



**Variance Board Regular Meeting
City Council Chambers, 2660 Civic Center Drive
Minutes – Wednesday, November 4, 2020 – 5:30 p.m.**

Pursuant to Minn. Stat. 13.D.021, Variance Board members, City Staff, and members of the public participated in this meeting electronically due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

1. Call to Order

Chair Sparby called to order the regular meeting of the Variance Board meeting at approximately 5:30 p.m. and reviewed the role and purpose of the Variance Board.

2. Roll Call & Introductions

At the request of Chair Sparby, City Planner Thomas Paschke called the Roll.

Members Present: Chair Peter Sparby; Vice Chair Michelle Pribyl; and Member Michelle Kruzel.

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: City Planner Thomas Paschke, Community Development Director Janice Gundlach, Senior Planner Bryan Lloyd, and Community Development Department Assistant Staci Johnson.

3. Approval of Agenda

MOTION

Member Kruzel moved, seconded by Member Pribyl to approve the agenda as presented.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

4. Review of Minutes: September 2, 2020

MOTION

Member Sparby moved, seconded by Member Pribyl to approve the September 2, 2020 meeting minutes as presented.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

5. Public Hearing

Chair Sparby reviewed protocol for Public Hearings and public comment and opened the Public Hearing at approximately 5:35 p.m.

a. PLANNING FILE 20-032

Consider a variance to City Code §1006.04.C (Setbacks) to allow a proposed medical office building and parking area to encroach into a required side yard setback at 2850 Snelling Avenue.

Senior Planner Lloyd reviewed the variance request for this property, as detailed in the staff report dated November 4, 2020.

Member Pribyl indicated she noticed in the applicants letter a reference to a need for a parking variance but did not see it in the staff report. She wondered if that was needed or not.

Mr. Lloyd explained the zoning code, sets out a number of parking stalls for a minimum requirement for a property given its general land use and its floor area but also provides for ways to reduce that minimum number on a given property. That reduction can come in the form of having on-street parking available adjacent to the site. It can also come in the form of being close to transit stops that have frequent service and would reduce the need for people to drive their own vehicles to that site and it also provides the opportunity to receive information that indicates the way this property will operate is such that it does not need the required minimum number of stalls. There are ways to reduce the minimum number of stalls that are required for the site without needing a variance and is why the analysis prepared in staff's recommendation does not include that topic.

Member Pribyl noted the request for parking stalls is twelve stalls and there are sixteen shown so is it the intent of the applicant to use sixteen or is that was agreed upon with the City because it seems to be very tight and if the applicant does not need sixteen maybe it could be reduced.

Mr. Lloyd indicated discussion with the applicant about that topic could be continued. He noted staff has not formally reviewed that part of this application yet because that opportunity does exist to work out an appropriate number of stalls. It is still sort of any open question although their proposal, given the description about how the office facility will operate with the number of practitioners on site at one time and the number of office staff along with patients. It certainly seems like the applicant is well on track to having an approvable plan.

Member Kruzel asked if there has been input from the neighborhood.

Mr. Lloyd indicated he has not received any emails or phone calls about this variance proposal.

Chair Sparby wondered in this situation if staff has seen the unique circumstances as really the application of the office business park requirements to this specific lot and that being out of the applicants' control.

Mr. Lloyd indicated the combination of the substandard lot size, if the lot were bigger there would be more room to implement that heightened setback in which case it might not be a compelling application for a variance.

Chair Sparby invited the applicant and representative to comment.

Mr. Reed Robinson, architect for applicant, addressed the Commission.

Member Pribyl wondered about windows in the office spaces. She did not think this building was real close to residential homes but she noticed windows in the lobby area but not in the other spaces and did not know if that was the preliminary nature of the drawing or if there are windows facing the residential properties or not.

Mr. Robinson indicated this is preliminary drawing and since that drawing windows have been introduced in the front of the building. There are some in the back as well, coming off of offices and also in the examination rooms on the south side, which is basically the residential area. The way this doctor happens to have the exam rooms set up is there is actually a small alcove area that is used as seating to make notes, etc. and on the other side of the wall is the exam area. The area that is the doctor's private area there is a window. On the north side there are windows out of the procedure and the PT area on both floors.

Dr. Sanjeev Arora, applicant, addressed the Commission.

Chair Sparby offered an opportunity for public comment with no one coming forward.

Chair Sparby closed the public hearing at 5:51 p.m.

MOTION

Member Pribyl moved, seconded by Member Kruzel, adoption of Variance Board Resolution No. 152 (Attachment D), entitled "A Resolution Approving Variances to Roseville City Code §1006.04.C, Office/Business Park Setbacks, at 2850 Snelling Avenue."

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.

6. Adjourn

MOTION

Member Pribyl, seconded by Member Kruzel, to adjourn the meeting at 5:54 p.m.

Ayes: 3

Nays: 0

Motion carried.