowing 49% of the south facing wall of the building, which is the main entrance, to have architectural metal panels. The City's Zoning Code allows a maximum of 1/3 of a building wall to be metal panels. The Code standard was put in place to avoid lower quality building exteriors. In this case; however, the applicant is proposing architectural metal panels which would enhance the look of the building and would not decrease its value. Staff recommends approval of the request and believes in this instance the proposed request is not contrary to the intent of the code.

Chair Hark asked if the applicants were requesting that an additional 16% of the wall be comprised of metal paneling.

Mr. Hunting replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Klein asked if the proposed design complied with what Mazda was using on their existing and newly constructed dealerships.

Opening of Public Hearing

Darwin Lindahl, 4124 Quebec Avenue North, Minneapolis, advised he was the architect for the project.

Chair Hark asked if he understood the staff report and recommendations.

Mr. Lindahl replied in the affirmative. He stated that each of the auto manufacturers in the area have a distinct image; the one being proposed was Mazda's. He displayed a color illustration of the proposed building. He advised that because of the orientation of the site and the limited amount of surface on the wall, they have to exceed the 33% in order to incorporate the Mazda image.

Chair Hark asked if there were other Mazda dealerships in the Twin Cities with this image.

Mr. Lindahl replied in the affirmative, stating there was one in Minnetonka.

Commissioner Wippermann asked if they were adding onto the existing building.

Mr. Lindahl replied only a minor addition was being proposed.

Commissioner Wippermann asked why they could not alter the exterior to comply with City Code.

Mr. Lindahl replied that in order to comply with the manufacturers design requirements they had to exceed the 33%. He advised that the building was oriented to the south in order to gain visibility from the highway; however, there was limited space on that side. Had the building been oriented differently they could have complied with code requirements since the building had much more frontage along Akron.

Chair Hark closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Discussion

Chair Hark stated he had no issues with the request.

Commissioner Simon believed the practical difficulty was that the proposed exterior was a

manufacturer's requirement.

Commissioner Elsmore stated she supported the request because the intent of the code was to prevent people from covering their buildings with cheap metal siding, and that was not what was being proposed in this instance.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Commissioner Scales, second by Commissioner Lissarrague, to approve the request to allow up to 49% of a wall surface to be comprised of metal paneling, whereas 33% is the maximum allowed, for the property located at 10 Mendota Road, for the reasons stated in the report.

Motion carried (7/0). This item goes to the City Council on January 13, 2014.

ANTHONY & ANNE DEPALMA – CASE NO. 13-55V

Reading of Notice

Commissioner Simon read the public notice to consider the request for a variance from the side yard setback to allow a 1,200 square foot garage 15 feet from the side property line whereas 50 feet is the required setback, for the property located at 6860 Athena Way. 7 notices were mailed.

Presentation of Request

Heather Botten, Associate Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. She advised that the applicant is requesting a side yard setback variance to allow a 1,200 square foot accessory building to be located 15 feet from the side property line whereas 50 feet is the required setback for accessory buildings larger than 1,000 square feet. If the new structure was an addition to the home or an accessory building less than 1,000 square feet in size the side yard setback would be 10 feet. The proposed structure would not be pole construction and would be in compliance with all other ordinance requirements. The property is a wooded lot with topographical challenges and a limited buildable area. Based on the zoning of the property and the lot size they would be allowed to have one accessory building up to 1,600 square feet in size. One of the functions of setback requirements is to maintain the consistency of structure placement and the aesthetic qualities from view. The lot is wooded and is screened from the neighboring properties. The proposed structure would be over 200 feet away from the road and over 240 feet away from the closest residential structure. Staff believes a practical difficulty could be found for the 15 foot side yard setback due to the topography of the lot and the location of the well and driveway limiting the buildable area. Staff recommends approval of the request with the conditions listed in the report. Staff received three emails from the surrounding neighbors; one in support of the request and two in opposition. A phone call was also received from a neighbor who had no concerns with the request.

Chair Hark asked if staff heard from the neighbor to the east.

Ms. Botten replied they had not.

Commissioner Klein asked if the City was considering a street connection through this neighborhood at some point.

Mr. Link replied that such a discussion had taken place in the past but he was unsure of the alignment and was not aware of any recent conversations regarding a connection.

Chair Hark asked where the septic system was located on the lot.

Ms. Botten deferred to the applicant for its exact location.

Opening of Public Hearing

Anne DePalma, 6860 Athena Way, advised she was available to answer any questions.

Chair Hark asked if she understood the recommendations listed in the report.

Ms. DePalma replied in the affirmative. She pointed out the septic and drainfield locations located west of the home.

Chair Hark asked if the applicant had had any discussions with the neighbor to the east.

Ms. DePalma replied she had not.

Commissioner Wippermann asked if it would be possible to move the garage to the west and the driveway to the east of the proposed building. He stated that driveway setbacks were not as stringent.

Ms. DePalma replied it would be challenging, especially since there was an existing landlocked water reservoir in that location. Also, the driveway already required an easement over the neighboring property.

