

MISSION STATEMENT: “The City of Mound, through teamwork and cooperation, provides, at a reasonable cost, quality services that respond to the needs of all citizens, fostering a safe, attractive and flourishing community.”

**MOUND PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 2025, 6:00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MOUND CENTENNIAL BUILDING
5341 MAYWOOD ROAD, MOUND, MN**

- 1. Call to Order**
- 2. Roll Call**
- 3. Review and approval of agenda, including any amendments**
- 4. Review and action**
 - A. August 19, 2025 special/rescheduled meeting minutes 1
- 5. Board of Adjustment and Appeals**
 - A. Review/recommendation – Planning Case No. 25-09 3
Variance – Second Driveway/Apron
1705 Baywood Shores Drive
Applicants: Rodney and Kathleen Thyr
 - B. Review/recommendation – Planning Case No. 25-10 16
Expansion Permit – Deck (Portion) Conversion to Screen Porch
1765 Jones Lane
Applicant: Steve Hanson on behalf of Steve Chase
- 6. Old / New Business**
 - A. City Council Liaison and Staff Project Update / Report
 - B. Next Meeting - Tues., October 7, 2025 Regular Meeting
6:00 p.m.
- 7. Information Items - None**
- 8. Adjourn**

The Planning Commission is an advisory body to the City Council. One of the Commission’s functions is to hold public hearings and make recommendations to the City Council. The City Council makes all final decisions on these matters. Mound City Ordinances require that certain documents and information be included in applications. The Planning Commission may postpone consideration of an application that is incomplete and may for other reasons postpone final action on an application. For each agenda item the Commission will receive reports prepared by the City staff, open the hearing to the public, and discuss the action on the application.”

QUESTIONS: Call Sarah Smith at 952-472-0604

MEETING MINUTES
SPECIAL/RESCHEDULED PLANNING COMMISSION
AUGUST 19, 2025

1. Call to Order

Chair Goode called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call

Members present: David Goode, Sheri Wallace, Jason Baker, Drew Heal, Samantha Wacker,
Kristin Young and Kathy McEnaney

Members absent: Nick Rosener

Staff present: Rita Trapp, Sarah Smith, Sarah Lenz

Others present: Doug Cutting, 4550 West 77th St Suite 190, Edina, MN 55435

3. Review and approval of agenda, including any amendments

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Heal, to approve the agenda. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

4. Review and action

A. July 1, 2025 regular meeting minutes

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Wallace, to approve the July 1, 2025 meeting minutes. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

5. Board of Adjustment and Appeals

A. Review/recommendation – Planning Case No. 25-07

Bluff Variance – construction of new/replacement home

3343 Warner Lane

Applicant: Greenwood Design Build on behalf of Tiffany Winter (Beitler)

Trapp presented a summary overview of the bluff variance request showing graphics of the topography and explaining the nonconforming setbacks of the existing house. The existing house is a single-family home that sits within the northern bluff impact zone and has a deck within the western bluff impact zone. The proposed house will not change use and will improve nonconformities by removing the deck that impacts the western bluff and improve the front and side yard setbacks. Trapp mentioned the AC unit will need to be addressed as it encroaches 3.2 feet into the side yard setback but is only allowed 2 feet. Other measurements appear to be conforming and will be verified during the building permit process.

McEnaney asked when the house was built and if the applicant will be taking residence or putting the home up for sale. The house was built in 1920 and Cutting replied the family will be taking residence.

Doug Cutting, owner of Greenwood Design Build, introduced himself and discussed the main focus is on the north bluff impact zone. Cutting explained there is no way to tear down and rebuild a home without impacting the north bluff but improvements to the existing encroachments can be made which were presented by Staff.

Staff believes this is a reasonable request with favorable setback improvements. Staff recommends approval with five conditions and four findings of fact.

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Wallace, to approve Planning Case 25-07 with Staff recommendation.

MOTION passed unanimously.

Goode asked when this request is expected to go to the City Council. Smith replied it is expected to be presented August 26, 2025.

6. Old / New Business

A. 2025 Planning Commission Term Expirations

Smith said Staff has heard from Wallace and Young but there is still one vacant seat. Smith said the City Attorney is working on an amended policy and reducing the number of Commission members.

