

# NorthOaks 

Building on a tradition of innovation

## CITY OF NORTH OAKS

Regular Planning Commission Meeting
Thursday, November 30, 2023

## 7:00 PM, Community Meeting Room, 100 Village Center Drive MEETING AGENDA

Remote Access - Planning Commission members will participate in person in Council Chambers (Community Room, 100 Village Center Drive, Suite 150, North Oaks, MN) during the meeting. Members of the public are welcome to attend. Any person wishing to monitor the meeting electronically from a remote location may do so by calling the following Zoom meeting videoconference number: 1-312-626-6799, Webinar ID: 86253908253 or by joining the meeting via the following link:
https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86253908253.

## 1. Call To Order

## 2. Roll Call

3. Pledge
4. Citizen Comments - Members of the public are invited to make comments to the Planning Commission during the public comments section. Up to four minutes shall be allowed for each speaker. No action will be taken by the Commission on items raised during the public comment period unless the item appears as an agenda item for action.
5. Approval of Agenda
6. Approval of Previous Month's Minutes

6a. Approval of Planning Commision Meeting Minutes of 10/26/2023
Planning Commission Minutes 10.26.2023.pdf

## 7. Business Action Items

7a. Discussion / Possible Action on Fence Variance \#23-7 at Spring Farm Development 2023-11-30 PC packet Spring Farm Variance.pdf

7b. Discussion of Garage Size Ordinance Amendment 2023-11-30 PC Report garage size ordinance.pdf

7c. Discussion of Setback/Natural Suitability Ordinance Amendment 2023-11-30 PC Report setback ordinance .pdf

## 8. Commissioner Report(s)

9. Adjourn - The next scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission is Thursday, January 25th, 2024.

# North Oaks Planning Commission <br> Meeting Minutes <br> City of North Oaks Community Meeting Room 

October 26, 2023

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Cremons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

## 2. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair David Cremons, Commissioners Grover Sayre III, Bob Ostlund, Joyce
Yoshimura-Rank, Councilor Mark Azman
Staff Present: Administrator Kevin Kress, City Attorney Bridget Nason, City Planner Kendra Lindahl
Absent: Stig Hauge, Nick Sandell
Others Present: Videographer Kenny Ronnan
A quorum was declared present

## 3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Cremons led the Council in the Pledge of Allegiance.

## 4. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There was no one present in the room, or online wishing to make comments.

## 5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Cremons suggested reversing the order of item 7 to move the garage size discussion first in the agenda, followed by the discussion of building height, setbacks and slope second. Councilor Azman asked to make an addition to the agenda to discuss adding specificity to the noise ordinance.

MOTION by Yoshimura Rank, seconded Sayre, to approve the agenda as amended. Motion carried unanimously.

## 6. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MONTH'S MINUTES

a. Approval of September 28, 2023 Minutes

Commissioner Ostlund made a correction to his correction in the previous month's minutes, noting that he said the notes should state "fleshing out" rather than "flushing out".

MOTION by Yoshimura-Rank, seconded by Sayre, to approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of September 28, 2023 with corrections as noted. Motion carried unanimously.

## 7. BUSINESS ACTION ITEMS

## a. Discussion on amending Chapter 150 of the North Oaks City Code regarding garages

 and accessory structure sizes.- City Planner Lindahl shared that the working group met to discuss a possible amendment to increase the maximum allowed garage size. City Code currently requires a CUP for garages exceeding 1,500 square feet, with 3,000 square feet as the maximum size allowed. There have been 15 CUP applications for garage size since 2015, and only one was denied. The working group recommends changing the maximum garage size threshold for CUP to 2,000 square feet. They also recommend that Floor Area Ratio shall not exceed . 12 or the maximum floor area ratio permitted by the subdivision approval.
- Administrator Kress suggested that they change the wording to not exceed 12 zoning district or maximum Floor Area because there are some districts such as RSM or RMM that aren't in the PUD have higher numbers than . 12 .
- Chair Cremons said he feels comfortable with the change, that it reflects trends in new home construction. Councilor Azman asked if the size recommendation would translate to a 4-car garage, and City Administrator Kress confirmed that it would. Councilor Azman was in favor of the change, stating it would help remove vehicles from driveways and protect them as well.
- Councilor Azman asked if a garage included living space, would the living space be included in the Floor Area Ratio? City Planner Lindahl confirmed that it would.
- Commissioners Ostlund, Yoshimura-Rank, and Sayre agreed that 2,000 square feet seems like a reasonable threshold.
- A public hearing will be scheduled for the November Planning Commission Meeting.
b. Discussion on amending Chapter 150 of the North Oaks City Code regarding building height, setbacks, and topography.
- City Planner Lindahl shared that the working group met to discuss a possible amendment to two parts of Section 151.050(D)7: Building Height and Setback requirements for buildings over 35 feet and the definition of "naturally uited".
- With regard to building height, the goal was to clarify the existing ordinance language. The working group came up with the following: 1) When ANY portion of the building within 50 feet of the property line exceeds 35 feet: Any time a side or rear elevation of a building exceeds 35 feet in height and such elevation exceeding 35 feet is within 50 feet of adjacent side or rear lot lines, the building line otherwise dictated by City ordinance shall be setback and additional 10 feet from that lot line; or 2) When a building is within 50 feet of the property line and ANY portion of the building exceeds 35 feet.
- Commissioner Sayre asked if the setback would be applied to all sides of the structure, or just the side where the height exceeds 35 feet. City Planner Lindahl said she believed it would need to be shifted on just the sides and rear.
- Commissioner Sayre said he felt this interpretation is different from how the ordinance has been historically interpreted. If the portion of the building that is over 40 feet is far from the lot line, and therefore not theoretically bothering the neighbor behind it, why should the whole building be penalized by the additional setbacks? Chair Cremons stated that it could still be visible and bothersome to neighbors on other sides of the building.
- City Administrator Kress clarified that the goal is to clarify whether a home over 35 feet has a standard additional setback of 10 feet, or if it is a stepped setback of 2 feet for every foot over 35 feet.
- City Planner Lindahl suggested that the current code requires the stepped setback requirement, and they are recommending clarifying the language to say that if a home is over 35 feet, you either increase the setback to 50 feet, or if you don't want to do that, then you look at the height on each side and do the stepped calculation to determine the setbacks.
- City Planner Lindahl said she does not believe anyone thinks of a home in parts, and if the concern is not having buildings over 35 feet next to adjacent properties, then it is better if it is clear that if any part of the house is over 35 feet, the additional setback should be applied to the whole house. City Administrator Kress agreed that it would be a lot easier if there was a standard setback rather than the stepped program. For example, in the properties on Sherwood Trail, none of the houses had an issue just moving the building outside of the 50 -foot setback.
- Chair Cremons said the challenge will arise with teardowns on smaller, older lots, where people may want to build more current style homes, but there is not a lot of extra space. Commissioner Sayre added that a 45 -foot home may not be as much of a worry in this day and age, and it may depend upon the style of the homes around it. If you are too restrictive on the setbacks, you depreciate the value of the lots.
- Chair Cremons asked whether they want to recommend to the Council that the 2-foot issue is no longer practical given the fact that a lot of the lots to be built on will be smaller and tighter since they will be teardowns? Or is it addressing a significant need?
- Commissioner Ostlund stated that he believes a lot of this is driven by realtors wishes to be able to sell homes that can be torn down. He is concerned about altering ordinances for people who might want to move here rather than looking out those who currently live here. Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank stated that she believes that historically, the ordinance has served the City well and she prefers to keep it as is, just clarify the language.
- Commissioner Sayre questioned whether it is in the best interest of people who live here now to have such a restrictive ordinance if someday they may want to sell their house, and/or have other homes sell to re-populate schools. Chair Cremons reiterated that the goal is to clarify the ordinance, not change it. City Administrator Kress provided an example of how the setback requirement would be applied on a smaller lot, and noted that he did not believe it would be too restrictive in most cases.
- Chair Cremons stated he would support keeping the 2-foot step calculation, and just making sure the language is clear. Commissioner Sayre asked if there could be some relief if the side of the home that is over 35 feet is in the back and it meets the setback requirements there, then the sides are not required to have the same added setback requirements? In the case of the home where this was an issue on Cherrywood, they couldn't afford to add any additional setback on the sides and still accommodate the size of the house. City Administrator Kress noted that it does not come up very often that the whole house cannot be moved back a full 50 feet. Commissioner Sayre stated he is less concerned about the issue of whether the whole structure needs to be moved or just certain sides if it does not come up very often. But if it does come up often and
prohibits people from building modern homes in the City, then the Commission needs to be careful not to make the ordinance overly restrictive.
- Commissioner Yoshimura-Rank questioned whether making the ordinance less restrictive would change what makes North Oaks unique, and whether we really want to be like every other community? She believes it is important to have some parameters. City Planner Lindahl stated that North Oaks is currently more restrictive than most cities, but there is historical precedence for that. The City could still require a CUP for buildings over 35 feet, but remove some of the setback requirements. This would give it more flexibility to evaluate each home on a case by case basis. She recommended reviewing other cities' requirements; some have a 35 -foot height requirement, period. North Oaks is not outrageous in its requirements.
- Chair Cremons suggested that they come up with an Option 1 and Option 2 with examples for consideration at the next meeting, and discuss it when more Planning Commissioners are present.
- The Commission moved on to discuss the interpretation of "naturally suited" in the ordinance. There is currently no definition of this phrase in the Code. The working group believes that the language was meant to suggest that land on a lot should be kept as close to the state it is in at the time construction/reconstruction is proposed, with the goal of minimizing cut and fill during building. They provided two options for discussion.
- City Attorney Nason recommended that if there is criteria interpreting the language, then it should be put in the code.
- Councilor Azman stated that he believes the source of the language is the history and culture of the idea that roads and homes are designed to meet and compliment the contours of the land. The land should not be adjusted to meet whatever home a builder or homeowner wants.
- City Administrator Kress noted that the interior of North Oaks is the only area where the "naturally suited" language becomes an issue because some of the newer developments such as Rapp Farm and Gate Hill are mass graded sites. In the interior, the issue that arises is when a home is torn down, is the new home any more detrimental to what was already there? And what is considered detrimental - soil movement, raising of the house in order to create a walkout? What the language should hone in on is what the threshold is for change to the land.
- The Planning Commission agreed that there should be guardrails on the amount of grading that can be done. They will revisit the discussion at the November Planning Commission meeting with examples from previous homes that were approved for construction and will attempt to come up with some standards.
c. Discussion on Noise Standards for Leaf Blowers, Mowers, etc.
- Councilor Azman asked the Planning Commission to consider whether noise standards could be implemented for noise related to yard work tools in the City.
- Chair Cremons suggested that there are two issues that could address this concern: time limitations and noise level.
- City Planner Lindahl shared two cities that have such limitations: Corcoran and Inver Grove Heights limit noise primarily by hours. Councilor Azman suggested that there
may be some exceptions to this, for example for the use of snow blowers after a large snow storm.
- City Administrator Kress stated he likes limitations around hours rather than decibel because decibel is nearly impossible to enforce.
- Planning Commissioners were in favor of some limitations, and agreed to continue the discussion to identify specific hours at the November Planning Commission Meeting.


