
DATE: June 10, 2017
TO: Glenwood City Commission
FROM: Mark Sprague and Ben Oleson, Hometown Planning
RE: Planning Commission Recommendations for June Public Hearing Applications

The Planning Commission held their regular meeting on June 5, 2017. They reviewed two separate applications and are providing you with their recommendations as noted in the report below.

Attachments, drawings and photos related to the application are attached for your reference.

PUBLIC HEARING #1

Application: Variance request to allow a decrease in setback from the south and east property lines.

Applicant: Keith and Jill Volkmann

Background Information:

- Location:**
 - o 227 1st Ave NE
 - o Lot 5, Block 11, Glenwood City Original Plat
 - o Parcel number(s): 21-0076-000
- Zoning:** R2 – Urban Residential

Planning Commission Recommendation: The Planning Commission has unanimously recommended approval of the requested variance.

City Commission Action: The City Commission may approve the request, deny the request(s), or table the request(s) if it should need additional information from the applicant. If the Commission should approve or deny the request, the Commission should state the findings which support either of these actions.

Findings of Fact: Staff would recommend the following findings of fact consistent with the discussion at the Planning Commission meeting and their recommendation for approval:

1. Will the granting of the variance be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning and/or Subdivision Ordinance?

The City's subdivision ordinance does not apply to this application.

The general purposes and intent of the front yard setback is to allow for adequate space between buildings and the traveled road surface and right-of-way to protect property during installation or maintenance of utilities in the right of way and to prevent damage to property or persons from vehicles running off the road. The proposed house/garage addition would be located closer than is allowed by ordinance, but consistent with the existing setbacks of those buildings. The roadway receives medium traffic and vehicle speeds are not such that damage would be likely to occur if a vehicle went off the road.

In addition, the Applicants' intent is to align the house with existing neighboring houses to the west and houses to the north. There would also be no second story, and it will be a handicap accessible dwelling.

2. Is the proposed use of the property reasonable?

The requested variance is reasonable in that it is not unusual for a residential property to have direct access from residence to garage, in most cases achieved by having an attached garage.

3. Is the plight of the landowner due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner?

The need for the variance would appear to primarily be related to the size of the lots in the Glenwood City Original Plat, and the need for more horizontal space to make the home handicap accessible.

4. Will the variance, if granted, alter the essential character of the locality?

The use of the property would remain residential and very similar in character to adjacent properties. The use of the property would remain residential and very similar in character to adjacent properties. The proposed structure will not have a second story or basement.

5. Are economic considerations the only reason the applicant cannot meet the strict requirements of the ordinance?

Economic considerations do not appear to play a significant factor in the requested variance. The request is due primarily to the small lot size.

PUBLIC HEARING #2

Application: Variance request to decrease the setback to 20 feet from the north property line. Lot coverage will be well below the maximum.

Applicant: Daniel and Doris Higgins

Background Information:

Location:

- 393 North Lakeshore Drive
- Part of Lot 10 and Part of Lot 12 South of CSAH 54 as recorded on Document #243793
- Parcel number(s): 21-0880-000

Zoning: R-1 (Suburban Residential)

Planning Commission Recommendation: The Planning Commission has unanimously recommended approval of the requested variance.

City Commission Action: The City Commission may approve the request, deny the request(s), or table the request(s) if it should need additional information from the applicant. If the Commission should approve or deny the request, the Commission should state the findings which support either of these actions.

Findings of Fact: Staff would recommend the following findings of fact consistent with the discussion at the Planning Commission meeting and their recommendation for approval:

1. Will the granting of the variance be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning and/or Subdivision Ordinance?

The City's subdivision ordinance does not apply to this application.

The general purposes and intent of the limit on impervious coverage is to allow for infiltration of rainwater, prevent pollution of public waters, and prevent flooding or other problems related to surface water runoff. The applicant would be increasing the impervious surface from 37 to 38%, but the proposed addition would still allow for adequate space to manage stormwater in the yard.

2. Is the proposed use of the property reasonable?

The requested variance is reasonable in that it is not unusual for a residential property to have house with an attached garage, and many of the other properties in the area have one. Also, the size of the structure with the proposed additions is in character with other dwellings in the vicinity.

3. Is the plight of the landowner due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner?

The need for the variance would appear to primarily be related to the location of the legal non-conforming existing house that is being added onto. The house is approximately 26 ft. from the edge of the right-of-way, within the 50 ft. setback.

4. Will the variance, if granted, alter the essential character of the locality?

The use of the property would remain residential and very similar in character to adjacent properties.

5. Are economic considerations the only reason the applicant cannot meet the strict requirements of the ordinance?

Economic considerations do not appear to play a significant factor in the requested variance. The request is due primarily to the location of the existing home being added onto.

If you have questions or concerns on the items in this report or any other issues, please do not hesitate to contact us. You can reach us by email at marksprague@hometownplanning.com or oleson@hometownplanning.com or by phone at 320-759-1560.

Sincerely,
HOMETOWN PLANNING

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Sprague', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Mark Sprague

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ben Oleson', with a large, stylized initial 'B' and 'O'.

Ben Oleson