B. City Council Liaison and Staff Project Update / Report

McEnaney stated that the LID discussed at the last Council Meeting did not pass but is currently in a grace period. McEnaney also addressed the recent Council workshop about parks expressing concern that some of the information presented may have been misguided. The purpose of the workshop was to explore whether certain parks could be sold or repurposed to improve the parks or maintain a manageable workload for City Parks staff.

Wallace mentioned storm water run-off being the number one pollutant of the lakes and brought up the possibility of turning these spaces into an area where water can be diverted to.

McEnaney said the workshop didn't get very far in discussion but that would be the type of topic that could be discussed in future workshops to try to create long-term goals. Discussion ensued about how information spread prior to the Council workshop.

McEnaney announced the new online payment platform for utility billing, InvoiceCloud, has launched and on Saturday, August 23, 2025 the Westonka Community Food Shelf Benefit Concert is taking place at Back Channel Brewing.

Smith said Staff continues to stay busy with building permits, property inquiries and working on the budget. The annual Incredible Festival is coming up and Mama's Happy was approved to have a fall festival.

Baker asked if there have been any approvals for the proposed restaurant on Commerce. Smith replied they were last working on getting their SAC numbers figured out but there have been no further updates.

C. Next Meeting - Tues., September 2, 2025 Regular Meeting 6:00 p.m.

The next Planning Commission meeting will be held Tuesday, September 2, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

7. Information Items

Wallace mentioned there is a blood shortage and said Memorial Blood Center is having a blood drive at Back Channel Brewing on Thursday, August 21, 2025.

8. Adjourn

MOTION by Baker, seconded by Wallace, to adjourn at 6:27 p.m. **MOTION** passed unanimously.

Submitted by Sarah Lenz



PLANNING REPORT

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Sarah Smith, Community Development Director
DATE: August 28, 2025
SUBJECT: Review of Variance Request - Second Driveway Apron
PLANNING CASE: 25-09
APPLICANT: Rodney and Kathleen Thyr
LOCATION: 1705 Baywood Shores Drive
MEETING DATE: September 2, 2025
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Low Density Residential
ZONING: R-1 Single Family Residential

BACKGROUND

Rodney and Kathleen Thyr, the property owners at 1705 Baywood Shores Drive, have submitted a variance application requesting approval for a second driveway apron at 1705 Baywood Shores Drive. Mound City Code Sec. 129-198 (b) states as follows:

(b) The number and types of access drives onto major streets shall be limited to a single access unless approved by the city engineer.

VARIANCE

City Code Section 129-40 (a) states that a variance may be granted to provide relief to a landowner where the application of the City Code imposes practical difficulty for the property owner.

- (1) The variance proposed meets the criteria for Practical Difficulties as defined in City Code Sub. 129-2.
- (2) Granting of the variance requested will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this chapter to owners of other lands, structures or buildings in the same district nor be materially detrimental to property within the same zone.
- (3) The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty.
- (4) A variance shall only be permitted when it is in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the zoning ordinance and when the terms of the variance are

consistent with the comprehensive plan.

According to City Code Sec. 129-2, "*Practical Difficulties*" is defined as follows:

Practical Difficulties, as used in conjunction with a variance, means that:

- (i) The property owner proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by the zoning ordinance; and
- (ii) The plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property including unusual lot size or shape, topography or other circumstances not created by the landowner; and
- (iii) The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality.

Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties. Practical difficulties include, but are not limited to, inadequate access to direct sunlight for solar energy systems

TIMELINE FOR DECISION

Pursuant to Minnesota State Statutes Section 15.99, local government agencies are required to approve or deny land use requests within 60 days. Within the 60-day period, an automatic extension of no more than 60 days can be obtained by providing the applicant written notice containing the reason for the extension and specifying how much additional time is needed. For the purpose of Minnesota Statutes Section 15.99, "Day 1" is determined to be August 1, 2025 provided by Minnesota Statutes Section 645.15. The review period can be extended by the City for an additional 60 days.