Chair Hark closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Discussion

Chair Hark stated he supported the request and felt there were practical difficulties due to the steep topography. Also, he did not think moving the building to the west would be a viable option because of the well location.

Commissioner Wippermann stated he would be voting no on the request as he felt there was an alternative location available.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Commissioner Scales, second by Chair Hark, to approve the request for a variance from the side yard setback to allow a 1,200 square foot garage 15 feet from the side property line whereas 50 feet is the required setback, for the property located at 6860 Athena Way.

Commissioner Elsmore questioned how this was different than the first request tonight in which the Commission voted for denial of the variance. She stated they were very similar with the exception of an outcry from the neighbors on the earlier request.

Chair Hark stated he felt there was a practical difficulty at this location due to the topography and well location whereas he did not find a practical difficulty with the previous request.

Commissioner Scales felt this request was completely different than the first request, with the biggest difference being that this was on the back corner of a lot in the woods where the neighbors would not see it rather than the front yard along the road.

Commissioner Klein pointed out that this was in a big hole as well.

Chair Hark stated another distinction was the fact that the proposed structure was much smaller than that of the earlier request.

Commissioner Lissarrague was concerned about approving this request because despite the topographical issues and the potential for additional cost, the building could be moved to a different location. He noted that although neighbors did not show up at the meeting tonight did not mean there would not be concerns in the future.

Commissioner Scales stated the main distinction between the two requests was that the neighbors' concern on the first request was the buildings visibility from the road. In this case, however, the building would not be visible. Also, the abutting neighbors did not have an issue with this request.

Commissioner Wippermann pointed out that staff received two letters from residents opposed to the request.

Commissioner Simon advised she would be voting no, and stated that reorienting the building in a north-south direction rather than east-west would reduce the encroachment by 10 feet.

Chair Hark asked if the well could be considered when looking at the variance criteria since it was essentially a permanent part of the land.

Mr. Hunting replied in the affirmative, stating wells are significant physical improvements that are not easily moved. He noted that the Commission is discussing completely re-routing a driveway and moving a well. That would be a significant impact to an applicant as part of a project that did not have to be looked at with the other request. Also, this is a side yard setback whereas the other request was for a front yard setback.

Commissioner Simon reiterated that the applicant could leave the garage in the proposed location but reorient it north-south and thus reduce the setback encroachment by 10 feet.

Chair Hark noted there could be required setbacks from the well.

Commissioner Elsmore thanked Mr. Hunting and fellow Commissioners for their comments, stating the distinction between the two requests was now clearer. She considered moving the driveway and the well a practical difficulty and therefore would vote in favor of the request.

Motion carried (4/3 – Lissarrague, Simon, Wippermann). This item goes to the City Council on January 13, 2014.

MARY T'KACH – CASE NO. 13-58V

Reading of Notice

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider the request for a variance to allow a solid fence within the front yard setback whereas the code requires front yard fences to provide no less than 75% clear visibility, for the property located at 1987 – 80th Street. 4 notices were mailed.

Presentation of Request

Heather Botten, Associate Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. She advised that the request is for the property located across from the VMCC. The applicant recently requested a variance for a seven foot high solid fence along the front property line; that request was denied by the City Council. The applicant is now proposing to construct two solid 42 inch high fence segments on top of a 2-3 foot berm which is setback 10 feet from the front property line. The Zoning Code requires any fence within the front yard to be no higher than 42" and to have at least 75% opacity, which essentially allows a chain link fence. The applicant has stated that the purpose

of the solid fencing would be to mitigate the lights shining into the house from the traffic along 80th Street and the Community Center, and also to reduce the noise pollution. When Dakota County widened 80th Street they obtained over 30 feet of property from the applicant. Additionally, the house was built prior to the Community Center being constructed. Ms. Botten noted there are other properties throughout the City which are located along busy county roads or across from churches, schools, businesses, etc. that could also be impacted by vehicle lights and noise. Approval of the variance could set a precedent for other solid fences in the front yard. Staff recommends denial of the request based on the reasons listed in the staff report.

Opening of Public Hearing

Mary T’Kach, 7848 Babcock Trail, advised she was available to answer any questions.

Chair Hark asked if she reviewed and understood the report.

Ms. T’Kach replied in the affirmative. She stated the noise on 80th Street has consistently gotten worse and she is trying to make the home more livable by creating a sound barrier as well as a visual barrier. She advised the fence would be landscaped on both sides which would help screen the fence from the road.

Chair Hark asked if staff was aware of any previous situations in which the practical difficulty was created when the County widened a road.

Ms. Botten replied that has been used as a basis for lot size and setback variances; however, this was the first fence variance.

Commissioner Elmore stated perhaps the berm alone would help mitigate the lights.

Ms. T’Kach replied she did not believe it would; especially due to the prevalence of taller vehicles, such as SUV’s. She noted that the Community Center parking lot is at a higher elevation than 80th Street.

Commissioner Klein asked if a chain link fence with woven slats would be allowed.

Ms. Botten stated it would likely not meet the 75% opacity rule.

Chair Hark closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Scales asked for clarification of the fence height rule.

