



Inver Grove Heights Planning Commission
Tuesday, September 19, 2023 at 7:00 PM
8150 Barbara Avenue, Inver Grove Heights, MN 55077

AGENDA

NOTICE TO RESIDENTS: Individuals may submit written public comments in advance of the meeting by emailing comments to Stacy Bodsberg (sbodsberg@ighmn.gov). Comments received prior to 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 19, 2023, will be provided to the Council at or before the September 19, 2023 meeting.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Roll Call**
3. **Consent Agenda**
 - A. Minutes from the September 6, 2023, Planning Commission Meeting
4. **Public Hearing**
 - A. Consider an Ordinance Amendment to Title 10 of the City Code (Zoning Regulations) to add Shipping Containers to Section 10-2-2 Definitions and to add Section 10-15-37: Shipping Containers as an Accessory Use. (Case No. 23-38ZA)
 - B. Consider an Ordinance Amendment to Title 10 of the City Code (Zoning Regulations) to increase the maximum allowed size of accessory buildings on lots greater than five (5) acres in the A, Agricultural District and E-1, Estate Residential District and to amend other accessory structures language in Section 10-15-18. (Case No. 23-39ZA).
5. **Regular Business**
6. **Adjourn**

This document is available upon a three (3) business day request in alternate formats such as braille, large print, audio recording, etc. Please contact Stacy Bodsberg, Community Development Support Specialist, at 651.450.2545 or sbodsberg@ighmn.gov.

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES - CITY OF INVER GROVE HEIGHTS

Wednesday, September 6, 2023 - 7:00 p.m.
City Council Chambers - 8150 Barbara Avenue

1. CALL TO OFFICE

Chair Niemioja called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.
The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Elizabeth Niemioja (Chair)
Scott Clancy (Vice Chair)
Jonathan Weber (Secretary)
Robert Heidenreich
Dennis Wippermann
Jason Teiken
Lance Twedt
Trisha Presley

Commissioners Absent: Aida Schaefer (excused)

Staff Present: Allan Hunting, City Planner
Heather Botten, Associate Planner
Stacy Bodsberg, Community Development Support Specialist

3. CONSENT AGENDA

A. Minutes of the August 2, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Presley mentioned that her first name is spelled incorrectly. (Should be Trisha)

B. Minutes of the August 15, 2023, Planning Commission Meeting

The Consent Agenda were approved with the correction noted.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Request for a Variance to construct a pool and perimeter walkway within the shoreland setbacks of Rosenberger Lake at property located at 8450 Alta Ave. (Jongbloedt-23-35V)

Reading of Public Notice

Commissioner Weber read the Public Hearing Notice. The notices were mailed to 17 property owners on August 17th, 2023.

Presentation of Request

Associate Planner Heather Botten discussed the request for property located at the end of Alta Avenue. The property is zoned R-1A, Single-Family Residential District. The applicant requests a variance to build a 20x40 foot pool with a 5-foot perimeter walkway within the shoreland setbacks. Setbacks for a structure on a lot that does not have city water and sewer is 100 feet from the ordinary high-water mark. The property is about 200 feet across. With the 100-foot setbacks, there is no buildable area without some type of variance needing approval. The house was constructed in 1990, there was a variance approved to allow the encroachment within the shoreland. At the time the water was considered a wetland, there is no additional setbacks required from a wetland. The house was constructed within 28 feet of the ordinary high-water

mark. In 2006, the previous owner asked for a variance for a home addition. At that time the DNR came out to the site and determined all portions of the water around it are a part of DNR ID# 19-41 and the 100-foot setback would have to be from all parts of the water.

The applicant requests a variance for the pool. The pool would not be any closer from the established setbacks of the existing house. Adding 5 feet for the perimeter walkway encroaches on both sides to be 5 feet closer than what the established setbacks are. The closest neighboring home is 200 feet away to the south. The pool is in compliance. A rear yard setback setback for a pool is 10 feet. There is no impact to those neighbors. Staff does not believe the improvements proposed would alter the character of the neighborhood. Staff believes there is rationale and a practical difficulty to support a variance for a pool and a perimeter walkway. Staff does not support the applicant's request specifically wanting the pool to meet the existing setbacks and having the perimeter walkway to encroach closer. Staff would support a variance to have the pool and perimeter walkway meet the established setbacks of the house with the two conditions listed in the report.