NOTIFICATION

Neighbors in the vicinity of the property at 1705 Baywood Shores Drive, per Hennepin County property information website, were mailed a letter on August 27, 2025, to inform them of the Planning Commission's review of the application at its September 2nd regular meeting. Members are advised that as part of the application materials submitted for the variance, the applicants provided a form, signed by neighboring property owners, expressing support for the variance which has been included.

DISCUSSION

1. The existing home at 1705 Baywood Shores Drive was constructed in 1984. The property, which is zoned R-1, is a corner lot with improved road frontage on both Three Points Boulevard and Baywood Shores Drive and is a lot of record. A variance was approved in 2001 for deck construction on the Three Points Boulevard (north) side of the home. As the request involves an existing condition on the property, Staff did not require the survey to be updated for the variance request. Applicant is advised that the City reserves the right to require an updated survey.
2. The property owners requested to have a driveway apron constructed by a concrete contractor, however, the project was not authorized as the City Code does not allow a second access.
3. There is an existing Class 5 area on the property north of the house that extends to the rear of the property previously constructed and used for storage. The variance for the second access is being requested to prevent damage to vehicles/trailers from driving over the curb according to information in the submitted application.
4. There is standard concrete curb on Baywood Shores Drive fronting the property and the curb is painted yellow (no parking) in the vicinity of the proposed new apron.
5. Per code, minimum driveway width is 10 feet and maximum width is 24 feet. Driveways must be a hard surface as approved by the City Engineer and located 1 foot from side/rear lot lines.
6. Maximum allowed impervious surface coverage on the property is 40%. A hardcover calculation sheet was submitted with the variance materials. Based on available survey and Hennepin County GIS information, Staff's evaluation is that hardcover is under the 40 percent allowance.

STAFF/CONSULTANT/DEPARTMENT/AGENCIES REVIEW

Copies of the request and supporting materials were forwarded to involved departments, consultants, and public agencies for review and comment. Please see letter from the City Engineer dated August 27, 2025 included as an attachment.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend City Council denial of the variance request for the second driveway apron at 1705 Baywood Shores Drive, based on the following findings of fact:

1. The criteria in City Code Sec.129-40(a) Variances are not met.

2. The proposed second driveway is not reasonable because the proposed location is hazardous for vehicular traffic heading eastbound on Three Point Boulevard and turning south onto Baywood Shores Drive, there is limited visibility for vehicles exiting the property, and the potential use of backing trailers on to or from Baywood Shores Drive is an unsafe practice based on heavy traffic volume.
3. There are less hazardous alternatives to allow for trailer traffic.
4. The City Engineer in his letter dated August 27, 2025 does not recommend approval of the proposed second driveway entrance.

CITY COUNCIL REVIEW

In the event a recommendation for the variance is received from the Planning Commission at its September 2nd meeting, the application will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at an upcoming meeting with tentative dates of Tues., September 9, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. or Tues., September 23, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

August 27, 2025

Sarah Smith, Community Development Director
City of Mound
2415 Wilshire Boulevard
Mound, MN 55364

RE: 1705 Baywood Shores Drive Second Driveway Request

Dear Ms. Smith:

I have reviewed the variance application and existing conditions for a second driveway entrance for 1705 Baywood Shores Drive. For the following reasons, I would not recommend approval:

- The proposed second location is on the inside corner of Three Points Boulevard and Baywood Shores Drive. Three Points Boulevard is a collector roadway with over 3,000 vehicle trips per day.
- This location is hazardous for vehicles heading eastbound on Three Points Boulevard and turning right (south) onto Baywood Shores Drive and potentially unable to see a vehicle pulling out of the added driveway.
- Resident pulling out of the added driveway also have limited visibility to see above mentioned traffic.
- As currently used, the second drive is for trailer storage. Indicating the trailer units are potentially backed up from Three Points Boulevard, which is an unsafe practice with the heavy volume of traffic.
 - Backing of trailer units onto the driveway as currently laid out indicates the pulling vehicle would need to encroach onto Three Points Boulevard and potentially stop any eastbound traffic.

