



**DRAFT**

Approved:

---

**CITY OF ARDEN HILLS, MINNESOTA  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 8, 2022  
6:30 P.M. - ARDEN HILLS CITY HALL**

---

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Pursuant to due call and notice thereof, Chair Paul Vijums called to order the regular Planning Commission meeting at 6:30 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

Present were: Chair Paul Vijums, Commissioners Shelley Blilie, Joshua Collins, Arlene Mitchell, Kurt Weber, and Jonathan Wicklund.

Absent: Commissioners Marcie Jefferys, Steven Jones and Clayton Zimmerman.

Also present were: City Planner Jessica Jagoe and Councilmember Fran Holmes.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA – JUNE 8, 2022**

**Commissioner Mitchell moved, seconded by Commissioner Wicklund, to approve the June 8, 2022, agenda as presented. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*May 4, 2022 – Planning Commission Regular Meeting*

**Commissioner Wicklund moved, seconded by Commissioner Weber, to approve the May 4, 2022, Planning Commission Regular Meeting as presented. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).**

**PLANNING CASES**

- A. **Planning Case 22-008; 4073 Valentine Court - Variance – Public Hearing Not Required**

**City Planner Jagoe** stated Robert Kunze (“Applicant”) has requested a variance to construct a garage addition on the property located at 4073 Valentine Court (“Subject Property”). The Applicant has requested a variance to decrease the required side yard setback from 40 feet to 7.82 feet from the northwest side yard property line.

**City Planner Jagoe** reviewed the surrounding area, Site Data, and the Plan Evaluation. It was noted the Planning Commission must make a finding as to whether or not the proposed application would adversely affect the surrounding neighborhood or the community as a whole based on the aforementioned factors. The Planning Commission members should state their rationale prior to the vote on the requested variance. A recommended motion by the Planning Commission should include the direction that Staff and the City Attorney prepare proposed findings of fact for City Council consideration.

**City Planner Jagoe** reviewed the options available to the Planning Commission on this matter:

1. Recommend Approval with Conditions
2. Recommend Approval as Submitted
3. Recommend Denial
4. Table

**Chair Vijums** opened the floor to Commissioner comments.

**Commissioner Mitchell** explained she was struggling with this request. She noted she was uncomfortable with how small the setback would become. However, after visiting the site, she understood this was a narrow corner lot and she would be offering her support for the variance request.

**Commissioner Weber** indicated this was the second time this applicant has requested a variance from the Commission. He stated he supported the first request and he supports this request as well. He noted the City had a great deal of right-of-way on this lot and no intention of using it. He believed the plans before the Commission were the best use of the property.

**Commissioner Collins** questioned how this request differed from the first time the variance request came before the Planning Commission.

**City Planner Jagoe** explained this was the same as the variance request that was reviewed in 2021.

**Chair Vijums** indicated he reviewed this request a year ago, and he supported the variance at that time. He discussed what the setbacks were when the home was built and noted the variance would be less than three feet. He asked if the addition siding would match the existing home.

**City Planner Jagoe** reported it was her understanding the addition would have consistent building materials with what was already on the home.

**Robert Kunze**, 4073 Valentine Court, explained the home was resided in the last five years. He indicated the siding and roofing materials were still readily available.

**Chair Vijums moved and Commissioner Weber seconded a motion to recommend approval of Planning Case 22-008 for a Variance at 4073 Valentine Court directing staff and the City Attorney to prepare proposed findings of fact based on the following:**

1. **The odd and unusual shape of the lot and topography are unique characteristics of the Subject Property, and those factors restrict alternative options for increased accessory storage.**
  2. **There is limited ability to extend the existing driveway to a detached structure in another location, and single family residential properties are limited to one driveway access per property so a second driveway access would not be permitted off of Valentine Avenue.**
  3. **The garage addition will not impede sight lines or obstruct the clear vision area from the roadways.**
  4. **This is a legal nonconforming lot that was developed in 1953 at which time City Code allowed a 10 foot side yard setback. The scope or scale of the variance request is to locate the proposed garage at a 7.82 foot setback.**
- and based on the submitted plans, as amended by the two (2) conditions in the June 8, 2022, report to the Planning Commission. The motion carried unanimously (6-0).**

**B. Planning Case 22-009; 1700 Highway 96 W – Comprehensive Plan Amendment – Public Hearing**

**City Planner Jagoe** stated Trident Development has submitted an application for two amendments to Chapter 6, Land Use of the Arden Hills 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed amendments would change the future land use designation in the northwest corner of 1700 Highway 96 West (“Subject Property”) from P/I, Public and Institutional to be guided as HDR, High Density Residential as well as modify existing language in Section 6.4.10 to include the entire Subject Property to allow an increase in the maximum density through the use of a Planned Unit Development.

**City Planner Jagoe** reported Minnesota state law requires that all communities within the Minneapolis-St. Paul metropolitan area update their Comprehensive Plans every ten years. The purpose of the Comprehensive Plan is to establish the policies that guide the future physical and community development of Arden Hills. It is also a reference document for the Planning Commission and City Council when evaluating private development projects.

**City Planner Jagoe** explained based on the future land uses, the City can plan for improvements, anticipate infrastructure needs, and create appropriate land use regulations. The City’s Zoning Code identifies specific zoning districts through which the land uses and goals in the Comprehensive Plan can be implemented. The zoning cannot conflict with the future land use designation. When there is a conflict between the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Code, the City is required to amend the Zoning Code to comply with the Comprehensive Plan.

**City Planner Jagoe** stated the Comprehensive Plan and all its amendments must reflect the adopted regional policies in the Metropolitan Council’s system and policy plans. Local planning efforts are linked to the larger regional infrastructure of parks and trails, road networks, and wastewater infrastructure, and the City’s plan must conform to the regional vision. An amendment to the Comprehensive Plan requires a recommendation from the Planning Commission following a public hearing, and adoption of a resolution by the City Council. Adjacent communities must be given up to 60 days to review and comment on the proposed amendment before it can be reviewed and approved by the Metropolitan Council. The Metropolitan Council has the final determination as to whether to allow a CPA or not, though