Staff heard from one person in the neighborhood who had general inquiries about the request. Botten sent them the site plan and informed them that the report is on the website. She has not heard anything further.

Planning Commission Discussion

Commissioner Twedt stated that he was very confused by the lot lines and property description on this piece of property. With 19.91 acres, he questioned if they own a large portion of the lake.

Associate Planner Botten replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Twedt questioned if the setback was on the lake immediately to the east and mentioned that the lake was very boggy and secluded.

Associate Planner Botten replied it was also to the west. It's a 100-foot setback coming from both directions. She agreed the water was boggy.

Commissioner Presley asked if the DNR has commented back on the application received.

Associate Planner Botten responded the DNR did respond and did not have any issues with the proposal. They encouraged staff's interpretation of the ordinance stating that the pool is a structure.

Commissioner Weber stated that the item's staff report states that comment had not been received from the DNR and questioned if that needed to be changed.

Associate Planner Botten replied that an email response was received today at 11:23 a.m. from the DNR.

Opening of the Public Hearing

Justin Jongbloedt, 8540 Alta Avenue, stated he has read and understands the report.

Chair Niemioja asked Mr. Jongbloedt if he understand the request by staff regarding the setbacks and the sidewalk, and if it worked into his plan.

Mr. Jongbloedt replied that he understands. He said in the backyard of his property there is landscaping and patio that has been there for 15-20 years. The pool could be built within the guidelines of the home, with the patio 5 feet and the way the landscaping is, it is in the 28.3 feet.

Chair Niemioja asked if it was on the western end of the 28.3.

Mr. Jongbloedt referenced the southeast side of the home, indicating that between 28.3 and 33.8, is a concrete pad with a hot tub and steps going down. There is patio work there from when the home was remodeled.

Chair Niemioja asked if there is a pre-existing concrete structure going out, if that has already been established as a new line.

Associate Planner Botten replied the patio would not have needed a permit. By code definition, there are specific requirements that are measured from the perimeter walk around a pool. It is specific in the code on what the setbacks include.

Chair Niemioja stated the standard is met for getting a variance on the pool. The setback for the walkway around the pool is what the Commission needs to consider.

Mr. Jongbloedt shared that the long-term plan would be to put a fence around the area. He asked if the fence would fall in line with anything.

Associate Planner Botten replied that it depends on how high the fence would be.

Mr. Jongbloedt replied about 3.5 to 4 feet.

Associate Planner Botten responded that should be fine. She said he could not do the concrete pad around the pool and do a patio later. If he cannot do it on one side, he could do it on the other side to make up for the loss of patio work.

Commissioner Clancy mentioned they were looking at the west and eastern sides, mainly the northeastern corner of the pool perimeter. He questioned if they were impeding upon the variance distance already. That gets them outside of the 28.3. He asked if the applicant could build closer to the house with the patio and stop as soon as they get close to the 28.3/80-foot distance from the high-water mark.

Associate Planner Botten replied it widens as going north. If there is room for them to push it up, they could, as long as everything is within the 28.3. She mentioned that a 20-foot-wide pool is large, there are also pools that could be 15 feet in terms of other options.

Commissioner Clancy referenced the proposed design and questioned if slicing the sidewalk patio and then stopping, so he could not build beyond that certain point. He said it was a possible idea, there needs to be reasoning to approve the rationale.

Associate Planner Botten replied they could be around a good portion of the pool, just not all the way around.

Mr. Jongbloedt stated if 28.3 is the imaginary line, it still fits. He would not have a perimeter around the entire pool. It would be more triangulated near where the deck is, which is still acceptable.

Commissioner Heidenreich agreed that pushing the pool closer to the house might be a solution, but did not think it was practical because they have to stay 10 feet from the deck structure so people do not think it is ok to try to jump that distance. He said the whole property is noncompliant. There is nothing that can be done to bring it into compliance, they cannot make it bigger. He suggested going with it and letting the DNR make the final decision.

Chair Niemioja said the DNR was not likely to come back on this item, it would be up to the City Council.

Chair Niemioja mentioned that staff's recommendation was to stay within the 28.3, but to let it happen.

Commissioner Wippermann asked what the difference was between a patio surface and a walkway surface.