The safer alternative is to reroute the trailer storage driveway to the current driveway entrance, which is farther south on Baywood Shores Drive. The existing access is safer because it provides more site distance and time for other approaching vehicles to see any backing maneuvers and react. It also will ensure all backing maneuvers are entirely on Baywood Shores Drive.

Sincerely,

Bolton & Menk, Inc.



Matthew S. Bauman, P.E.

City Engineer



2415 Wilshire Boulevard, Mound, MN 55364
Phone 952-472-0600 FAX 952-472-0620

VARIANCE APPLICATION

Application Fee and Escrow Deposit required at time of application.

Planning Commission Date 9/2/25 Case No. 25-09
City Council Date 9/6/25 or 9/23/25 (tentative)

Please type or print legibly

SUBJECT PROPERTY LEGAL DESC.	Address <u>1705 Baywood Shores Dr Mound</u>		
	Lot <u>006</u>		Block <u>005</u>
	Subdivision <u>Replat Harrison Shores</u>		
	PID # <u>13-117-24 22 0054</u> Zoning: R1 R1A R2 R3 B1 B2 B3 (Circle one)		
PROPERTY OWNER	Name <u>Rodney J Thyr</u> Email <u>k " "</u>		<u>1</u>
	Address <u>1705 Baywood Shores Dr</u>		
	Phone Home <u>6</u>	Work <u>21</u>	Fax <u>2</u>
APPLICANT (IF OTHER THAN OWNER)	Name <u>SAME</u> Email _____		
	Address _____		
	Phone Home _____	Work _____	Fax _____

1. Has an application ever been made for zoning, variance, conditional use permit, or other zoning procedure for this property? Yes () No (x). If yes, list date(s) of application, action taken, resolution number(s) and provide copies of resolutions.

2. Detailed description of proposed construction or alteration (size, number of stories, type of use, etc.):

Homeowner needs/wants a 2nd driveway apron/approach
on property site

3. Do the existing structures comply with all area, height, bulk, and setback regulations for the zoning district in which it is located? Yes (☒) No (). If no, specify each non-conforming use (describe reason for variance request, i.e. setback, lot area, etc.):

SETBACKS:	REQUIRED	REQUESTED (or existing)	VARIANCE
Front Yard: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Side Yard: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Side Yard: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Rear Yard: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Lakeside: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
_____: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Street Frontage:	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Lot Size:	_____ sq ft	_____ sq ft	_____ sq ft
Hardcover:	_____ sq ft	_____ sq ft	_____ sq ft

4. Does the present use of the property conform to all regulations for the zoning district in which it is located? Yes (☒) No (). If no, specify each non-conforming use:

5. Which unique physical characteristics of the subject property prevent its reasonable use for any of the uses permitted in that zoning district?

- | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| () too narrow | () topography | () soil |
| () too small | () drainage | (<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>) existing situation |
| () too shallow | () shape | () other: specify |

Please describe: the city of mound & Street dept of Mound have painted this curb area yellow/No parking - this is due to my driveway & my neighbors driveway. But I need to drive over a curb with vehicles & trailers. Causing damage to my personal property.

6. Was the practical difficulty described above created by the action of anyone having property interests in the land after the zoning ordinance was adopted (1982)? Yes (), No (☒). If yes, explain:

7. Was the practical difficulty created by any other human-made change, such as the relocation of a road? Yes (), No (☒). If yes, explain:


8. Are the conditions of practical difficulty for which you request a variance peculiar only to the property described in this petition? Yes (☒) , No (). If no, list some other properties which are similarly affected?

9. Comments: See attached picture + Signatures of neighbors indicating their approval of this Variance.

There are SEVERAL homes near me with 2 driveways that have been built or added since 1994. There is an old city ordinance against attached garages - this is not followed - obviously.

I certify that all of the above statements and the statements contained in any required papers or plans to be submitted herewith are true and accurate. I acknowledge that I have read all of the variance information provided. I consent to the entry in or upon the premises described in this application by any authorized official of the City of Mound for the purpose of inspecting, or of posting, maintaining and removing such notices as may be required by law.

