

**Excerpt from the
ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING
Community Planning & Economic Development (CPED)**
250 South Fourth Street, Room 300
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1385
(612) 673-3153 Phone
(612) 673-2526 Fax

The following actions were taken by the Zoning Board of Adjustment on October 01, 2015.

Board Members: Sean Cahill, Anja Drescher, John Finlayson, Eric Johannessen, Dan Ogiba, Matt Perry, Dick Sandberg, Jacob Saufley, Ami Thompson

Committee Clerk: Fatimat Porter 612.673.3153

ITEM SUMMARY

Description:

Item #4- 3515 2nd Avenue South (BZZ# 7189, Ward 9) (Janelle Widmeier)

The Department of Community Planning and Economic Development recommends that the Zoning Board of Adjustment adopt staff findings for the applications by White Tree LLC for the property located at 3515 2nd Avenue South:

A. Variance of the drive aisle width requirement.

Action: The Board of Adjustment **denied** the variance to reduce the minimum drive aisle requirement from 12 feet to 11.5 feet.

Aye: Cahill, Finlayson, Johannessen, Perry, Thompson

Nay: Drescher, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley

Motion passed

B. Variance to allow a surface parking space to be located less than 6 feet from habitable space of a dwelling.

Action: The Board of Adjustment **denied** the variance to allow 0 feet of separation between a parking area and habitable space of a dwelling.

Aye: Cahill, Finlayson, Johannessen, Perry, Thompson

Nay: Drescher, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley

Motion passed

C. Variance to reduce the minimum interior side yard requirement.

Action: The Board of Adjustment **denied** the variance to reduce the interior side yard requirement from 5 feet to 0 feet to allow a parking area.

Aye: Cahill, Finlayson, Johannessen, Perry, Thompson

Nay: Drescher, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley

Motion passed

TRANSCRIPTION

Staff Widmeier presented the report.

Chair Perry: Thanks for that presentation Ms. Widmeier. Any questions of staff? Yes Mr. Johannessen.

Board Member Johannessen: Thanks Chair Perry. Just to make sure then, the requirement is then for zero parking because of the proximity to a frequented transit. Is that correct?

Staff Widmeier: Yes, they do qualify for the transit reduction for their proximity to transit.

Board Member Johannessen: Great thanks.

Chair Perry: Any other questions of staff? If you could just take a moment and refresh our memories, when you're talking about grandfather rights; when does a space that has been used for parking how does it retain its grandfather rights? Is it like other uses that have to be used for a certain number of; it can't be not used for a certain number of months or what's the background on that?

Staff Widmeier: Yeah, you have to use it within a certain amount of time. With the parking along the alley, it hasn't been blocked off. So it hasn't lost its function. It's still been usable as a parking area. The other area, where the additional four spaces are proposed, has clearly been used for something else. So there can be no grandfather rights for it because it has been discontinued for over a year.

Chair Perry: Thank you very much. Any other questions of staff? I see none. Thank you very much. Is the applicant present? Yes sir. Would you like to give testimony? Ok, if you could give your name and address for the record please. And just to point out, I think what, you're welcome to talk about whatever you want regarding these variances but the last variance to reduce the minimum front yard requirement, staff is agreeing with you and we haven't really discussed that so you might want to focus on the parking.

Robb Lubenow (3515 2nd Ave S): I'm the new owner, the new proud owner of 3515. As Janelle mentioned this building has been vacant for quite some time. At least eight years. We recently acquired it in the end of May. And immediately we started working on going through the approval process. Actually I think we met with Janelle in early June to talk about the parking in addition to redesign the interior space and bring it back to usable space and not vacant. This exterior design may have had a day in the sun in the 70's but we did, thankfully and thankfully to a lot of the neighbors, bring it back to the original intent; so the stucco Mensa roof came off and we are intending to repair, tuck-point, new façade with an awning as well. Along the side of the building is the area of concern. So there is an existing curb cut with a private alley going down. The neighbor's directly to the south of us have