## 8. COMMISSIONER REPORT(S)

- None


## 9. ADJOURN

Chair Cremons stated the next Planning Commission meeting would be November 30th, 2023.
MOTION by Sayre, seconded by Yoshimura-Rank, to adjourn the Planning Commission meeting at 8:34 p.m. Motion carried unanimously by roll call.

Kevin Kress, City Administrator
Date approved $\qquad$

## PLANNING REPORT

TO: North Oaks Planning Commission
FROM: Kendra Lindahl, City Planner
Kevin Kress, City Administrator
Bridget McCauley Nason, City Attorney
Michael Nielson, City Engineer
DATE: November 21, 2023
RE: $\quad$ Request for a Fence Variance for 0 Spring Farm Road (City file 23-7/ Landform File 23-010)

Date Application Submitted October 26, 2023
Date Application Determined Complete: November 6, 2023
Planning Commission Meeting Date: November 30, 2023
City Council Meeting Date: December 14, 2023
60-day Review Date:
December 25, 2023

## BACKGROUND

John Sonnek, representing Charles Cudd Company, LLC applied for a variance from City Code Title XV, Chapter 151.034 to allow a solid 6foot high privacy fence in the Spring Farm (Gate Hill) subdivision adjacent to Centerville Road, to be located on and across the three tracts addressed as 0 Spring Farm Road and legally described as Tracts YYY, ZZZ, and AAAA , RLS 639, Ramsey County, MN.


Figure 1 - location amp

100 Village Center Drive, Suite 230
North Oaks, MN 55127

Attached for reference:
Exhibit A: Location Map
Exhibit B: Site Plan

Exhibit C: Fence Specifications and Photos
Exhibit D: Gate Hill 2021 Plans
Exhibit E: City Engineer memo dated November 21, 2023

## ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

The applicant is requesting approval of two variances to allow a 6-foot high privacy fence on three outlots. The first variance is to allow a solid fence more than 48 inches high and the second variance is to allow the fence to cross two property lines between the open space parcels.

Section 151.034 (FENCES, SCREENING, PLANTING STRIPS, AND LANDSCAPING) requires compliance with the following:

1. Further purposes of this subchapter are to establish requirements, standards, and guidelines relative to the construction and use of fences, screening, planting strips, and landscaping within 30 feet of lot lines.

The proposed fence is within 12 feet of the east lot line (adjacent to Centerville Road) and 2.2 feet from the west lot line of 63 Spring Farm Road.
2. Subject to the limitations in § 151.033, fences, screening, planting strips, and landscaping are permitted within 30 feet of a lot line, but subject to the following restrictions.
(1) Solid walls in excess of 48 inches above adjacent ground grades shall be prohibited.

Does not comply. The proposed fence is a solid fence 6 feet tall. A variance from this standard is requested and discussed below.
northoaks@northoaksmn.gov
www.northoaksmn.gov

100 Village Center Drive, Suite 230
North Oaks, MN 55127
(2) Fences in excess of 48 inches high above adjacent ground grades shall be at least $30 \%$ open through the structure to allow for passage of light, air, and wind.

Does not comply. The proposed fence is a solid fence 6 feet tall. A variance from this standard is requested and discussed below.
(3) The side of the fence considered to be the finished side as opposed to structural supports shall face abutting property.

Complies. The vinyl fence is finished on both sides.
(4) Fences in side or rear yards, i.e., subject to division (B)(6) below, the area between the front building foundation line of the principal structure and rear lot line shall not exceed a height of 6 feet above finished grade.