Owner's Signature


Date 7-29-2025

Applicant's Signature


Date 7-29-2025

July 29, 2025


**Request for Variance to install a second driveway approach/apron for private residence at 1705 Baywood Shores Dr, Mound, MN 55364
Owners Rodney J & Kathleen M Thyr.**

To whom it may concern, the following neighbors for the property listed above owned by Rodney and Kathleen Thyr have our support/permission to be granted a Variance from the City of Mound for a second approach/driveway.

Today's status, as shown in the picture below, does not allow parking at that curb site, as the City of Mound already has recognized that the driveway already exists-hence the yellow curbing.

Name/Address Dustin/Wendy Timmons 5308 Three Points Blvd Mound MN 55364

Signature



Name/Address Walter Baker 5300 Three Points Blvd Mound MN 55364

Signature



Name/Address Chad Johnson 5260 Three Points Blvd Mound MN 55364

Signature



Name/Address Suzanne & Jameson Smieja 1700 Baywood Shores Dr Mound MN 55364

Signature



Name/Address Leeann & Thomas Kelly 1712 Baywood Shores Dr Mound MN 55364

Signature



Name/Address Byron & Kay Nelson 1770 Baywood Shores Dr Mound MN 55364

Signature Kay Nelson

Name/Address James & Ruthann Shull 1724 Baywood Shores Dr Mound MN 55364

Signature James Shull


Name/Address Mark & Elizabeth Schneider 5317 Baywood Shores Dr Mound MN 55364

Signature Elizabeth Schneider

Name/Address John & Patricia Tombers 1736 Baywood Shores Dr Mound MN 55364

John Tombers

Signature _____





HARDCOVER CALCULATIONS

(IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE)

PROPERTY ADDRESS:	1705 Baywood Shores Dr
OWNER'S NAME:	Rodney J & Kathleen M Thyr

LOT AREA _____ SQ. FT. X 30% = (for all lots) 12553

LOT AREA _____ SQ. FT. X 40% = (for Lots of Record)

* Existing Lots of Record may have 40 percent coverage provided that techniques are utilized, as outlined in Zoning Ordinance Section 129-385 (see back). A plan must be submitted and approved by the Building Official.

	LENGTH		WIDTH		SQ FT	
HOUSE	_____	X	_____	=	_____	<u>Total</u>
	_____	X	_____	=	_____	
TOTAL HOUSE					
DETACHED BUILDINGS (GARAGE/SHED)	_____	X	_____	=	_____	<u>100</u>
	<u>10</u>	X	<u>10</u>	=	<u>100</u>	
TOTAL DETACHED BUILDINGS					
DRIVEWAY, PARKING AREAS, SIDEWALKS, ETC.	<u>17</u>	X	<u>22</u>	=	_____	<u>374</u>
	_____	X	_____	=	_____	
	_____	X	_____	=	_____	
TOTAL DRIVEWAY, ETC					<u>240</u>
DECKS Open decks (1/4" min. Opening between boards) with a pervious surface under are not counted as hardcover.	<u>12</u>	X	<u>20</u>	=	_____	<u>240</u>
	_____	X	_____	=	_____	
	_____	X	_____	=	_____	
TOTAL DECK					
	_____	X	_____	=	_____	
	_____	X	_____	=	_____	
TOTAL OTHER					
TOTAL HARDCOVER / IMPERVIOUS SURFACE.....						1946
UNDER / OVER (indicate difference)						
PREPARED BY	<u>Kathleen Thyr</u>					DATE <u>7-31-2025</u>

LOT SURVEYS COMPANY, INC.

LAND SURVEYORS

REGISTERED UNDER LAWS OF STATE OF MINNESOTA

7601 - 73rd Avenue North

560-3093

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55428

Surveyors Certificate

INVOICE NO. 11680
F. B. NO. 218-49
SCALE 1" = 20'
0 - DENOTES IRON


LUTTERMAN HOMES



THREE POINTS BLVD.

Concrete

Walk



□ Denotes Wood Hub Set
For Excavation Only

□ Denotes Proposed Elevation

→ Denotes Surface Drainage

Lot 1, Block 7, REPLAT OF
HARRISON SHORES

Top of Block

951.1

Garage Floor Elevation

950.6

Lowest Most Floor Elevation

949.8

Signed

Raymond A. Prasch

Raymond A. Prasch, Minn. Reg. No. 6743

MEH

We hereby certify that this is a true and correct representation of a survey
of the boundaries of the above described land and the location of all build-
ings and visible encroachments, if any, from or on said land.