parking along side of the building. Exactly the same as we wish to install the parking. There is a current easement to allow that. As you can see here parking was run along the side of the building kind of where the dumpster is now. The last one is this is a picture of the property directly to the south of us. Here is the common driveway and it's full. Since we've purchased the property, we've been on site quite a bit and kind of notice some of the constraints and issues with parking. Sometimes we can find a parking spot in front of our building. But given, again, it's the one way alleyway, there's an impact for parking. And ideally we have the opportunity to do something similar and immediately similar to us. And that's what we're applying a variance for. And last one, she mentioned this, and we do have the parking in the back with the handicap space. And we would like to install the four additional spots for the new 12 unit building. It was a nine, nine unit building; it was a boarding house, daycare, kind of murky use previously. And also to note that only the front portion here, is a unit, the back is for mechanicals, storage and laundry space. So being directly up to a habitable unit is only happening in this one case. And they do have access through the front. The other part, just to kind of give you an idea and a context of the site, is the existing conditions (??) the parking immediately on our area. I guess I would say bar none this is the most restrictive area in south Minneapolis has to do with snow emergency routes. Starting from basically Nicollet, on the other side, Nicollet, First, Stevens, Second, Third, it skips Clinton, Fifth are all snow emergency routes. We are right here; this is our property here, in addition to the perpendicular routes of 35th and 36th. So there is in fact, basically from, not only ourselves but other multi families that are prevalent especially on Second, would have to find additional parking somewhere, but given the extent of the snow emergency that could be difficult. And especially if they do limit parking to one side of the street if there is an excess snow. The other thing she mentioned is a one way, so there's no parking on one side of the street directly in front of use. The area that there is, is a bus route and there is additional curb cuts for our neighbor as well, so that also limits parking on site. And then directly in front of the school, located here, is all no parking as well on one side of 35th. So there is an opportunity for parking on site and it is used not just down the road or some other area, it's directly next to us on the building. The other thing that I know it didn't talk about in the report is given the previous uses of the building; we are bringing everything up to code and required to do so. For that we have to have accessible units, so one level, one third of our units are going to be handicap accessible. Something to talk about is having additional parking that's close for those tenants that we intend to have accessible people that need to use those units. It's good to have parking as close as they can to the building; out the front door, out the back, directly by the lift location. So there's also a need within the building, it's a little unique from south Minneapolis with the old buildings. They don't have lifts and they don't have handicap accessibility, so that's something our building has. And yes we have some, but we don't want to limit those just for the units that have accessible parking. The last few things I want to talk about are just points that came up in the report. We did start the process when it was a one to one ratio. One unit requires one spot and we started that prior to the change. I know we're now after that so it alleviates that but there still is a demand and impact for parking on site. We do have three bedroom units; we do have primarily two bedroom units. So given twelve units, admitting

there's going to be more than five cars realistically and those are going to be fighting with other people in the neighborhood for spaces if it's not approved. And the last thing is snow. I know snow was mentioned a couple of times in the report being an issue. I'm not sure if that's implied that our neighbors would just simply put their snow in our lot. But we are working with the property owner directly south of us. They take all their snow off site and we're trying to get cooperation with them to have the same company, simply remove the snow bring off site and not have that issue in the winter months. Finally, support, we do have, I do have two, and we've been able to meet with a lot of neighbors. We like to get involved with as many as we can. A lot of people can't make it today. There were three groups; I see at least two that want to talk in our support. If they get off work, if not, we did meet with the people within one block of us and were able to get 18 signatures in support of it. We do have the formal neighborhood group support. Alondra Cano, local city council member, she is behind us one hundred percent. As far as every adjacent property owner supports what we would like to do with the parking. We do have I think we do have three or four emails that were sent. Ultimately there's an opportunity to allow parking on site given the restrictions the neighborhood is for that. Any questions?

Chair Perry: Thanks for your testimony. Housekeeping note, if you would like to have that included in the public record, you need to give it to the clerk to be included in the public record. Questions of the applicant? Yes, Mr. Saufley.

Board Member Saufley: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for your testimony. I see the property is in a R5 zone. Can you testify to how many apartments or other multifamily units are on that same block? Is it the entirety of the block?

Mr. Lubenow: No its not, I know just north of us there its three single families, kind of right where that bus stop is. Multi family, it is ourselves, the unit directly south of us which is a mirror image of our building. Then there's a single family home but I believe it's used for business, some type of business. And I think there's two or three more multi family. It's probably eight to ten units for the next two buildings. And on the end is a single family.

Board Member Saufley: Ok. Thank you.

Chair Perry: Any other questions? Ms. Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Yes, first thank you for removing that really ugly front. Thank you for doing that.

