

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, 330 CITY HALL
ST PAUL, MINNESOTA, MARCH 13, 2017

Continued from February 13, & February 27, 2017

PRESENT: Mmes. Albert, Maddox, Trout-Oertel and Younkin Viswanathan; Messrs. Rangel Morales, and Miller of the Board of Zoning Appeals; Ms. Skarda, City Attorney; Mr. Westenhofer, Ms. Lane and Ms. Crippen of the Department of Safety and Inspections.

ABSENT: Gloria Bogen*, Thomas Saylor*
Excused*

RECUSED: Kara Younkin Viswanathan

The meeting was chaired by Katrice Albert, Acting Chair.

Nate Golin (#16-067184) 1023 Osceola Avenue: Two variances in order to construct an addition onto Linwood Monroe Arts Plus Lower Campus school building: 1) A building footprint occupying a maximum of 35% of the lot or 28,452 square feet is allowed, the proposed building would occupy 38.5% of the lot or 31,300 square feet for a variance of 3.5% or 2,848 square feet. 2) A building height of 30 feet is allowed, the proposed addition, at three stories, would be constructed to match the height of the existing classroom spaces of 47 feet for a height variance of 17 feet.

Mr. Westenhofer reviewed the case history with a recommendation for approval, subject to the following conditions: 1) The proposed building addition is constructed as shown on the plans submitted with this application. 2) The site development complies with the mitigation plan to complete a traffic study documenting existing traffic volumes and planned operations at the school. 3) Archival photographic documentation must be obtained for the existing building prior to any demolition activities, which must be completed and submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on a Minnesota Architecture-History Form for the site. 4) The finished building be consistent with the design submitted to SHPO by the project proposer's representatives on January 10, 2017.

The public portion of the hearing had been closed at the previous hearing on February 13, 2017.

Ms. Trout-Oertel when the applicant presented this project to the Board in February 13th, he acknowledged that this plan asks staff as well as the neighborhood to ACCEPT certain impediments and compromises. These were Mr. Parent's exact words. So if this project is carried out the end result will not be optimal. One obvious way in which it will not be optimal is that there will not be enough green space and daylight on the site. But that is not the only reason, SPPS's is main reason for moving the Pre-K and fourth grade to Linwood is to make it consistent with the master plan. But the site is too small to make this happen. The fifth grade cannot be brought to this site due to the size of the site. Linwood will still not be consistent with the district's Pre-K through 5 model. If Linwood can't be made consistent with the model, why bring fourth grade to the site, why even bring Pre-K to the site? Why not find a different site altogether since the proposed addition will have a permanent affect on the neighborhood. SPPS acknowledges that things always change within the school district. In fact, Linwood's program is likely to change in the near future as SPPS is hoping to turn the Pre-K into a full day program. If that happens, the proposal before us will not be able to accommodate all the pre-school children at Linwood. The project will be obsolete from the get go. She thinks that we all agree that quality schools are a priority, but she believes that this site is not large enough to accommodate additional students and that SPPS has other options.

Ms. Trout-Oertel moved to deny the variance and resolution based on findings 1, 2, 3, 4 & 6.

The motion failed for lack of a second.

Ms. Maddox moved to approve the variance and resolution based on findings 1 through 6, subject to the following conditions: 1) The proposed building addition is constructed as shown on the plans submitted with this application. 2) The site development complies with the mitigation plan to complete a traffic study documenting existing traffic volumes and planned operations at the school. 3) Archival photographic documentation must be obtained for the existing building prior to any demolition activities, which must be completed and submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on a Minnesota Architecture-History Form for the site. 4) The finished building be consistent with the design submitted to SHPO by the project proposer's representatives on January 10, 2017.

Mr. Miller seconded the motion, which passed on a roll call vote of 4-1(Trout-Oertel) (1 Recused).

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Jerome Benner II

Thomas Saylor, Secretary