Surveyed by us this 4th day of May 19 83



PLANNING REPORT

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Sarah Smith, Community Development Director
DATE: August 28, 2025
SUBJECT: Review of Expansion Permit Request – Deck Conversion to Screen Porch
APPLICANT: Steve Hanson on behalf of owner Steve Chase
PLANNING CASE: 25-10
LOCATION: 1765 Jones Lane
MEETING DATE: September 2, 2025
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: Low Density Residential
ZONING: R-1 Single Family Residential

SUMMARY

Steve Hanson, on behalf of property owner Steve Chase, has submitted an expansion permit requesting approval to allow conversion of a portion of the existing front deck to a 10' x 14' screen porch at 1765 Jones Lane.

REVIEW PROCEDURE

Criteria

The expansion permit regulations are found in City Code Sec. 129-41. A major or minor expansion permit for a nonconforming structure may be issued, but is not mandated, to provide relief to the landowner where this chapter imposes practical difficulties to the property owner in the reasonable use of the land. In determining whether practical difficulties exist, the applicant must demonstrate that the following criteria exist:

1. The proposed expansion is a reasonable use of the property considering:
 - (a) Function and aesthetics of the expansion.
 - (b) Absence of adverse off-site impacts such as from traffic, noise, odors and dust.
 - (c) Adequacy of off-street parking.
2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances justifying the expansion are unique to the property and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of the property since enactment of this chapter have had no control.

3. The exceptional or extraordinary circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant.
4. The expansion would not adversely affect or alter the essential character of the neighborhood.
5. The expansion requested is the minimum needed.

60-Day Land Use Application Review Process

Pursuant to Minnesota State Statutes Section 15.99, local government agencies are required to approve or deny land use requests within 60 days. Within the 60-day period, an automatic extension of no more than 60 days can be obtained by providing the applicant written notice containing the reason for the extension and specifying how much additional time is needed. For the purpose of Minnesota Statutes Section 15.99, "Day 1" is determined to be August 26, 2025 as provided by Minnesota Statutes Section 645.15. The review period can be extended by the City for an additional 60 days.

NOTIFICATION

Neighboring property owners of the subject site, per Hennepin County property information website, were mailed a letter on August 27, 2025 to inform them of the Planning Commission's review of the application at its September 2nd meeting.

STAFF / CONSULTANT / AGENCY / UTILITIES REVIEW

Copies of the request and supporting materials were forwarded to involved departments, consultants, agencies and private utilities for review and comment. As of the preparation of the packet no comments have been received.

DISCUSSION

1. The property is an R-1, non-lakeshore lot of record and the house was constructed in 1975. The existing deck, located on the front of the house, has a nonconforming 28-foot setback and received a 2-foot front yard setback variance in 1996. Per City Code Sec. 129-100, a 30-foot front setback is required. The current proposal includes construction of a screened porch within a portion of the deck on the west side. The existing front setback does not change with the proposal. Side setbacks are being met. As the proposal is for conversion of the existing deck footprint that received variance approval, the new screen porch was shown in a site plan from the applicant and deemed suitable.
2. Maximum allowed impervious surface coverage is 40%. Applicant information is that hardcover on the property is under the 40 percent allowance by 1,407 square feet.
3. Eaves for the screen porch do not exceed 2 feet per information from the applicant which meets the code requirement.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend City Council approval of the expansion permit for the proposed conversion of a portion of the existing deck to a screen porch at 1765 Jones Lane, subject to the following list of conditions:

1. No future approval of any development plans and/or building permits is included as part of this action in the event the expansion permit is approved.
2. Applicant shall be responsible for procurement of any and/or all local or public agency permits including, but not limited to, the submittal of all required information prior to building permit issuance.
3. The applicant shall be responsible for fees incurred with the application.
4. The applicant is responsible for recording the resolution with Hennepin County. The applicant is advised that the resolution will not be released for recording until all conditions have been met. The applicant may also direct the City to record the resolution with the fees to be taken out of the escrow.
5. No building permit will be issued until evidence of recording of the resolution at Hennepin County is provided unless an escrow of sufficient amount is on file with the City.
6. Additional conditions from Staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council.