Associate Planner Botten replied that the walkway surface is connected to the pool. Code specifically states for a pool that you measure from the perimeter walk, slope around the pool, or the edge of the pool, whichever is closer. In this case the perimeter walk is the greatest.

Commissioner Wippermann said he doesn't have a problem with approving the variance for the entire request.

Chair Niemioja closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Discussion

Chair Niemioja mentioned that Commissioner Heidenreich made a great point in that the entire area is non-compliant. The fact that it was a lake was surprising.

Commissioner Twedt said there are setback requirements for a couple of reasons, one to protect the water, the other to protect the neighbors. The applicants own the lake. He said it sounded like this was protecting them from themselves.

Chair Niemioja mentioned there is a practical difficulty that applies for the pool. She would extend that a little beyond what staff is saying. She said if the DNR didn't have a strong opinion on it, she thought the practical difficulty would apply.

Commissioner Weber asked how often the high-water mark is analyzed.

City Planner Allan Hunting replied he was unsure how often. Those are established by the DNR.

Commissioner Weber said he was comfortable giving all for this request. The maps are unlikely up to date and the water line could be out another 10 feet.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Weber, Second by Twedt, to Approve the Variance to construct the pool and the perimeter walk within the shoreland setback subject to the two conditions, using the rationale listed, allowing it to go to the 23-foot mark, and to accept the DNR email into the record and packet for property located at 8450 Alta Ave. (Jongbloedt-23-35V).

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

This item tentatively goes to the City Council on September 25th, 2023.

B. Request for the Vacation of Drainage and Utility Easements within Outlot A and Outlot B, Robert Curve Fourth Addition. (IGH Partners-23-36SPUD)

Reading of Public Notice

Commissioner Weber read the Public Hearing Notice. The notices were mailed to 51 property owners on August 17th, 2023.

Presentation of Request

City Planner Allan Hunting discussed the request consisting of a 190-unit apartment building and 54 townhomes. The Planning Commission approved the final PUD setback in April. In July, the Council approved Phase 1. The developer chose to do this in two (2) phases. There would be 45 townhome units on one side and 9 townhomes units on the other side along with the apartment building. The City Council approved Robert Curve Fourth Addition. That consisted of the one lot with the other items as described in the outlots. The outlots were dedicated with easements. The applicant is coming through with Phase 2, Robert Curve Fifth consisting of the two outlots, the apartment, and townhomes. Those show the same easements. The process is to vacate the easements shown on the two outlots on Robert Curve Fourth. Those would be vacated with the County in the process. They would be rededicated on Robert Curve Fifth Addition. He stated that the City Council would act on this item at the end of September. Planning and engineering have no issues with the vacation and rededication.

Opening of the Public Hearing

Andy Brummer, IGH Partners LLC/Trident Development LLC, 1200 25th Avenue South, St. Cloud, Applicant, stated he has read and understands the report.

Chair Niemioja closed the public hearing.

Planning Commission Recommendation

Motion by Weber, Second by Presley, to Approve the Vacation of the Public Drainage and Utility Easements within the plat of Robert Curve Fourth Addition (IGH Partners-23-36SPUD).

Ayes: 8

Nays: 0 Motion carried.

This item tentatively goes to the City Council on September 25th, 2023.

5. REGULAR BUSINESS None.

6. ADJOURN

Motion to adjourn the Planning Commission Meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Recording Secretary Sheri Yourczek.

DRAFT



Planning Commission Report

MEETING DATE:	September 19, 2023
CASE NO:	23-38ZA
APPLICANT:	City of Inver Grove Heights
PROPERTY OWNER:	NA
REQUEST:	Zoning Code Amendment relating to allowing Shipping Containers
LOCATION:	NA
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:	NA
ZONING:	NA
STAFF CONTACT:	Allan Hunting, 651.450.2554

ACTION REQUESTED

BACKGROUND

After City Council approved the Variance to allow a shipping container for Jersey's Bar and Grill in May of this year, Council asked staff to research possible regulations to allow shipping containers.

Staff conducted some research and found some regulations for shipping containers in other cities and states. Researching ordinances for abutting or nearby cities, only Mounds View and Apple Valley addressed them. Mounds View allows temporary use in residential districts for storage and Apple Valley does not allow in any district. All other abutting city codes did not address.