N/A. The fence is in an open space parcel with no other structures. However, the fence shall comply with the 6 -foot height limit.
(5) Fences in front yards, i.e., the area between the blacktopped or other finished edge of any road and the front building foundation line of the principal structure may, after being setback a minimum of 10 feet from the blacktopped or other finished edge of any road pursuant to § 151.033(B), be a maximum of 48 inches in height, except in the case of corner lots where, in addition to complying with the 10 -foot setback in § 151.033(B), a maximum 30-inch height above road height shall be permitted within a triangular area defined as follows: beginning at the intersection of the blacktopped or other finished edge of any roads within the front yard; thence 40 feet along 1 the road edge; thence diagonally to a point 40 feet from the point of beginning on the other road edge; thence to the point of beginning.

N/A. The fence is in an open space parcel with no other structures. The fence would be located outside of the sight visibility triangle.
(6) In the case of a corner lot, both yards abutting the blacktopped or other finished edge of a road shall be considered a front yard.

N/A. The fence is in an open space parcel with no other structures. The fence would be located between the lots with homes and Centerville Road.
(7) All fences, screening, planting strips, and landscaping shall be located entirely on the lot of the person(s) installing or causing installing of the same.

Does not comply. The proposed fence is a continuous fence that crosses two lot lines.
(8) Nothing in this section is intended to supersede any stricter requirements set forth in any private covenant or agreement affecting any lot owners) nor any stricter requirements set forth in any statute, law, or regulation relating to setbacks from wetlands or public waters.

Approval from NOHOA would be required prior to construction.
(9) Barbed wire or similar fences shall be prohibited.

Complies. The fence is proposed to be white vinyl.
(10) Fences surrounding swimming pools shall comply with $\S \S 150.055$ et seq., and to the extent not inconsistent herewith, the requirements in this chapter.

N/A
(11) No fence, screening, planting strip, or landscaping shall be permitted which creates a traffic hazard.

Complies. The fence will be outside of the sight visibility triangle and will not create a traffic hazard.
(C) The provisions of M.S. Ch. 344, as it may be amended from time to time, shall not apply within the city.

N/A
(D) Fences, screening, planting strips, and landscaping must be maintained so as to not endanger life or property and any fence, screening, planting strip, or landscaping which endangers life or property shall be deemed a nuisance.

The Spring Farm Master Association would be responsible for maintenance of the fence. The fence will cross a 30 -foot water main easement on the north side of the proposed
fence. The City Engineer has reviewed this and noted that a fence could be permitted in this location provided that the applicant acknowledges that:

- Any maintenance or construction activity required in the existing drainage and utility easement that requires removal of the fence will be done at the expense of the property owner.
- Repair or replacement of the fence due to construction activities will be at the property owner's expense.
- The property owner acknowledges these requirements in writing and signs an agreement that will be recorded and run with the property.
(E) Any deviation from the provisions of this section shall require a variance.


## VARIANCES

As noted above, two variances are requested. The applicant did not provide a narrative to describe how they believe the standards have been met. Nevertheless, in order to grant approval of the variance, the City must find that the following standards have been met:

1) (a) Their strict enforcement would cause practical difficulties because of circumstances unique to the individual land under consideration, and the variances shall be granted only when it is demonstrated that the actions will be in keeping with the spirit and intent of this chapter.

The Planning Commission could find that there are practical difficulties in complying with the height limits and setbacks from property lines as this fence is intended to screen the residential homes from the traffic on Centerville Road. A fence only 48 inches tall or a fence with $30 \%$ open space would not serve this screening purpose and must cross the open space parcel lot lines to accomplish this purpose.

However, the Planning Commission could find that the applicant has not provided any evidence of a practical difficulty. The applicant could build a 6 -foot tall fence with at least $30 \%$ open space through the fence materials, which would supplement the screening provided by the existing trees located between the proposed fence and Centerville Road.
(b) PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES means the land in question cannot be put to a reasonable use if used under conditions allowed by the official controls, the plight of the land owner is due to circumstances unique to the land in question which were not
created by the land owner, and the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.
(c) Economic considerations alone shall not constitute an undue hardship if reasonable use for the land exists under the terms of this chapter.

The Planning Commission could find that the request is not driven by economic considerations alone. The request is a desire to provide additional screening from Centerville Road for residents.
(d) A variance may not be granted for any use that is not permitted under this chapter for land in the zone where the affected person's land is located.

## N/A

(2) Subject to the above, a variance may be granted only in the event that all of the following circumstances exist:
(a) Unique circumstances apply to the which do not generally apply to other land in the same zone or vicinity, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of the land have no control;

The Commission may find that the need for the fence is driven by the unique circumstances of this site, which backs up to Centerville Road, a high volume street.

The Commission could find that many homes back up to high volume streets in the City and are subject to the same standards.
(b) The proposed uses is reasonable;

The Commission may find that the proposed fence is reasonable in this location due to the proximity to Centerville Road.

The Commission may find that the fence is not reasonable in this location because there are options to provide additional screening in conjunction with the existing trees that do not require a variance.
(c) That the unique circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant;
(d) That granting the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this chapter to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district;
www.northoaksmn.gov

The Commission may find that based on the unique circumstances of this site, granting the variance will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied others in the same circumstances.

Alternatively, the Commission may find that there are no unique circumstances that warrant a variance as many parcels are adjacent to Centerville Road and similar high volume streets.
(e) That the Variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulties;

The Commission may find that the variance is needed to alleviate the practical difficulties created by the home locations near Centerville Road.

The Commission may find that the applicant has not identified any practical difficulties and, therefore, relief through the variance is not required.
(f) The proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent land, or substantially increase the congestion of the roads and streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood; and

The Commission may find that the proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent land, or substantially increase the congestion of the roads and streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
(g) At no time after the land became nonconforming was the property under common ownership with contiguous land, the combination of which could have been used to reduce or avoid the nonconformity of the land.

N/A

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the preceding review, Staff recommends the following options in relation to the variance requests.

CITY OF
NorthOaks
Building on a tradition of innovation

## PLANNING COMMISSION OPTIONS

In consideration of the variance requests, the Planning Commission has the following options, which could be modified by the Commission:
a. Recommend approval of the variances.

Based on the applicant's submission, the contents of the staff report, public testimony and other information available to the Planning Commission, the Commission could recommend approval of the variances based on the finding that variance standards have been met. Specifically:

1. There are practical difficulties in complying with the height limits and setbacks from property lines as this fence is intended to screen the residential homes from the traffic on Centerville Road. A fence only 48 inches tall or a fence with $30 \%$ open space would not serve this screening purpose, and any continuous fence must cross the open space parcel lot lines to accomplish this purpose.
2. The request is not driven by economic considerations alone. The request is motivated by a desire to provide additional screening from Centerville Road for residents.
3. The need for the fence is driven by the unique circumstances of this site, which backs up to Centerville Road, a high volume street.
4. The proposed fence is reasonable in this location due to the proximity to Centerville Road.
5. The unique circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant;
6. Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied others in the same circumstances.
7. The variance is the minimum action needed to alleviate the practical difficulties created by the home location near Centerville Road.
8. The proposed variance will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent land, or substantially increase the congestion of the roads and streets, or increase the danger of fire, or endanger the public safety, or substantially diminish or impair property values within the neighborhood.
9. The applicant must comply with the conditions in the November 21, 2023 City Engineer's memo.
b. Recommend denial of the variances.