In recommending approval of the subdivision, Staff offers the following findings:

1. The criteria of City Code Sec. 129-41 Expansion Permit are being met.
2. The proposed expansion is a reasonable use of the property. The expansion will be in keeping with the character and aesthetics of the area.
3. The existing deck received variance approval in 1996. The current proposal to convert a portion of the existing deck to a screened porch does not change the current setback.
4. The expansion permit is being minimized as only a portion of the existing deck is being converted to a screen porch.

CITY COUNCIL REVIEW

In the event a recommendation for the expansion permit is received from the Planning Commission at its September 2nd meeting, the application will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration at an upcoming meeting with tentative dates of Tues., September 9, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. or Tues., September 23, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

ATT Sarah Smith
I emailed the digital
copies of this.



EXPANSION PERMIT APPLICATION

2415 Wilshire Boulevard, Mound, MN 55364 Phone
952-472-0600 FAX 952-472-0620



Application Fee and Escrow Deposit required at time of application.

Case No. _____

Please type or print legibly

SUBJECT PROPERTY LEGAL DESC.	Address <u>1765 Jones Lane</u>	
	Lot <u>5</u> , <u>Re plat of Harrison Shores</u>	Block <u>1</u>
	Subdivision <u>Re plat of Harrison Shores</u>	
	PID # <u>13-117-2422-0030</u> Zoning <u>R1</u> R1A R2 R3 B1 B2 B3 (Circle one)	
PROPERTY OWNER	Name <u>Steve Chase</u> Email _____	
	Address <u>1765 Jones Ln.</u>	
	Phone Home _____	Work _____ Fax _____
APPLICANT (IF OTHER THAN OWNER)	Name <u>Steve Hansen H&H Homes</u> Email _____	
	Address <u>5723 KIPLING AVE, MTKA, MN 55345</u>	
	Phone Home _____	Work <u>SAME</u> Fax _____

1. Has an application ever been made for zoning, variance, conditional use permit, or other zoning procedure for this property? Yes (X) No (). If yes, list date(s) of application, action taken, resolution number(s) and provide copies of resolutions.

Front setback from 30 to 28' + because of existing deck

2. Detailed description of proposed construction or alteration (size, number of stories, type of use, etc.):

10' x 14' screen porch above existing deck

Case No. _____

3. Please complete the following information related to the property and building's conformity with the zoning regulations for the district in which it is located including the expansion permit request.

SETBACKS:	REQUIRED	REQUESTED (or existing)	EXPANSION
Front Yard: (N S E W)	<u>28'</u> ft.	_____ ft.	<u>0</u> ft.
Side Yard: (N S E W)	<u>20</u> ft.	_____ ft.	<u>0</u> ft.
Side Yard: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Rear Yard: (N S E W)	<u>11</u> ft.	_____ ft.	<u>0</u> ft.
Lakeside: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
_____: (N S E W)	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Street Frontage:	_____ ft.	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Lot Size:	<u>13585</u> sq ft	_____ sq ft	_____ sq ft
Hardcover:	<u>3616</u> sq ft	_____ sq ft	<u>0</u> sq ft

4. Does the present **use** of the property conform to all regulations for the zoning district in which it is located? Yes ☒, No (). If no, specify each non-conformity:

5. Are there exceptional or extraordinary circumstances justifying the expansion unique to the property such as lot size or shape, topography or other circumstances over which the owners of the property since enactment of this chapter have no control? Please check all that apply:

() too narrow
() too small

() topography
() drainage

() soil
() existing situation

() too shallow

(X) shape

() other: specify

Please describe: NO Expansion, staying within existing aproved
boundries according to 1996 variance case #96-59

Case No. _____

6. Were the exceptional or extraordinary circumstances described above created by the action of anyone having property interests in the land after the zoning ordinance was adopted (1982)? Yes (), No (X). If yes, explain:


7. Were the exceptional or extraordinary circumstances created by any other person-made change, such as the relocation of a road? Yes (), No (X). If yes, explain:

8. Are the exceptional or extraordinary circumstances for which you request an expansion permit peculiar only to the property described in this petition? Yes (), No (). If no, list some other properties which are similarly affected?