These containers typically go by the term "shipping" or "cargo" containers. Containers are six-sided steel containers originally constructed as cargo containers used for the transport of goods and materials and do not include structures like railroad cars, recreational vehicles, bus bodies, semi-trailers and similar prefabricated items.

A primary benefit to a business allowing such containers is that they can be purchased as used containers or be customized for the specific use and can be hauled onto the site, put in place and be ready to go. There would be no construction of a building. The containers proposed to be allowed utilize the existing exterior ribbed metal material without the need for a Variance.

EVALUATION OF REQUEST

Staff presented some background information to the City Council at a Council meeting in July. Council continued to support the idea of allowing shipping containers and asked staff to prepare an Ordinance and present to Planning Commission at a public hearing.

The City Council wanted to allow shipping containers as an accessory for use throughout the city. Staff looked at how these containers might be used and felt that they might be used differently in commercial zoning as opposed to industrial zoning. In commercial areas, they would most likely be

used as outdoor bars (Jersey's Bar), kiosks or the like. In industrial areas, they would most likely be used for storage units. As a result, staff has prepared different performance standards for these districts.

The following contains the proposed draft language for a Code Amendment allowing shipping containers in the city.

10-2-2: DEFINITIONS

SHIPPING CONTAINER

A "shipping container" is a six-sided steel unit originally constructed as a general cargo container used for the transport of goods and materials. The maximum dimensions allowed are twenty feet (20') in length by eight feet (8') in width by eight feet (8') in height. Shipping containers do not include similar structures such as railroad cars, recreational vehicles, bus bodies, semi-trailers, and similar prefabricated items.

10-15-37: SHIPPING CONTAINERS AS AN ACCESSORY USE

Shipping containers are allowed as an accessory use in the B-2, P, I-1, I-2 zoning districts subject to the following performance standards:

A. For shipping containers located on properties zoned B-3:

1. A limit of one (1) shipping container shall be allowed per lot.
2. Property owners may be required to obtain a building permit from the City prior to placing or moving the shipping container onto the property. The Building Official shall determine what permits may be needed based on the use of the container.
3. The shipping container shall be placed on a hard surface such as concrete, asphalt or a gravel pad.
4. A shipping container located within the floodplain shall comply with all floodplain requirements.
5. The placement of the shipping container shall comply with all applicable building setbacks for the zoning district in which it is located and all other applicable zoning ordinance requirements, except as modified herein.
6. A shipping container shall not be used as a dwelling unit.
7. A shipping container shall not be used solely for storage purposes.
8. Shipping containers are allowed to retain their vertical ribbed metal siding but must be painted a color that is compatible with the primary structure on the lot or to blend in with the surrounding environment.
9. The shipping container shall be structurally sound, operated in a safe manner and maintained in good repair. No shipping container may contain any holes, peeling paint, rust or damage.

B. For shipping containers located on properties zoned P, I-1 and I-2:

1. A limit of three (3) shipping containers shall be allowed per lot.
2. Property owners may be required to obtain a building permit from the City prior to placing or moving the shipping container on to the property. The Building Official shall determine what permits may be needed based on the use of the container.
3. Shipping containers shall be placed on a hard surface such as concrete, asphalt or a gravel pad.
4. Shipping containers located within the floodplain shall comply with all floodplain requirements.
5. The placement of shipping containers shall comply with all applicable building setbacks for the zoning district in which it is located and all other applicable zoning ordinance requirements, except as modified herein.
6. Shipping containers shall not be used as a dwelling unit.
7. No stacking of shipping containers shall be allowed.
8. Shipping containers are allowed to retain their vertical ribbed metal siding but must be painted a color that is compatible with the primary structure on the lot or to blend in with the surrounding environment.
9. All shipping containers shall be structurally sound, operated in a safe manner and maintained in good repair. No shipping container may contain any holes, peeling paint, rust or damage.

ALTERNATIVES

The Planning Commission has the following actions available on the proposed project:

A. Approval:

If the proposed request is found to be acceptable, approval of the applicable following action should be taken:

- Recommend amending the Zoning Ordinance to allow for shipping containers to be allowed as an accessory use in the B-3, I-1, I-2, and P zoning districts with the performance standards listed.