Based on the applicant's submission, the contents of the staff report, public testimony and other information available to the Planning Commission, the

Commission could recommend denial of the variance based on the finding that variance standards have not been met. Specifically:

1. The applicant has not provided any evidence of a practical difficulty. The applicant could build a 6 -foot tall fence with at least $30 \%$ open through the fence materials, which would supplement the screening provided by the existing trees located between the proposed fence and Centerville Road.
2. There are no unique circumstances on this site as many homes back up to high volume streets in the City and are subject to the same standards.
3. The fence is not reasonable in this location because the there are options to provide additional screening in conjunction with the existing trees that do not require a variance.
4. Granting the variances will confer on the applicant special privilege that is denied others in the same circumstances. There are no unique circumstances that warrant a variance as many parcels are adjacent to Centerville Road and similar high volume streets.
5. The applicant has not identified any practical difficulties and, therefore, relief through the variances is not required.

## Map Ramsey
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EVERSTRONG PROFILES ARE AMERICAN MADE AND ASTM COMPLIANT


Mernational is a globally recognized leader in the development and delivery of
voluntary consensus standards.


A Fibll, Compreniensive Vinyl ppograms For fernee people By Fince pieople


## EverStrong ${ }^{\circ}$

## PROFILES

## All sext Il We Profiles Meet ASTM F964-13. Control Tests Including:

D256 To determine Izod impact properties
D618 Practice for Conditioning Plastics for Testing
D635 Test Method for Rate of Burning and/or Extent and Time of Burning of Plastics in a Horizontal Position
D638 To determine tensile properties
D648 To determine heat distortion temperature
D696 Test Method for Coefficient of Linear Thermal Expansion of Plastics Between $030^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and $30^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ with a Vitreous Silica Dilatometer
D790 To determine flexural properties
D792 To determine specific gravity
D883 Terminology Relating to Plastics
D1435 Practice for Outdoor Weathering of Plastics
D1600 Terminology for Abbreviated Terms Relating to Plastics
D1784 Specification for Rigid Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Compounds and Chlorinated Poly (Vinyl Chloride) (CPVC) Compounds
D1898 Practice for Sampling of Plastics
D2240 To determine Shore hardness values
D2244 Practice for Calculation of Color Tolerances and Color Differences from Instrumentally Measured Color Coordinates
D2565 Practice for Xenon-Arc Exposure of Plastics Intended for Outdoor Applications
D4216 Material Class Number 1-32333-3. To establish Cell Classification of PVC material. Illusions compounds have higher cell classification because one or more properties are superior to those used in standard acceptable compounds
D4226 Test Methods for Impact Resistance of Rigid Poly-(Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Building Products
D4726 Specification for Rigid Poly(Vinyl Chloride) (PVC) Exterior-Profile Extrusions Used for Assembled Windows and Doors
E-84-04 Used to determine the flame spread value of PVC material; EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ burn rate is significantly lower than allowed value


EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ Profiles are backed by almost 50 years experience in the fence business as a manufacturer and distributor. We have been in the vinyl fence fabrication business since 1996, and with this knowledge we expanded into extrusion.

EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ set up an extrusion plant with the most technologically advanced extruding systems in the industry, some of the most seasoned people in extrusion worldwide, and a complete quality control lab which is unparalleled in our industry.

All EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ Profiles are inventoried in stock lengths in White, Beige, Gray, and Clay all the time. They are available to ship as soon as your order is placed. That is correct; the only lead time on stock lengths of profiles is giving your address to our carrier.

All EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ Profiles are manufactured to rigid specifications using only the best compounds available in the market.

All EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ Profiles and Accessories are tested and compliant to ASTM as well as our own, more strict specifications.



## 

## 1-1/2" $\times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ SLOTTED RAIL

| Item ${ }^{\text {\% }}$ | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| V15558WS-080 | 1-1/2" $\times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ |
| V155593WS-080 | $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 93-3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ |
| V155570WS-080 | $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 70^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1-1/2" $\times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ RAIL |  |
| Item \# | Description |
| V15558W-080 | 1-1/2" $\times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ |
| V155593W-080 | $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 93-3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ |
| V155570W-080 | $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 70^{\prime \prime}$ |
| $2^{\prime \prime} \times 3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ RAIL |  |
| Item ${ }^{\text {\# }}$ | Description |
| V2358-120 | $2^{\prime \prime} \times 3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ |
| V2356-120 | $2^{\prime \prime} \times 3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 6$ |



## $2^{\prime \prime} \times 3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ T-RAIL

| Item \# | Description |
| :--- | :---: |
| V2358TR | $2^{\prime \prime} \times 3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ T-Rail Vinyl |
| V2356TR | $2^{\prime \prime} \times 3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime}$ T-Rail Vinyl |


| $2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}$ SLOTTED RAIL |
| :--- | :--- |
| Item\#  <br> V2616WS-085 $2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\prime}$ Slotted Rail <br> V268WS-085 $2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ Slotted Rail |

$2^{\prime \prime} \times$ 7" $^{\prime \prime}$ DECO RAIL

| Item |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| V278WS-095 | $2^{\prime \prime} \times 7^{\prime \prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ |
| V2793WS-095 | $2^{\prime \prime} \times 7^{\prime \prime} \times 93-3 / 4^{\prime \prime}$ |

## Description

| Item \#  <br> V2616W-085 Description <br> V268W-085 $2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\prime \prime}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

$2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}$ RAIL


## 此相 Available Profiles

## METAL RAIL INSERTS

| Item\# | Description |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| U-CHANNEL | Galv. Steel Reinforcement Channel $93.75^{\prime \prime}$ for $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 5-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ |  |
| U-CHANNEL26 | Galv. Steel Reinforcement Channel $93.75^{\prime \prime}$ for $2^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}$ |  |

## ALUMINUM REINFORCEMENT INSERT

| Item \# | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| AHC6 | Aluminum Reinforcement Insert 6' |
| AHC8 | Aluminum Reinforcement Insert 8' |
| AHC10 | Aluminum Reinforcement Insert 10' |

## HALF ARCH WELDED (FOR 42"WIDE - 72" WIDE GATES)

Item \#
Description

VBHAW $2^{\prime \prime} \times 3-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ for $42^{\prime \prime} W-72^{\prime \prime} W$ Gates

ALUMINUM POST INSERTS
Item \#
Description
$4.5^{\prime \prime} \times 4.5^{\prime \prime} \times 9$ 9 Aluminum Post Insert

VINYL GATE INSERT
Item \#


Privacy Panels feature a " V "-Jointed tongue and groove board and come with a wide variety of decorative tops. Privacy fence panels include a metal reinforcement channel in the bottom rail to help create a stronger and longer lasting fence. We pride ourselves on offering a Privacy Panel for every taste. They are also offered in color and woodgrain. Lattice comes in color and woodgrain.


PRIVACY


PRIVACY WITH SMALL DIAGONAL LATTICE


PRIVACY WITH STEPPED PICKET TOP


PRIVACY WITH DIAGONAL LATTICE


PRIVACY WITH STRAIGHT PICKET TOP


PRIVACY WITH SCALLOPED PICKET TOP


PRIVACY WITH SQUARE LATTICE


PRIVACY WITH FRAMED PICKET TOP


PRIVACY WITH ARCHED PICKET TOP


## PRINAM



## SEMILPRIINAY



SMALL DIAGONAL LATTICE


OLD ENGLISH LATTICE


SQUARE LATTICE

The Semi-Privacy line has one of the largest selections we offer. Customers are invited to pick one of our pre-made styles or to custom design their own. Semi-Privacy panels are specially designed to offer privacy without a "closed in" feeling. Our extensive selection offers open lattice styles as well as the more secure "front to back" large picket styles. All are available in color and woodgrain.