Mr. Lubenow: It's definitely a honeymoon with the neighbors.

Board Member Thompson: You did well with that. My question is about that one unit on the ground level that would be with those glass block windows, does that unit have access

to other windows that would not be glass block? Or how, can you speak to the impact that would happen to that single unit with the proposed parking?

Mr. Lubenow: Yes, absolutely. So that is the one unit that does have, again the back is the mechanical storage, laundry, but it is that one unit, that has the southern side windows are glass block. So we are a fully sprinkled building with two exit corridors so we, there's actually not a requirement to have operable windows at all. So we have new fresh air, etc. The front of their unit, we have an open floor design. I'm not sure you can see it in the plans but the entire front of their unit that is a kitchen opening up to the living room, yes, those have operable windows. And they can see out. And I guess, their side windows, if they're not looking at our cars, they'll be looking at our neighbors cars.

Chair Perry: Any other questions of the applicant? I have a question. Staff has said that there is no practical difficulty here. And the City has just passed; this is brand spanking new in terms of ordinance, the fact that when you're near a high traffic or transit area, you don't have a requirement for any, not some, but any off street parking for the unit of your size. So, how do you respond to that?

Mr. Lubenow: Yeah, again, it's hopefully not just a timing thing. I know when we started the process it was that one to one. When we got halfway through we were trying to get our building plans submitted and approved so we could start work before the snow collects. During that time frame it changed, it changed, now there are no requirements. We understand that yes, there's a benefit being close to busing, parking. That benefit somewhat slowly gets removed the further you get from downtown or some other cases. That does reduce the impact but given our ownership of other properties in the neighborhood, close by; there is still a need, especially when you get to the two bedrooms and three bedrooms. There's going to be a need and there's going to be cars parked somewhere because of this building coming back. So, yes, the City says that for a lot of cases you don't need parking, and that kind of helps. Yes it helped us to begin the process and it's going to help other buildings as well. But we have an opportunity to provide parking and this was a building that actually used to be where 35W is now. It got moved down to this site. So the difficulty and the hardship is when they moved that building onto our site, it limited what can be done. It is obvious for a few reasons that it's probably used as parking and (??) accessible for both buildings. But it's a condition that's now there, where if we were tearing this down and rebuilding it, yes we could address these issues and you know, have the proper parking, probably all the way in the back. Redo the building so that it's not impactful. But we have a unique situation where it's the building and then also parking that somewhere along the line was on the south side. And we'd like to have that back again because there is going to be a use required by our units.

Chair Perry: Ok. Thanks. I think that's all the questions so thanks very much for your testimony. Is anyone else here who'd like to speak in favor of this application? You guys get to pick the order, and if you could give your name and address for the record.

Ryan Schmid (3504 3rd Ave S): Kitty corner from behind this project. We purchased this home, my wife and I did, about three years ago. And for the first couple of years there I don't know how many times I had to call 311 or the police due to problems with this property. We could never get the previous owner to shovel the sidewalk, let alone, pick up the trash or keep out the transients. So we were very happy when we heard the proposal that this gentleman and his partner were making. They came before the neighborhood board; they were very open with what they were doing. The fact that they are taking this property and making it into something useful and investing in there is important for us. Living in the neighborhood parking is a problem. We have a number of; actually the unit to the north of him on the corner is actually a triplex so there's one more unit there on the corner of 2nd and 35th Street. There's actually a three unit house there. But parking's a problem especially in the winter time with snow emergencies. We have a large number of multi-generational households in the neighborhood and that also means more cars as well. Often when we have people come over, there's no parking on 3rd Street there. So having these units there without the additional parking, while I understand the City's ordinances trying to promote mass transit, for this number of units is impractical because those cars are going to have to park somewhere. So we whole heartedly, my wife and I, whole heartedly support this project going forward. There does need to be additional parking included with this as well. Just wanted to, like I said, we live directly behind them so this is going to impact us as well but given that we would like to see this project go forward along with the parking as well so that it's not an additional impact on the residence.

Chair Perry: Thank you very much. Anyone else who would like to speak in favor of this application? Yes sir, your name and address.

Henry Jimenez (3736 Chicago Ave): The executive director of the neighborhood association.

Chair Perry: Which neighborhood?