B. Denial:

If the Planning Commission finds issues with the Ordinance, a recommendation of denial should be made or specify recommended changes to the Ordinance.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends Approval of an Ordinance to allow shipping containers.

ATTACHMENTS

None



Planning Commission Report

MEETING DATE:	September 19, 2023
CASE NO:	23-39ZA
APPLICANT:	City of Inver Grove Heights
PROPERTY OWNER:	NA
REQUEST:	Amending Accessory Structure Sections in the City Code
LOCATION:	NA
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:	NA
ZONING:	NA
STAFF CONTACT:	Heather Botten, 651.450.2569

ACTION REQUESTED

BACKGROUND

The City Council has seen several accessory structures Variances this past year. At the July 10, 2023, City Council meeting, Council directed staff to move forward with an Ordinance Amendment relating to accessory structure requirements, specifically:

1. Increasing the maximum size of accessory structures allowed on lots greater than five (5) acres that are zoned A, Agricultural or E-1, Estatic District (lot size of 2.5 acres).
2. To consider adding language that would allow residential parcels that do not have an attached garage the flexibility to have an additional detached structure.
3. The City Council also asked staff to update other portions of the accessory structure ordinance that may be outdated.

EVALUATION OF REQUEST

Amending existing language: Accessory structure size, separation, and number of small sheds.

The City recognizes that within the large lot rural residential portions of the city, larger accessory structures can be appropriate. The regulations on gross square footage and total number of accessory buildings were designed to limit the massing of structures in the rural areas of the city. The City Council has reviewed and modified the allowed size and number of accessory structures over the years, most recently increasing the size allowance on lots 3.4 acres - 5 acres in size, with a maximum size of 2,400 gross square feet.

Currently, for residential lots five (5) acres or larger, the maximum size for a detached accessory structure is 2,400 gross square feet. Lots larger than five (5) acres are allowed up to two detached structures, but their combined gross square feet cannot exceed 2,400 square feet.

Staff has reviewed accessory structure ordinances in other cities and found the following information for maximum size of accessory structures:

City	Maximum Size of Accessory Structure	Notes
Rosemount	2,400 sq ft	
Farmington	1,500 sq ft	
Cannon Falls	2,000 sq ft	The combination of attached and detached accessory structures shall not exceed this standard.
Woodbury	2,000 sq ft	
Cottage Grove	2,500 sq ft	
Lino Lakes (5-10 acres)	5,000 sq ft - combined attached and detached structures	or 2.21 percent of the lot area, not to exceed 10,000 sq ft.
Lino Lakes (10-20 acres)	10,000 sq ft - combined attached and detached structures	or 1.85 percent of the lot area, not to exceed 15,000 sq ft.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE LANGUAGE

Amended text to the existing code:

10-15-18 ACCESSORY STRUCTURES

B. On lots of five (5) acres or more, but less than 7.50 acres, which are located in an A or E-1 zoning district, detached accessory structures to single-family residential uses shall not exceed a total gross floor area of three thousand square feet (3,000 sq ft). On lots seven in a half (7.5) acres or more but less than ten (10) acres in size, which are located in an A or E-1 zoning district, detached accessory structures to single-family residential uses shall not exceed a total gross floor area of three thousand five hundred square feet (3,500 sq ft). On lots greater than ten (10) acres, which are located in an A or E-1 zoning district, detached accessory structures to single-family residential uses shall not exceed a total gross floor area of three thousand seven hundred fifty square feet (3,750 sq ft). The gross floor area figure may exclude any usable attic space or loft space. The total number of all detached accessory structures on lots of five (5) acres or more in size in the A or E-1 zoning district shall be limited to two (2).

Building separation is addressed in the Building Code. Therefore, the following sentence can be removed from the zoning code.

~~E. In all residential zoning districts (R, E, and A) there shall be a minimum space of six feet (6') between the principal and accessory structure unless attached, and a minimum space of six feet (6') between all other accessory structures.~~

Currently, there is no limit on how many structures, 120 square feet or less, can be on a property. To help control the number of small structures on a lot, a maximum number should be implemented.

H. Exceptions to the requirements contained in this section relating to accessory structures are as follows:

1. No more than two (2) accessory structures to single-family residential uses in all A, E, and R zoning districts, each with gross floor areas of one hundred twenty (120) square feet or less.

New Language:

Lots Without an Attached Garage.