BOARD ON BOARD WITH DIAGONAL LATTICE

SEMI-PRIVACY WITH 6" BOARDS



BOARD ON BOARD WITH FRAMED PICKET TOP


BOARD ON BOARD WITH STRAIGHT PICKET TOP


BOARD ON BOARD


SEMI-PRIVACY WITH 6" BOARDS AND DIAGONAL LATTICE


SEMI-PRIVACY WITH ALTERNATING 6" AND 1-1/2" BOARDS


SEMI-PRIVACY WITH 3" BOARDS

## CHASSG T/GTORIAN PIGKET




1-1/2" X 1-1/2" STRAIGHT TOP PICKET


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" SCALLOPED PICKET


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" STEPPED TOP PICKET


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" FRAMED TOP PICKET


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" ARCHED TOP PICKET

One of the most popular fence styles in the USA is the Classic Victorian Picket. Using $1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime} \times 1-1 / 2^{\prime \prime}$ pickets, it is a maintenance-free look alike of the old red cedar fence. All of the panels are carefully designed with the classic look in mind and all are available in color and woodgrain.


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" STAGGERED TOP PICKET


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" SCALLOPED TWO-RAIL


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" STAGGERED TWO-RAIL


1-1/2" X 1-1/2" FRAMED TWO-RAIL

## GONIEMPORARY PICKEI



Contemporary Picket offers what is known as the "good neighbor" approach to fencing. It is a fence that features both sides of the panels being exactly the same. The pickets are assembled THROUGH the rails instead of simply being attached to them


7/8" X 3" PICKETS WITH POINTED PICKET CAPS (REDUCED SPACING)


7/8" X 3" PICKETS W/ POINTED PICKET CAPS


7/8" X 1-1/2" PICKETS W/ POINTED PICKET CAPS


7/8" X 3" PICKETS WITH DOG-EAR PICKET CAPS


7/8" X 3" SCALLOPED PICKETS W/ POINTED PICKET CAPS


7/8" X 1-1/2" PICKETS W/ POINTED PICKET CAPS (REDUCED SPACING)


7/8" X 3" ARCHED PICKETS W/ DOG-EAR PICKET CAPS


7/8" X 3 " STEPPED PICKETS W/ POINTED PICKET CAPS


7/8" X 1-1/2" SCALLOPED W/ POINTED PICKET CAPS (REDUCED SPACING)

ORWMMENTEA PCAKET


Ornamental 1" x 1" Picket offers a vinyl alternative to the wrought iron fence. It enables the homeowner to maintain the look of wrought iron without the maintenance.


1" X 1" ORNAMENTAL PICKET FENCE WITH STAGGERED PICKET TOPS


1" X 1" ORNAMENTAL PICKET FENCE WITH STAGGERED FRAMED PICKET TOP



1" X 1" ORNAMENTAL PICKET FENCE WITH STRAIGHT PICKET TOP


1" X 1" FRAMED TOP ORNAMENTAL PICKET FENCE



GOTHIC

## POST \& RAII



Our Post \& Rail fence is available with three different styled rails for the Two-Rail, Three-Rail, Four-Rail or Crossbuck fence. Whatever setting you may have, we have the look you want and the strength you need. We also offer all Post \& Rail styles in color and woodgrain.


2-RAIL


4-RAIL


2-RAIL DIAMOND


3-RAIL


CROSSBUCK


3-RAIL DIAMOND

## RAIING



TRADITIONAL - 2" X 3.5" TOP-RAIL


EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ offers a complete lines of vinyl railings. All railing panels contain a metal channel in the top-rail. Some styles are also offered in Grand Illusions colors and woodgrains. An optional metal channel for the bottom rail is available for extra protection.


TRADITIONAL - T-RAIL TOP-RAIL


COLONIAL - T-RAIL TOP-RAIL

## GURIVES \& TRANSITIONS



Are you looking for the perfect finishing touch for your fence installation? EverStrong ${ }^{\circledR}$ Curved and Transitions Rails have many different options to help bring out the beauty of your landscaping and home or installation. They can be mixed and matched to show creative style and enhance any section. You can even get them in Grand Illusions Color Spectrum ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ and Grand Illusions Vinyl WoodBond ${ }^{\text {TM }}$



ARCHED PRIVACY


SCALLOPED PRIVACY


## CIRTVES \& TRANSTIONS

## EverStrong offers many options to enhance the look and feel of your fence installation.

Looking for a perfect fence idea to go with your creative personality?
Consider one of these terrific curved, transition, and rounded corner styles for your next project.


WATERFALL "A" SLOPE RAIL
Available in ALL fence styles


## SCALLOPED "C" RAIL

Available in ALL fence styles


SWEEP "D" RAIL
Available in ALL fence styles


RADIUS "E" RAIL
Only available in picket fence styles


CROWNED "F" RAIL
Available in all full privacy and Semi-privacy fence styles


SCALLOPED "G" RAIL
Available in all full privacy and Semi-privacy fence styles


WATERFALL "H" RAIL
Available in all full privacy and Semi-privacy fence styles



## S-CURVED STYLED "J" RAIL

Available in all full privacy and Semi-privacy fence styles

## ARBORS \& PERGOLAS



## ARBORS \& PERGOLAS

EverStrong Arbors \& Pergolas are an important option to help add flair to your fence installation by taking it from a good looking fence install to a great looking fence install in one simple step. Use with a gate or as a fun ornament for your landscaping.


## $\square$

## Classic Series

Looking for something simple and timeless? Check out your 4 Illusions "Classic" color options: White, Beige, Gray, and Clay.


CLASSIC BEIGE


CLASSIC GRAY


## CLASSIC CLAY (NEW!)

ALL COLORS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE SEE PHYSICAL SAMPLE FOR ACTUAL COLOR.



## $\square$



## Color Vinyl Fence!

 Grand Illusions Color Spectrum ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ is the next evolution of a product. Choose from 32 different low gloss colors of vinyl fence. You can even Mix 'n' Match ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ your colors to create incredible home accent matching fence installations.
(ALL GRAND ILLUSIONS COLORS AND WOODGRAINS AVAILABLE IN ASSEMBLED PANELS ONLY)


## Grand Illusions Color Spectrum FOCUS COLORS

The above four colors with matching posts, caps, and matching 4' and 5' wide gates are in stock and available for immediate shipment in V300-6 privacy panels ( $6^{\prime} \mathrm{H} \times 8^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ ). ALL COLORS SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE. SEE PHYSICAL SAMPLE FOR ACTUAL COLOR.

- Low Gloss Matte Finish
- Mix ‘n' Match ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ Your Colors
- Sky2Blue ${ }^{\text {Th }}$ Color Protection



ALL COLOR SWATCHES SHOWN ARE APPROXIMATE. SEE PHYSICAL SAMPLE FOR ACTUAL COLOR.

(ALL GRAND ILLUSIONS COLORS AND WOODGRAINS AVAILABLE IN ASSEMBLED PANELS ONLY)

## Endless Color Possibilities...

All of these beautiful low gloss Grand Illusions Color Spectrum colors are created to match common home accent colors. You can Mix ' $n$ ' Match ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ them with any other Illusions colors as well. (These colors are not available through the QuickShip ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ program. Ask your local dealer for delivery times.) (ALL GRAND ILLUSIONS COLORS AND WOODGRAINS AVAILABLE IN ASSEMBLED PANELS ONLY)

## ALL STYLES AVAILABLE IN ALL COLORS.

Colors shown are approximate. See physical sample for actual color.