Ms. Botten stated the fence could be over 42 inches in height had it been built 30 feet back from the property line.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Commissioner Wippermann, second by Commissioner Simon, to deny the request for a variance to allow a solid 42” fence within the front yard setback whereas the code requires front yard fences to provide no less than 75% clear visibility, for the property located at 1987 – 80th Street, for the reasons stated in the staff report.

Motion carried (7/0). This item goes to the City Council on January 27, 2014.

VINCE NONNEMACHER – CASE NO. 13-57V

Reading of Notice

Commissioner Simon read the public hearing notice to consider the request for a variance to construct a new home on a vacant lot of record that does not comply with the minimum lot size requirements, for the property located at 7929 Argenta Trail. 7 notices were mailed.

Presentation of Request

Allan Hunting, City Planner, explained the request as detailed in the report. He advised that the applicant is requesting a variance from minimum lot size to allow the construction of a single-family home on an existing lot. The lot is located on the far west side of the City, along the Eagan border, on the north side of Yankee Doodle Road. The parcel was at one time larger in size. The County purchased part of the property when the right-of-way for County Road 28 was acquired. The right-of-way ran through the middle of the parcel and the southern remnant was purchased by the County. The subject property is 3.45 acres in size and is zoned Agricultural. The Zoning Code has a provision that allows existing lots of record to be considered conforming if they contain at least 70% of the minimum lot size. In this case 70% is 3.5 acres, so the site is approximately 2,000 square feet shy. Staff believes a practical difficulty can be found since the lot size was created through right-of-way acquisition and was not the result of the landowner. Because the site lies in the Northwest Area and has redevelopment potential once sewer and water are accessible, both Engineering and Planning reviewed the request with this in mind. The County will require the driveway be at the far western point of the lot. The Engineering Department is requiring that the applicant create a stormwater basin on the west side of the lot. Staff recommends approval of the request with the conditions listed in Alternative A.

Opening of Public Hearing

Vince Nonnemacher, 1815 Valley Curve Road, Mendota Heights, advised he was available to answer any questions.

Chair Hark asked if the applicant reviewed and understood the report.

Mr. Nonnemacher replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Klein asked if the applicant was the builder or the owner, and noted that Yankee Doodle Road was a highly traveled road.

Mr. Nonnemacher replied he was the owner. He advised he was not concerned about noise, stating the elevation of the house location would work as a sound barrier.

Ryan Vetter, 3294 Rolling Hills Drive, Eagan, advised his property was to the west of the subject property and he had concerns regarding the proposed grading, aesthetics, and safety issues resulting from the required stormwater basin. He advised that when he purchased his property he was informed that the likelihood of someone moving onto the subject property was very unlikely given the City ordinance that was in effect. He noted it was a highly traveled road and that adding another driveway could be detrimental.

Chair Hark asked Mr. Vetter if he had a septic system.

Mr. Vetter replied he did not as he was connected to Eagan water and sewer.

Commissioner Elsmore asked if there were any roads between his property and the applicant's.

Mr. Vetter replied there were not.

Commissioner Lissarrague asked if Mr. Vetter wished he had purchased the subject property himself.

Mr. Vetter replied he would have liked to own it; however it was not financially feasible for him at the time. Also, he fully anticipated the property would have sat empty because of the significant restrictions and limited building locations.

Commissioner Wippermann asked what depth of water was anticipated in the proposed basin during heavy rains.

Mr. Hunting replied that typically the ponds in the Northwest Area were set up as infiltration basins which collect water during a storm and then it soaks into the ground and is dry.

Commissioner Simon asked if the area where the retention pond was proposed typically held water during the summer months.

Mr. Vetter replied it had not since he had lived there.

Commissioner Simon advised it would likely remain the same after development.

Craig Selendar, 3298 Rolling Hills Drive, was concerned about the proposed home obstructing his view, as well as the safety issue of having a driveway access on Yankee Doodle Road. He disagreed with the statement that the character of the neighborhood would not be compromised; stating the proposed home would be at one of the highest elevations in the area and would likely be highly visible. He asked the Commission to keep in mind that the ordinances put in place for a reason.

Mr. Nonnemacher advised it would be difficult to see the proposed home from Yankee Doodle Road.

Mr. Selendar stated the parcel was 2,000 square feet smaller than required, which he considered to be a significant area. He advised that most of the mature trees on the property would likely have to be removed as they were in the proposed driveway location.

Commissioner Klein asked what Mr. Selendar's lot size was.

Mr. Selendar replied .75 acres.

Chair Hark closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Lissarrague asked for clarification of possible scenarios for the property.

Mr. Hunting replied it could either have one single-family home on it or it would have to wait until the Northwest Area redeveloped into smaller lot sizes with sewer and water.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Commissioner Klein, second by Commissioner Scales, to approve the request for a variance to construct a new home on a vacant lot of record that does not comply with the minimum lot size requirements, for the property located at 7929 Argenta Trail, with the conditions listed in Alternative A.

Motion carried (7/0). This item goes to the City Council on January 27, 2014.

OTHER BUSINESS

Chair Hark asked Commissioners to advise staff of any planned vacations.

The meeting was adjourned by unanimous vote at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kim Fox
Recording Secretary