



**DRAFT**

**THE REGULAR MEETING FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION BOARD HELD ON JUNE 20<sup>TH</sup>, 2022,  
AT 7:00 P.M., AT THE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

\*\*\*\*\*

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 P.M., by Dan Erickson. Members present were Victoria Hallin, Eldon Johnson, Scott Moller, Jon George, and Gene Stoeckel (Princeton Twsp. Rep.) Staff present was Mary Lou DeWitt (Comm. Dev. Zoning Specialist).

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING ON MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2022**

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 16<sup>TH</sup>, 2022. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

**AGENDA ADDITIONS / DELETIONS:**

GEORGE MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO APPROVE THE AGENDA. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**A. Variance for 1701 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue North**

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Zoning Specialist Memo:

**Background:**

R.W. Properties, LLC submitted an application for a variance to allow approximately 4' feet of the west corner of the twin home garage to be built in the front yard 30' foot platted setback. The property site is located at 1701 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue North and zoned R-2, Residential District.

**Analysis:**

The development of Northfield Commons was platted for twin homes in 2003. At the time, the front yard setback was 30' feet. Since then, the R-2, Zoning District Ordinance has been amended where the front yard setback is 20' feet for twin homes. With this being said, the 30' foot plat setback will be observed in distinction of the placement of utilities. There is a storm main located on the south portion of the lot and runs to the catch basin on 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue North. The variance request will not make the building site any closer to the storm main. This variance is for only the one side of the twin home set where the angle of the lot makes it impossible to build the same design of twin home for this development.

After this set of twin homes, there is one pair left to be built and the development will be complete. The remaining twin home set will not have an issue with meeting the setbacks.

**Variance Review Standards:**

According to Section 2 of Chapter IV of the Zoning Ordinance, requests may be made for variance from the literal provisions of the Zoning Ordinance in instances when the applicant for the variance establishes that there are practical difficulties in complying with the Zoning

*Ordinance. A variance shall not be granted by the Planning Commission unless it conforms to the following standards:*

*1. Is the variance in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance?*

**Comment:** One of the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance is to establish regulations to promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the residents of Princeton, which is accomplished through regulating the location of structures. The proposed twin home garage west corner will only be 3.63 sq. ft. in the 30' foot setback.

*2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?*

**Comment:** This is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan as residential improvement of neighborhoods and encouragement of residential growth.

*3. Does the property owner propose to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the Zoning Ordinance?*

**Comment:** The focus of this review is whether the request of building a new twin home where the west corner of the attached garage is 3.63 sq. ft. in the 30' foot setback. Staff believes placing the proposed home closer to the front yard setback is reasonable.

*4. Are there circumstances unique to this property not created by the landowner?*

**Comment:** The lot layout along with the bend in the road make it difficult to not intrude in the 30' foot setback. Also, this twin home development is in an homeowners association so reducing the garage size would make it difficult for storage and storage sheds are not allowed.

*5. Will the issuance of the variance maintain the essential character of the locality?*

**Comment:** The issuance of the variance will maintain the essential character of the locality. This is a twin home development that has the same standard design throughout.

*6. Does the alleged practical difficulty involve more than economic consideration?*

**Comment:** Yes, the alleged practical difficulty involves more than economic considerations because of the layout of the lot makes it difficult to build the same twin home design in this development.

**Conclusion / Recommendation:**

Based on the findings that the variance meets the listed Variance Review Standards, staff would recommend approval of the Variance to allow approximately 4' feet of the west corner of the twin home garage to be built in the front yard 30' foot platted setback, subject to the following conditions:

1. A Building Permit and Water & Sewer Permit shall be obtained prior to construction.
2. Sodding or seeding along with driveway completion must be completed prior to issuing a Certificate of Occupancy. If unadvisable, a temporary Certificate of Occupancy may be issued subject to an escrow deposit to assure compliance by no later than July 1<sup>st</sup> of the following year.

\*\*\*\*\*End of Staff Memo\*\*\*\*\*



**DRAFT**

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY JOHNSON, TO OPEN THE PUBIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

There was no one other than the applicant for the public hearing.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY MOLLER, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC HEARING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

JOHNSON MOVED, SECOND BY HALLIN, TO APPROVE THE VARIANCE TO ALLOW APPROXIMATELY 4' FEET OF THE GARAGE CORNER TO BE BUILT IN THE FRONT YARD 30' FOOT PLATTED SETBACK IN THE R-2, RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, AT THE PROPERTY SITE LOCATED AT 1701 8<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE NORTH, PID #24-610-0110, LEGAL DESCRIPTION LOT 11, BLOCK 1, NORTHFIELD COMMONS. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED.

The Planning Commission Board reviewed the Findings of Fact:

1. Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the Ordinance? Yes.
2. Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes.
3. Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes.
4. Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes. Lot layout with bend in the road.

**OLD BUSINESS:** None

**NEW BUSINESS:** None

**COMMUNICATION AND REPORTS:** None

HALLIN MOVED, SECOND BY GEORGE, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING. UPON THE VOTE, THERE WERE 5 AYES, 0 NAYS. MOTION CARRIED. THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:14 P.M.

ATTEST:

---

Dan Erickson, Chair

---

Mary Lou DeWitt, Comm. Dev. Zoning Specialist