Patio White


Autumn Orange


Brick Red


Sky Blue

Seafoam Green


Desert Sand



Tan


Federal Blue


Olive


Sage
 Vintage Wine


Dark Royal Blue


Seacoast Gray


Colonial Yellow


Burgundy


Midnight Blue


Eastern Green


Millennium Gray


Antique White


Atlantic Blue


Barn Red


Evergreen


Brownstone


Bordeaux


Adobe


Sahara


Prairie Dust


Forest Green

Need a custom color?
Give us a swatch and we'll match it!

The Grand Illusions Color Spectrum "Designer Series"allows you to match any color. This creates limitless color possibilities for any fence application.



## EVERSTRONG VINYL PROFILES LIMITED WARRANTY

EverStrong Vinyl Profiles ("EverStrong") warrants to the purchasing homeowner (the "Purchaser") that the components of his or her vinyl fence where EverStrong Profiles were used, as applicable, will be free from manufacturing defects including peeling, flaking, blistering and corroding when subject to normal and proper use, subject to the following terms and conditions. Should any manufacturing defect occur during the lifetime of the Purchaser (and provided that the Purchaser is still the homeowner at the time such defect is reported), EverStrong, at the sole option of EverStrong, will repair or replace the defective material or the defective parts.

## Limitations

In the event of any repair or replacement of fence product under this limited warranty, EverStrong shall not be liable for labor charges or other expenses incurred in connection with removal or installation of either the original or replacement product. EverStrong reserves the right to refund the amount paid by the Purchaser for the fence product instead of repairing or replacing the defective fence product. In the event of repair or replacement under the terms of this limited warranty, the original limited warranty shall apply to the repaired or replaced fence product and will extend for the balance of the original limited warranty period only. The coverage offered by this limited warranty automatically ends upon the earlier of the sale of the property or death of the last of the Purchasers.

In the event a fence product is purchased by or installed upon property owned by a corporation, governmental agency, partnership, trust, religious organization, school, condominium, homeowner association, cooperative housing arrangement, apartment building or any other type of building or any other premises not consisting of a single family home used by an individual homeowner as his or her primary residence, the limited warranty period will be twenty (20) years from the installation date where EverStrong product was used.

EverStrong does not warrant installation or defects caused by installation. This limited warranty is void if any of the following occurs: (a) improper application techniques; (b) misuse, neglect or improper storage; (c) altering or changing the product by use of applied heat, welding, solvents, epoxies or any other alterations beyond the manufacturer's control; (d) impact of objects, fire, flood, hurricane, tornado, wind storms, casualty, or "Acts of God"; (e) painting the surface of the product; (f) adverse effects of air pollution, mold and Normal Weathering of surfaces. The manufacturer of this product does not recommend or approve this product for all possible end use applications. The appropriate local code authority should be consulted as to its safety and applicability for intended usage.

EverStrong reserves the right to discontinue or modify any of its products, without notice to Purchaser. EverStrong shall not be liable in the event the replacement product varies in color or gloss level in comparison to the original product as a result of Normal Weathering or if a fence product has been discontinued or changed. If EverStrong replaces or repairs any product under this limited warranty, it may substitute products determined by EverStrong to be of comparable quality or price range.

To submit a warranty claim, the "purchaser" must notify the original company of purchase who will supply to EverStrong the documentation necessary.

THE STATEMENTS CONTAINED IN THIS LIMITED WARRANTY SET FORTH THE ONLY WARRANTIES EXTENDED BY EVERSTRONG, AND ARE IN LIEU OF ALL OTHER WARRANTIES, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO IMPLIED Warranties of merchantability and warranties of fitness, AND THE PROVISIONS OF THIS WARRANTY SHALL CONSTITUTE THE ENTIRE LIABILITY OF EVERSTRONG AND THE PURCHASER'S EXCLUSIVE REMEDY FOR BREACH OF EVERSTRONG' WARRANTY. TO THE EXTENT PERMITTED BY APPLICABLE LAW, EVERSTRONG SHALL NOT BE LIABLE TO THE PURCHASER FOR INCIDENTAL OR CONSEQUENTIAL DAMAGES FOR BREACH OF ANY EXPRESS OR IMPLIED WARRANTY ON THE PRODUCT.



## $\$$









November 21, 2023

Ms. Kendra Lindahl, AICP<br>Landform<br>North Oaks City Planner<br>Via Email: KLindahl@landform.net

## RE: Fence Variance Request - 0 Spring Farm Road

Sambatek Project No. 51986
Dear Ms. Lindahl,
I have reviewed the application for the fence variance and find that the proposed fence location is encroaching into and crossing an existing 30 ' wide drainage and utility easement where a waterman is currently constructed.

Typically, a structure would not be allowed within a drainage and utility easement, however I consider a fence as a temporary structure and would recommend allowing the fence at the proposed location with the understanding that;

1. Any maintenance or construction activity required in the existing drainage and utility easement that requires removal of the fence will be done at the expense of the property owner.
2. Repair or replacement of the fence due to construction activities will be at the property owner's expense.
3. The property owner acknowledges these requirements in writing and signs an agreement that will be recorded and run with the property.

Please have the City Attorney review this and prepare a document for signature.
Sincerely,


Mike Nelson, PE
City Engineer
Cc: Kevin Kress, City Administrator Bridget McCauley Nason, City Attorney

ITY OF
NorthOaks

## PLANNING REPORT

TO: North Oaks Planning Commission
FROM: Kendra Lindahl, City Planner
Kevin Kress, City Administrator
Bridget Nason, City Attorney
DATE: November 21,2023
RE: $\quad$ Amendment to Chapter 150 of the City Code Regarding Garage Size

## BACKGROUND

A working group made up of Chair Cremons, Council member Azman and staff is meeting monthly to address a number of zoning ordinance sections that have been identified by staff, the Planning Commission and City Council as in need of review and potential amendment. Staff will bring individual items to the Planning Commission on a regular basis to present amendments for consideration. This month we are bringing garage size back for discussion.

The Planning Commission reviewed this item at the September $28^{\text {th }}$ meeting and the October $26^{\text {th }}$ meeting. Commissioners asked that the ordinance be modified for review at the November $30^{\text {th }}$ meeting, and that a public hearing should be scheduled when certain other ordinances are ready

## ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

The City requires a conditional use permit for garages exceeding $1,500 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}$.
City Code Section 151.005 defines a garage as "An accessory building or accessory portion of the main building which shall not exceed 1,500 square feet."