Mr. Jimenez: The Central Neighborhood Association which is where the building is located. I'm just here to talk on behalf of the board. The board actually has voted in favor of this parking variance. We don't have the capacity to give them that but those neighbors unanimously decided that they would want to support this project.

Chair Perry: Excuse Mr. Jimenez. Is that something we have in our packet? Did you submit it? So we do not have a copy of that from the neighborhood association? No?

Mr. Jimenez: I have the letter.

Chair Perry: That's fine. I just want to make sure we didn't over look something. I'm sorry for the interruption.

Mr. Jimenez: That's ok. I also do want to say this was one of the top ten priority properties of the neighborhood that they wanted to focus on bringing positive attention to. And I would like to say that we have stopped getting negative phone calls, people are excited about the project. So, we're all happy with what's happening there. And parking was already a problem there.

Chair Perry: May I ask for you to maybe follow up and explain that a little bit more. What do you mean parking was already a problem there?

Mr. Jimenez: I mean just visually, I guess maybe I'm not speaking for the board at this point, just from working in the neighborhood I would say, yeah, when I do canvassing, I already don't necessarily park on Second Avenue sometimes. When I try to go meet with neighbors in that area, it's already bad. Second Avenue is just a difficult street to try to find parking, and which is where the building is located.

Chair Perry: You were referring to Second Avenue, that block in general. Not that particular property.

Mr. Jimenez: I mean that avenue in general yes, but particularly where the building is located.

Chair Perry: Thanks very much for coming down and giving testimony.

Mr. Jimenez: Should I submit the letter to.....

Chair Perry: If you could get that letter so that it could be part of the public record that would be great. Is there anyone else that would like to speak in favor of this application? You want to step up and give your name and address for the record?

Nikki Lambert (3504 3rd Ave S): You heard from my husband a little bit earlier. I just kind of wanted to speak up as well and say, you know this project has been really great. When we first moved in, that structure was dilapidated. It was half boarded up. A lot of times there was evidence someone was trying to break in and squat there or do whatever there. And now it's being cleaned up. We're seeing a lot of junk being taken out of there. You know, it's just so much nicer for the whole neighborhood. And yes, our neighborhood has a parking issue. We have a household where we have a normal sized lot and we have a garage and we only have one car so the car is always in the garage. And when folks come over to visit us, they can't park in front of our house usually, because somebody else is already parked there, because there are just so many cars in the neighborhood because it's a dense neighborhood. A lot of people, our particular block is mostly single family homes, but again, like my husband said multi-generational. A lot of people have two cars in the garage and two cars out front. And you add five or six more cars to the regular residence of the

neighborhood and that's five or six more people that are parking seven, eight, nine blocks away during a snow emergency.

Chair Perry: Thanks for coming down, giving testimony. Anyone else like to speak in favor of the application? I see no one. Is there anyone that would like to speak against this application? I see no one. Let's close the public hearing. Couple of points, I don't think we have any argument on what a great project this is and how it's benefitting the neighborhood. What we have to focus on is the parking and the other variance if people want to discuss that, the front yard, minimum front yard requirement for the canopy. So we need to direct our attention for our discussion. Secondly, whether we agree with it or not, the City has changed not only its policy, but its ordinance and what is required for off street parking for a building of this size. So we can't really debate that as well. And with that, Mr. Cahill.

Board Member Cahill: Thank you Mr. Chair. Chairman, I'm going to have a little bit of different recommendation. I'm going to separate out variance D and recommend staff approval. And grant that at this time.

Board Member Saufley: Second.

Chair Perry: I'm fine with that. So there is a motion and I think I heard Mr. Saufley second that. Is there any discussion on that motion? Which is to approve, I'm going to call variance D, the canopy variance. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, will the clerk please call the roll?

Aye: Cahill, Drescher, Finlayson, Johannessen, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley, Thompson

Motion passed

Chair Perry: Ok, so that variance request is approved to reduce the minimum front yard requirement adjacent to the 2nd Avenue South to allow an awning to extend 3.5 feet from the front of the building. Mr. Cahill.

