

**Kindred Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting Minutes**  
Wednesday, October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2021 ~ 6:30pm ~ Kindred City Hall

**1. Call to Order at 6:30pm**

Members present: Kersting, Thompson, Lammers (via conf call). Absent: Mauch & Woller-Cornog.  
Others present: Auditor Arnaud, PWS Schock, Bob Schmidt, Dave DuBord, John Lowry, Jamie Swenson, & Jason DuBord.

**2. Approval of meeting minutes**

**Motion to approve meeting minutes of 09/15/2021 by Thompson, second by Lammers; RCV – MP**

**3. Public Hearing: Moving Building Permit Application by Schmidt & Sons for Dave DuBord**

**Motion to open the public hearing by Thompson, second by Lammers; RCV – MP**

Bob Schmidt discussed his company's application to move two accessory structures for Dave DuBord to/from 121 4<sup>th</sup> Ave S. A 28'x36' garage will be moved from rural Kindred to DuBord's property and a smaller 14'x18 garage will be removed from DuBord's property. DuBord has already completed a variance and building permit for the new building. Tabitha stated that Schmidt & Sons and DuBord had submitted all required items as per the ordinance and permit application, except the exact move date and copy of the Cass County moving permit. Bob shared that once the Cass County Sheriff escort availability is confirmed, the move date will be decided, and the Cass County permit will be completed. Move in could be completed by Friday, Oct 22<sup>nd</sup> or the following week. Bob noted that there are currently no clearance concerns, so no tree removal is needed. Tabitha shared that in addition to the current list of entities on the application that are to be notified of the move, Schmidt & Sons should contact Moore Engineering regarding any route conflicts with the lagoon project in progress. Discussed the length of time the permit should be issued. No other public concerns or comments were made.

**Motion to close the public hearing by Lammers, second by Thompson; RCV – MP**

**Motion to approve the Moving Building Permit Application for Schmidt & Sons for a period of 7 days by Thompson, second by Lammers; RCV – MP**

**4. Westbrook Addition Update**

John Lowry, Civil Engineer with Lowry Engineering, presented an updated preliminary layout of the 29-acre agricultural area that is proposed to become about 60 single-family residential and park lots. The development will include a stormwater/fish pond, water, sanitary sewer, curb/gutter, street lights, and 70' street ROW. They are intending to request SFR-3 district that requires a minimum lot width of 60-ft.

The required 10% land dedication for park use would be about 2.5 acres, but the developers are offering 4 acres and planning to create a fishing pond, similar to ponds like Woodhaven or Rose Creek in Fargo. The increased land dedication would allow for about 2 acres of pond space that would also act as use for storm water retention, as well as providing space for gazebos, picnic shelters, or playground equipment. The larger park lot has been moved further south than previous layouts to accommodate the Park District's request to make the space more publicly accessible. There is also a smaller 30' lot to be dedicated for a bike trail/path. The smaller street frontage would reduce the special assessments, which the Park District noted as concern.

Lowry said the development will offer some lots in each buyer's market, including entry-level homes; provides amenities/recreation areas, minimizes rear yard neighbors, lot depths of 150'-190' to add more yard space, reducing some of the lot widths below 60'. The layout does include 8 of the 57 residential lots at 52' wide. Reducing the linear foot of a lot, creates lower special assessments (when calculated by lot frontage). This creates overall more affordable entry-level homes. Swenson, development team/realtor, stated that most new home buyers are in the market for affordable housing. The 52' lot would be an estimated \$300K, which fits some buyers on tighter budgets. The smaller side yards would still allow for other home improvements, like decks or patios. The developers would be asking for the variance on lot width for a small number of lots. Just 8 of the 57 lots are less than the minimum 60' lot width required under SFR-3 zoning. Further discussion on

the SFR-3 ordinance allowance for twin home construction; multi-family “duplexes” are a permitted use. Developers would like to plan on formal public hearings at the next P&Z meeting.

Lammers, on via conference call, shared that the main driver of the development is understandably cost. Without seeing the new updated layout in person, he still struggles with the reduction of the 60’ lot widths. He will review the updated layout as soon as he’s able. Jason DuBord said the development team would be happy to meet in person prior to the next meeting to review. Thompson asked if the intent would be for each 52’ lot to have a stand-alone home or if the 52’ lot would include one twin home intended for two families. Developers confirmed it would be one twin home structure on two 52’ lots, sharing the center property line. With a minimum 8’ side yard setback, a twin home could be constructed up to 44’ wide. They stated that the market for 60’ lots would estimate \$300K-\$325 but they still want to reach the need of new homeowners just starting out; the 52’ lots would keep costs more reasonable for the contractors and the buyers. The buyers’ market has evolved to include more of these types of residences.

Lowry stated they intend to have covenants in place to help care for the aesthetics and curb appeal. Lots of variable widths were intentionally split up throughout the development to help control row-housing or “cookie cutter” appearance. Common areas, greenspace, signage would likely delegate ownership/maintenance to the HOA. The developers are not asking for a change in the zoning ordinance, but want to consider a variance in a small number of lots to reduce the ability for other developers to come and create multiple “cloned” type structures. Kersting said the minimum 60’ lot width should be required per ordinance. Thompson stated she is more open to the idea now, but would like a larger picture or real-world examples. Developers showed examples online, including Lost River in Fargo. They noted that a lot of people have interest in moving to Kindred and they want to offer more opportunities. Their goal was to incorporate 5-10 52’ lots; they settled on only 8. Discussion on appropriate quantity. Discussed the main entrances to be used: 8<sup>th</sup> Ave on North, 53<sup>rd</sup> St on South, Linden St on East. Lift station and infrastructure layouts still need to be discussed further since the layout has evolved.

Rich stated that the PW committee could meet with the developers to further discuss the infrastructure and street layout as they have not met again yet. He noted that EMS should be considered, possibly creating temporary turnarounds on the west end and consider use of 9<sup>th</sup> Ave S.

DuBord shared that the development wants to be good for the city by offering affordable housing; the market is less interested in lower-income housing. They are donating more park space than required and incurring the costs for the construction of the fishing pond space. They want to be financially responsible to the future property owners. The goal with smaller lots is to meet the different tiers of price points for buyers. Developers have scheduled additional meetings with Park Board, and will meet with PW as well. Tabitha said updated preliminary plat documents should be submitted to City Hall by Nov 1<sup>st</sup> to get the public hearing notices completed for the Nov 17<sup>th</sup> P&Z meeting and Dec 1<sup>st</sup> Council meeting.

**5. Permit Report** – Five new building permits were issued since the Sept meeting report: one new single-family residential and four residential accessory structures (one deck, two garages, one demo garage).

**6. Additions**

Rich discussed the option to consider survey requirements for fencing or accessory structures. Maintenance of rights-of-way has continued to be an issue when structures are installed too close to or over the property lines. PW has asked Moore Engineering if a project is being completed in town, that they locate and pin the block corners in an attempt to reduce the cost on any home owners that need to get a survey. Jamie Swenson asked if the city could hire out the survey of block corners so that some points are established? Board present concurred that surveys would ensure that lines are identified but they are expensive with most companies. Discussion on legalities if surveys were required and interest in estimates to have the block corners surveyed.

**7. Adjournment**

**Motion to adjourn at 7:55pm by Thompson, second by Lammers; RCV – MP**

\_\_\_\_\_  
P&Z Board Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tabitha Arnaud, City Auditor

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date approved