Since 2015, the City has received 15 applications for a conditional use permit to exceed this limit. Only one of those applications has been denied as shown on the following table:

| ADDRESS | TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ALL GARAGE SPACE | EXCESS OVER 1,500 SQUARE FEET | NOTES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 Phoebe Lane | 1,800 | 300 | 2015 |
| 33 Hill Farm Circle | 2,100 | 600 | 2017 - Detached garage requested of 1,428. Denied due to excess F.A.R. |

northoaks@northoaksmn.gov
www.northoaksmn.gov
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North Oaks, MN 55127

|  | Building on a tradition of innovation |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ADDRESS | TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ALL GARAGE SPACE | EXCESS OVER 1,500 SQUARE FEET | NOTES |
| 9 Red Forest Way | 1,969 | 469 | 2018 - CUP Detached garage of 1,080 |
| 2 Eagle Ridge | 1,548 | 48 | 2018 - CUP Detached garage of 1,020 |
| 26 Evergreen Rd | 2,636 | 1,136 | 2019 - New construction |
| 33 Mallard | 1,826 | 326 | 2019 - Converted lower exercise room to garage space |
| 17 Evergreen Rd | 1,806 | 306 | 2021 - New construction (excess space for RV) |
| 12 Cherrywood | 1,627 | 127 | 2021 -New construction |
| 3 Eastview | 1,916 | 416 | 2021 - New construction |
| 14 Cherrywood | 1,994 | 494 | 2021 - New construction |
| 1 South Deep Lake | 2,077 | 577 | 2022 - Detached garage |
| 70 west Pleasant Lake | 2,302 | 802 | 2022 - New Detached garage of 1,152 |
| 9 Sandpiper Lane | 2,312 | 812 | 2023 - Demo / rebuild of new home |
| 8 Cherrywood Circle | 2,736 | 1,236 | 2023 - New Home. Submitted CUP 5/30/23 - still pending receipt of materials to deem complete |
| 12 Columbine | 1,667.5 | 167.5 | 2023 - Enlarge existing garage. Scheduled for Council action on 9/21/23 |

NorthOaks
Building on a tradition of innovation

If the City is comfortable with larger garages (as the table suggests), it may be time to consider modifying the standards to reflect the current market and the City's comfort with larger garages.

It is important to ensure that garages are in scale with the home to avoid the appearance of a garage with an attached house. There are a number of tools available to manage garage size including limits to the square footage or front elevation.

## Definitions

The current City Code definitions should not include performance standards. Staff recommends the following changes with underlined text for the proposed additions to the City Code and struck through text for the deletions:

ACCESSORY BUILDING, STRUCTURE, OR USE. A subordinate building, structure, or use which is located on the same lot on which the main building or principal use is situated and which is reasonably necessary and incidental to the conduct of the primary use of the main building or principal use.

CARPORT. An area serving the same purpose as a garage as defined herein, but not entirely enclosed with walls.

GARAGE, PRIVATE. An accessory building (attached or detached) or accessory portion of the main building which shall not exceed 1,500 square feet.

PRINCIPAL BUILDING OR USE. The main use of land or buildings as distinguished from subordinate or accessory uses. A PRINCIPAL USE may be either permitted or conditional.

## Garage Size Discussion

The following language is recommended by the working group for approval. The draft language shows underlined text for the proposed additions to the City Code and struck through text for the deletions.

Section 151.050(C)(1) of the City Code (permitted accessory uses):
Attached or detached private garage and private carport facilities, provided the structures are constructed in the same architectural style as the principal building or structure and provided that the combined facilities shall not exceed 1,5002,000 square feet;

Section 151.050 (D)9 of the City Code (conditional uses) would be revised as follows:
(9) Garage which exceeds $1,5002,000$ square feet, provided that:
(a) The garage shall not exceed 3,000 square feet;
northoaks@northoaksmn.gov
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(b) The garage shall be constructed in the same architectural style as the principal building or structure;
(c) The floor area ratio shall not exceed 0.12 or the maximum floor area ratio permitted by the subdivision approval;
(d드) No use of the garage shall be permitted other than for private residential noncommercial use; and
(ed) The factors set forth in § 151.076(C) shall be considered.
Staff is recommending deletion of item (c) because compliance with the FAR is required of all development and is redundant in the CUP standards.

Staff reviewed the last four conditional use permits submitted to the City to determine the impact of the change proposed. The analysis shows that three of the four would still require a CUP under the draft ordinance. However, nine of the last 15 CUPs would have been permitted without a CUP.

|  | ATTACHED GARAGE |  | DETACHED GARAGE |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PROJECT | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PRE-EXISTING } \\ \text { (SF) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NEW ADDITION } \\ & \text { (SF) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { PRE-EXISTING } \\ & \text { (SF) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NEW ADDITION } \\ & \text { (SF) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TOTAL } \\ \text { GARAGE (SF) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { HOUSE SIZE } \\ (\mathbf{S F})^{*} \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL FLOOR AREA |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 1 S. Deep Lake } \\ \text { Rd } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 585 | N/A | N/A | 1,492 | 2,077 | 3,700 | 4,285 |
| 70 West Pleasant | 1,150 | N/A | N/A | 1,152 | 2,302 | 5,853 | 7,003 |
| 9 Sandpiper | N/A | 2,312 | N/A | N/A | 2,312 | 6,515 | 8,827 |
| 12 Columbine | 908 | 364 | 400 | N/A | 1,672 | 5,131 | 6,403 |

Both 1 South Deep Lake and 70 West Pleasant were granted CUPs for detached garages with recreation space above. The City must ensure that the space above the garage would not be used as an accessory dwelling unit (which is not permitted in the City), but that can be addressed through the building permit process.


Figure 1-Detached garage at 1 South Deep

Figure 2 - Detached Garage at 70 West Pleasant
, p651-792-7750
f 651-792-7751
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Staff also looked at the definitions for floor area and floor area ratio:

- The current City Code defines "TOTAL FLOOR AREA. The total area of all stories, as determined using exterior dimensions, including garages that are not part of the BASEMENT, clerestory area and covered porches and decks." Basement is defined as "A floor level of a building or structure that has less than an average of $50 \%$ of the perimeter walls exposed above the lowest grade." Floor Area Ratio is defined as "The ratio of the TOTAL FLOOR AREA of all buildings to the GROSS LOT AREA, excluding $2 / 3$ of any WETLAND."
- The East Oaks PDA defines "Total Floor Area. All building area above or accessible to grade and that part of the Basement area determined by the percentage of the Basement walls that are exposed. Garages are included." The PDA also defines "Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The ratio of Total Floor Area to Gross Lot Area, excluding two-thirds (2/3) of any DNR and/or VLAWMO designated Wetland areas except that the determination of the FAR for Lots lawfully existing on July 1, 1996 shall exclude two thirds (2/3) of only DNR designated Wetlands.

The definition included in the PDA comes from the 1999 version of the City's zoning ordinance. Staff finds that the current City Code definition is consistent with industry practice and recommends no change. We will update the existing FAR worksheet (which uses the old FAR definition found in the PDA) to reflect the current City Code definition of FAR.

## REQUESTED ACTION

The Planning Commission should review the draft ordinance and provide feedback for staff to prepare a final draft for a potential public hearing at the January meeting.

## PLANNING REPORT

TO: North Oaks Planning Commission
FROM: Kendra Lindahl, City Planner
Kevin Kress, City Administrator
Bridget Nason, City Attorney
DATE: November 21, 2023
RE: Amendment to Chapter 150 of the City Code Regarding Building Height, Setbacks and Topography

## BACKGROUND

A working group made up of Chair Cremons, Council member Azman and staff is meeting monthly to address a number of provisions in the City's existing zoning ordinance that have been identified by staff, the Planning Commission and City Council as areas where revisions to the existing language may be beneficial. Staff will bring individual items to the Planning Commission on a regular basis to present amendments for consideration. This item relates to building height, setbacks and topographical conditions.

The City has been challenged on the existing language related to these items and how to interpret the existing code language. One of the areas the working group has been reviewing is the current requirement for houses with a height greater than 35 feet to obtain a conditional use permit (CUP). Staff believes that this is something that could be moved into development standards rather than requiring a conditional use permit. If the application meets the standards, staff would approve the building permit. However, the Planning Commission directed staff to keep the CUP requirement but modify the standards to raise the threshold for a CUP.