Board Member Cahill: Thank you Mr. Chair. With regard to that, I will move to the parking variances. With regard to our findings I was struck by the, I do believe there are practical difficulties on this property. I was struck first of all this abuts up against 35W which has limitations. Then on, it's not like a normal block face where you have blocks to the east of you and blocks to the west. It limits significantly access to parking spaces that are in a reasonable distance I think. This is further exacerbated, I think, by the snow emergency. I think that's a realistic issue and difficulty about why we're going to have any vehicles on the property. That is something to consider. Particularly on a property like this which is stuck between two major thoroughfares, two major one ways that are east west corridors for southern Minneapolis. So I do think those practical difficulties exist. However, my difficulty I'm having, hopefully you can answer this for me, is also the intent of the ordinance and

keeping with the Comprehensive Plan. I do have the concern that the City Council's response to this is well that's the point. We don't want to have vehicles here at all. For one it's a market choice and we're essentially focusing our force in the market's hand have folks here who do not have vehicles to live here. I'm not sure that's an appropriate goal but it is the goal that, I do think that is the spirit and intent. So I'm struck by that as saying, there is very much a practical difficulty but this is the scenario exactly that the City Council intended to produce. So I'm having a tough time dealing with that. But I'd like comments from my fellow board members.

Chair Perry: Thanks for the comments on that Mr. Cahill. Anybody else? Ms. Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, to follow up on Mr. Cahill's comments, I kind of feel like there are practical difficulties if there were a requirement for parking. But since there's no requirement for parking, there's no hardship to overcome. And so then we end up discussing, is there a, under what circumstances are there needs for additional parking in certain buildings. And that's already been decided for us, based on the Council and the Zoning laws. So while I could understand the practical difficulties outlined by Board Member Cahill, there's no challenge to overcome. There's no requirement for parking that has to be alleviated.

Chair Perry: Thanks Ms. Thompson. And for the public, so you know, we are not a policy making body. Your council members, the elected officials are the policy making body. What our job is is to take the policy and the ordinances that exist and using legal findings, determine if there is a need for relief from the code. Anybody else would like to comment on this? Mr. Finlayson.

Board Member Finlayson: I have worked in the area over the years and it has been adequately characterized the parking situation is awful. I mean, you know, I end up half a block, a block away sometimes, as Mr. Cahill points out freeways right there. I have a great deal of empathy but I can't figure out how to make it work because the ordinance is there. I essentially have reached the conclusion that any exception to this will be a political exception rather than an exception we can deal with.

Chair Perry: Thanks for those comments Mr. Finlayson. And I think Mr. Saufley would like to speak.

Board Member Saufley: Thank you Mr. Chair. You know I share Board Member Cahill's thoughts that there is a practical difficult here in the neighborhood. I think that the orientation of the streets and the major thoroughfares creates a real parking problem. I think as a multi-family unit you have simply the sheer number of people that are going to be living on this parcel creates a unique situation. And taking a look at that snow emergency map; I mean everyone has to deal with the snow emergency but it's really unusual to see that many streets that are a day one emergency; where at least on that first night

everybody has to bail to find somewhere to move a vehicle. I think that's, I've never lived in a neighborhood myself that has that level of day one snow emergency streets. With respect to finding number two, I guess I feel that the parking ordinance is meant, in part, to not require parking. It doesn't necessarily restrict us from granting a variance to permit more parking. To some extent the market has to dictate how this is going to play out. I think we do have to struggle a little bit to rectify how the ordinance and the intent of the policy behind the ordinance kind of plays into this. I don't think it forecloses us from deciding to increase the amount of parking by variance. I do think it is a reasonable request and I do think it is in keeping with the spirit and intent of other portions of the Comprehensive Plan which is increase density within the city. And I think that would be a real struggle in this neighborhood if more parking was not provided.

Chair Perry: Thanks Mr. Saufley for your comments. Anyone else? Mr. Sandberg then Mr. Johannessen.

Board Member Sandberg: I agree with a lot of what Mr. Saufley said and I usually argue on the other side of this issue about parking. But in this case a number of the practical difficulties related to the location and surrounding infrastructure I think are evident. I think the ordinance that eliminated the requirement for parking was done in order to facilitate development, not to put a, to eliminate the, and I think the fact the ordinance is there does not eliminate those difficulties that have been listed. I think those difficulties are still there. The requirement may not be there but the difficulties are still there. So I think there's still a good opportunity to make an argument that there are practical difficulties in this case, even though it's not required to meet the ordinance. So I think, I think practical difficulties have been identified. I think the reasonableness of this is also been; a pretty good argument has been made for this. I think that this parking arrangement has been shown to work on the neighboring building which is also a unique structure as this one is. So I think it could be made to work and I think it's reasonable to expect that it could. When I first saw this, I thought that the residential units were going to be glass blocked off and accessible for egress. I was against it but with the explanation from the applicant I'm agreeing that this is a reasonable proposal. And I think the arguments that the neighbors have made about this kind of, make a good statement in favor for finding number three. That it will not, this parking will not adversely affect the characteristic of the neighborhood. That the use of this building is going to be an improvement to the neighborhood.