Going to BUILD ABOVE EXISTING deck, VIEWS are not
affected, setbacks are not encroached,

9. Comments: _____

I certify that all of the above statements and the statements contained in any required papers or plans to be submitted herewith are true and accurate. I acknowledge that I have read all of the variance information provided. I consent to the entry in or upon the premises described in this application by any authorized official of the City of Mound for the purpose of inspecting, or of posting, maintaining and removing such notices as may be required by law.

Owner's Signature  Date _____

Applicant's Signature Steve Hansen Date 8-23-25



HARDCOVER CALCULATIONS

(IMPERVIOUS SURFACE COVERAGE)

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 1765 Jones Lane
OWNER'S NAME: Steve & Mary Chase

LOT AREA _____	SQ. FT. X 30% = (for all lots)	
LOT AREA 13585	SQ. FT. X 40% = (for Lots of Record) 5434	5434


* Existing Lots of Record may have 40 percent coverage provided that techniques are utilized, as outlined in Zoning Ordinance Section 129-385 (see back). A plan must be submitted and approved by the Building Official.

	LENGTH		WIDTH		SQ FT	
HOUSE	24	X	54	=	1296	
	20	X	26	=	520	
	TOTAL HOUSE 1816					1816
DETACHED BUILDINGS (GARAGE/SHED)	8	X	10	=		
		X		=		
	TOTAL DETACHED BUILDINGS 80					80
DRIVEWAY, PARKING AREAS, SIDEWALKS, ETC.	55	X	20	=	1100	
	55	X	11	=	605	
	5	X	10	=	50	
	TOTAL DRIVEWAY, ETC 1755					1755
DECKS Open decks (1/4" min. Opening between boards) with a pervious surface under are not counted as hardcover.	16	X	10	=	160	
		X		=		
		X		=		
	TOTAL DECK 160					160
	12	X	18	=	216	
		X		=		
	TOTAL OTHER 216					216
TOTAL HARDCOVER / IMPERVIOUS SURFACE 4027						4027

UNDER / OVER (indicate difference)	-1407
------------------------------------------	-------

PREPARED BY Steve Hansen	DATE 8/25
--------------------------	-----------

PLAT OF PART OF
 LOT 5, T12N, R12E, S12E, of Section 36, Township 12 North, Range 12 East, of
 Iron County, Minnesota



Certificate of Survey:

I hereby certify that this
 is a true and correct representation of a survey of the land
 of Lot 5, Township 12 North, Range 12 East, of Section 36, Township 12 North, Range 12 East, of
 to show the proposed improvements, but does not show the pro-
 posed location of a proposed building.

Witness my hand and seal
 this 1st day of June, 1914
 at Iron County, Minnesota

Gordon R. Coffin
 Gordon R. Coffin, Register
 Iron County, Minnesota

FLOOR PLAN

SCALE 1/2" = 1'-0"

EXISTING HOUSE

EXISTING SLIDING DR
EXISTING 2-2X10 HEADER

FIREPLACE
FIREPLACE FOOTING

24" EXISTING WALL EXTENTION

24" 8" BLOCK FOOTING 3'-0" DEEP

BEAM
POST
BEARING
3"
TO FOUNDATION

4X4 2X8 RAFTER #1

2-2X10 RIDGE BEAM
WITH 1 1/2" SPACING

2X8 RAFTER #2

2X6 RAFTER TIE

CROSS SECTION
2X8 RAFTER #3

2X8 RAFTER #4

54" CEMENT
FAN MOUNTED
TO RIDGE BEAM

SCREEN DR

2X8 RAFTER #5

311 2X6 RAFTER TIE

2X8 RAFTER #6

12" HELICAL PIER FOOTING

14'-0"

HELICAL PIER FTG

2'-0" OVERHANG ALL AR

1 CROSS SECTION
SCALE 1/2" = 1'-0"