Currently, City Code does not allow flexibility for a residential property that does not have an attached garage to have more than one detached accessory building. Like the properties that have an attached garage, they are only allowed one detached accessory building. Some cities provide language allowing a residence to have more than one detached building if there is not an attached garage.

Staff is suggesting the following language to be added to City Code:

Each residential lot with a principal building is allowed attached garage space or one detached garage up to five hundred (500) square feet in addition to an accessory building or buildings as allowed per Section 10-15-18.

Measuring the Size of an Accessory Structure.

To ease the confusion of calculating the size of accessory buildings, staff thought it would be appropriate to add language in the code on how to measure the gross square footage of an accessory structure.

Staff is suggesting the following language to be added to City Code:

Gross Floor Area (GFA): The gross floor area shall be defined as the sum in square feet of all floors of the building measured from the exterior face of the exterior walls.

For the purpose of this section, the gross square footage of an accessory building shall be measured by outside dimensions.

*The bulk standard sections in the zoning code would also be amended accordingly.

ALTERNATIVES

The Planning Commission has the following actions available for the proposed request:

A. Approval:

If the Planning Commission finds the proposed amendment language to be acceptable, the Commission could recommend approval of the ordinance change or amend the proposed language.

B. Denial:

If the Planning Commission does not find it necessary to modify the existing language, the Commission could recommend denial of the proposed ordinance amendment or portions thereof.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff supports the proposed ordinance changes.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Section 10-15-18 Accessory Structures Current Language

10-15-18: ACCESSORY STRUCTURES:

A. Each detached accessory structure to single-family residential uses in all E-2, R-1 and R-2 zoning districts shall not exceed a total maximum gross floor area of one thousand (1,000) square feet. The gross floor area figure may exclude any usable attic space or loft space. The total number of all detached accessory structures on lots in the E-2, R-1 and R-2 zoning districts shall be limited to one.

B. On lots of five (5) acres or more in size, which are located in an A or E-1 zoning district, detached accessory structures to single-family residential uses shall not exceed a gross floor area of two thousand four hundred (2,400) square feet. The gross floor area figure may exclude any usable attic space or loft space. The total number of all detached accessory structures on lots of five (5) acres or more in size in the A or E-1 zoning district shall be limited to two (2).

C. On lots of 2.5 acres or more, but less than 3.4 acres in size, which are located in an A or E-1 zoning district, detached accessory structures to single-family residential uses shall not exceed a gross floor area of one thousand six hundred (1,600) square feet. On lots 3.4 acres in size up to five (5) acres in size, which are located in an A or E-1 zoning district, detached accessory structures to single-family residential uses shall not exceed a gross floor area equal to the lot size (in acres) multiplied by four hundred and eighty (480). The gross floor area figure may exclude any usable attic space or loft space. The total number of all detached accessory structures on lots of 2.5 acres or more, but less than five (5) acres in size in the A or E-1 zoning district, shall be limited to one.

D. On lots of less than 2.5 acres in size, which are located in an A or E-1 zoning district, detached accessory structures to single-family residential uses shall not exceed a gross floor area of one thousand (1,000) square feet. The gross floor area figure may exclude any usable attic space or loft space. The total number of all detached accessory structures on lots of less than 2.5 acres in size in the A or E-1 zoning district shall be limited to one.

E. In all residential zoning districts (R, E and A) there shall be a minimum space of six feet (6') between the principal and accessory structure unless attached, and a minimum space of six feet (6') between all other accessory structures.

F. Detached accessory structures in the A and E-1 zoning districts that exceed a gross floor area of one thousand (1,000) square feet must maintain a fifty foot (50') minimum setback from all property lines.

G. In no zoning district may an accessory structure be constructed on a lot prior to the construction of the lot's principal structure.

H. Exceptions to the requirements contained in this section relating to accessory structures are as follows:

1. Accessory structures to single-family residential uses in all A, E and R zoning districts with gross floor areas of one hundred twenty (120) square feet or less;

2. Accessory structures to principal agricultural uses (i.e., farms, ranches, stables, greenhouses, nurseries, and uses deemed similar by the city council) in the A and E-1 zoning districts. (Ord. 1181, 9-8-2008; amd. Ord. 1209, 4-26-2010; Ord. 1411, 6-14-2021)