Chair Perry: Thanks for those comments Mr. Sandberg. Anyone else like to weigh in? I'm sorry Mr. Johannessen was in queue.

Board Member Johannessen: Thank you Chairman. I guess I'm torn. I'm happy that it's being renovated, obviously right. I mean everyone once to get rid of dilapidated buildings. But when I count the bedrooms, I get 21 bedrooms. And even if we grant a variance for four additional, that's still only nine spots for 21 people possibly. I'm just not seeing the trade off

to kind of go against what the ordinance say for four spots. Which obviously, I'm sure it would benefit but I just don't see it. And that's my opinion. Thanks.

Chair Perry: Thanks Mr. Johannessen. Ms. Drescher.

Board Member Drescher: I do agree with my fellow Board Member Sandberg wholeheartedly. Actually, there are practical difficulties with the parking as already very much expressed. Also, in regards to two, the second finding, window openings, that was a really big concern as well too. Like a lower level floor and it's not a great apartment and the quality of so, but that has been solved. Thank you for the explanation. Also, you demonstrated you do have a snow removal plan in works. That was another great concern of course. So, I actually am in favor to granting the variances.

Chair Perry: Thanks for those comments. Anyone else? Mr. Ogiba.

Board Member Ogiba: Thank you Chair Perry, my fellow Board Members Sandberg and Drescher said better than what I can say. And I'm in full support of their comments.

Chair Perry: I think everybody has weighed in. Is there a motion anybody would like to make? I'll say this. I think between, I'll check with staff. Have you heard the findings for the three findings that we have to find for?

Staff Widmeier: Yes, all three findings have been covered.

Chair Perry: I did too. That's not to say that I agree with them. But I understand that they're out there. With that, I think someone could just make a motion and since these variances are all interdependent, I would suggest we just make a motion for or against all three.

Board Member Sandberg: I move. I move approval of the variances as requested.

Chair Perry: So what I'm calling variance A, B and C.

Board Member Sandberg: Right.

Board Member Ogiba: Second

Chair Perry: And Mr. Ogiba seconded that. Any further discussion? Will the clerk please call the roll? If you're voting yes, what that means is that you're voting to grant the variances as requested.

Aye: Drescher, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley

Nay: Cahill, Finlayson, Johannessen, Perry, Thompson

Motion failed 4-5

Chair Perry: So there's a tie. And that means that I vote and I am voting no as well. The City, whether I agree or not agree with the City's ruling on, latest change to parking requirements, the policy is there. As Ms. Thompson has pointed out, there really is no practical difficulty to get over because the variances exist as it is. So with that, the motion fails and I will entertain a motion from someone in the opposition. Ms. Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: I move staff findings.

Board Member Cahill: Second.

Chair Perry: There's a motion and a second. Cahill seconded it that. Thompson moved. Any further discussion? Will the clerk please call the roll?

A. Variance of the drive aisle width requirement.

Action: The Board of Adjustment **denied** the variance to reduce the minimum drive aisle requirement from 12 feet to 11.5 feet.

Aye: Cahill, Finlayson, Johannessen, Perry, Thompson

Nay: Drescher, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley

Motion passed

B. Variance to allow a surface parking space to be located less than 6 feet from habitable space of a dwelling.

Action: The Board of Adjustment **denied** the variance to allow 0 feet of separation between a parking area and habitable space of a dwelling.

Aye: Cahill, Finlayson, Johannessen, Perry, Thompson

Nay: Drescher, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley

Motion passed

C. Variance to reduce the minimum interior side yard requirement.

Action: The Board of Adjustment **denied** the variance to reduce the interior side yard requirement from 5 feet to 0 feet to allow a parking area.

Aye: Cahill, Finlayson, Johannessen, Perry, Thompson

Nay: Drescher, Ogiba, Sandberg, Saufley

Motion passed