Deb Breen gathered the CUPs for building height and found 59 CUPs for building height were submitted since 2000. Many of these CUPs were tied to new developments where streets and grading were done prior to home construction. In 2006, an application from 8 Mink Lake was submitted and denied. The application was then revised, resubmitted and approved. Also, it appears that some blanket approvals were granted for Rapp Farms and Red Forest Way as part of the East Oaks PDA so that individual CUPs were not required.

The Planning Commission discussed this issue at length at the October $26^{\text {th }}$ meeting. There was debate among Commissioners about what the City was trying to accomplish and the best approach to do so. The Planning Commission wished to clarify the language to allow development consistent with the vision for North Oaks. The working group met on November $10^{\text {th }}$ and $21^{\text {st }}$ to discuss the issue and developed the current language for consideration.

CTY OF
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## ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

Section $151.050(\mathrm{D})(7)$ of the City Code requires a conditional use permit for buildings with a height greater than 35 feet and establishes the following standards:
(a) The front elevation of the building does not exceed 35 feet in height at any point;
(b) The building height at any other elevation does not exceed 45 feet;
(c) The environmental and topographical conditions of the lot prior to building development are naturally suited to the design of a building with an egress or walkout level;
(d) Buildings shall be limited to a basement and 2 full stories. Finished areas within the roof structure will be considered a full story;
(e) Any time the side or rear elevations of a building exceeds 35 feet in height within 50 feet of adjacent lot lines, the building line shall be setback an additional 2 feet from the adjacent setback line for each foot in height above 35 feet; and
(f) Section 151.083 is complied with.

There has been debate about both items c and e in the standards.
The Commission noted that item (c) was adopted based on the historic North Oaks vision that homes be designed to be part of the land rather than grading a lot to fit a desired home. Staff researched other cities to review how they deal with this issue and found that most cities have general language similar to North Oaks, but the working group did recommend including some language from the City of Gem Lake.

The issue of setbacks has become a source of concern in recent years. Administrator Kress noted that when he speaks with landowners with home taller than 35 feet, most simply design the home to meet the 50 -foot setback regardless of which portion of the home exceeds 35 feet. However, in 2022 a landowner challenged the City ordinance interpretation that when any portion of the home exceeds 35 feet, the home must comply with the 50 -foot setback on the side and rear. The working group felt that the more liberal interpretation was reasonable and directed staff to prepare language that would clarify the intent to only require the larger setback for those portions of the structure that exceed 35 feet in height.

The working group recommended that the language be modified as follows:
(a) The front elevation of the building does not exceed 35 feet in height at any point;
(b) The building height at any other elevation does not exceed 45 feet. Chimneys, weather vanes and the like shall not be counted as an element of building height;
(c) The environmental and topographical conditions of the lot prior to building development or grading are naturally suited to the design of a building with an egress or walkout level. Naturally suited shall be defined as lots that meet at least the following criteria:
i. A lot should meet all current City stormwater regulations;
northoaks@northoaksmn.gov www.northoaksmn.gov
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ii. A house should have a 3-foot minimum elevation difference from the basement finished floor elevation to the groundwater elevation, as determined by a geotechnical engineer by a soils investigation;
iii. A natural slope in the topography prior to any construction, grading or improvements that organically accommodates a home design with an egress or walkout level and no artificial topographical grade change in excess of 6 feet is required or created; and
(G)iv. Any other factors that demonstrate the proposed structure is compatible with the natural condition of the land prior to any construction, grading or improvements;
(d) Buildings shall be limited to a basement and 2 full stories. Finished areas within the roof structure will be considered a full story;
(e) Any time there is athe side or rear elevations of a building that exceeds 35 feet in height and that elevation is within 50 feet of adjacent lot lines, the setback requirement applicable to that part of the structure relative to that lot linebuilding line shall be increased bysetback an additional 2 feet for each foot in height (or portion thereof) above 35 feet. For example, if a portion of a planned structure is 44 feet in height and that portion is less than 50 feet from a side or rear lot line, the 30-foot setback requirement for that side of the structure would be increased by 18 feet to a minimum 48-foot setbackfrom the adjacent setback line for each foot in height above 35 feet; and
(f) Section 151.083 is complied with.

The exhibits below show a home with a $42^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime}$ rear elevation could be placed on different lots:

NorthOaks


Figure 1 - Home with $42^{\prime} 11^{\prime \prime}$ rear elevation


Figure 2 - Entire home complies with 50-foot setback


Figure 3 -Only meets setbacks for taller portion of building


Figure 4 - Illustration of proposed setback requirements
Alternatively, the language could only require the portion above 35 feet to meet the setback, as shown in figure 4. Only the highlighted portion of the language below is different from the language proposed on page 2 of this report:
(g)(a) The front elevation of the building does not exceed 35 feet in height at any point;
(h)(b) The building height at any other elevation does not exceed 45 feet. Chimneys, weather vanes and the like shall not be counted as an element of structure height; The environmental and topographical conditions of the lot prior to building development or grading are naturally suited to the design of a building with an egress or walkout level. Naturally suited shall be defined by lots that meet at least the following criteria:
i. A lot should meet all current City stormwater regulations;
ii. A house should have a 3-foot minimum elevation difference from the basement finished floor elevation to the groundwater elevation, as determined by a geotechnical engineer by a soils investigation;
iii. A natural slope in the topography prior to any construction, grading or improvements that organically accommodates a home design with an egress or walkout level and no artificial topographical grade change in excess of 6 feet is required or created; and (i)iv. Grading is intended to minimal and the house must be designed to fit the natural grades of the site prior to any construction, grading or improvements;
(j)(d) Buildings shall be limited to a basement and 2 full stories. Finished areas within the roof structure will be considered a full story;
(k)(e) Any time any portion of the side or rear elevations of a building exceeds 35 feet in height and that part of the building is within 50 feet of adjacent lot lines, the setback requirement applicable to that part of the structure relative to that lot linebuilding line shall be increased bysetback an additional 2 feet for each foot in height (or portion thereof) above 35 feet. For example, if a portion of a planned structure is 44 feet in height and that portion is less than 50 feet from a side or rear lot line, the 30 -foot setback requirement for that portion of the structure would be increased by 18 feet to a minimum 48-foot setbackfrom the adjacent setback line for each foot in height above 35 feet; and
(H)(f) Section 151.083 is complied with.

## SUMMARY

The purpose of the proposed ordinance amendment is to reduce the number of residents required to apply for a conditional use permit for a garage because the process is expensive and time consuming and is generally approved. The intent is to ensure that the ordinance has standards in place to ensure that the garages are scaled appropriately for the home on site. Does the draft language address those concerns if the questions above are addressed?

The Commission was divided at the last meeting about how setbacks should be applied:
Option 1. If any portion of the building exceeds 35 feet, the entire building must meet the increased setback ( 2 feet for every foot in height) or the 50 -foot structure setback. This is how staff has been applying the code.

Option 2. If a portion of the building exceeds 35 feet feet, that entire elevation must meet the increased setback. This is the language on page 2 of the staff report.

Option 3. If a portion of the building exceeds 35 , that portion of the building must meet the increased setback. That is the highlighted language on this page.

## Attached for reference:

Exhibit A: Summary of other city ordinances
Exhibit B: Research memo from Deb Breen
Exhibit C: 70 West Pleasant Plans

Exhibit D: 38 Catbird Plans
Exhibit E: 9 Sandpiper Plans
Exhibit F: Setback Exhibits

## REQUESTED ACTION

The Planning Commission should review the draft ordinance and provide feedback for staff to make edits to the draft for a potential public hearing at the January meeting.

