

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting of: February 12, 2021

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Board of Adjustment February 12, 2021 in the County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, John Jones, called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. with Board members present: Jones, Dan Mol, Paul Aarestad & Bob Neumann. Absent was Dan Vick. Barry Rhineberger, Planner, represented the Planning & Zoning Office; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, attended on WebEx.

ACTION ON MINUTES

On a motion by Aarestad, seconded by Mol, all voted to approve the minutes for the January 8, 2021 meeting as printed.

1. MATT BRONDER – New Item

LOCATION: 13307 80TH St. NW – Lot 7, Southview Addition, according to plat of record, Section 26, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Lake John - Southside Twp.) Tax 217-049-000070

Requests a variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F)(2) & (3), 155.057, 155.090(C) Table 3, Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow replacement of an existing 572 sq. ft. one story dwelling with a new dwelling that includes a 1,125 sq. ft main level with a lookout basement and a 1,563 sq. ft. modified second story, 528 sq. ft. attached garage, 96 sq. ft. entry porch, and 55 sq. ft. lakeside deck,. New structure to be 87.7 ft. from the OHW, 10.8 ft. from the property line, 18.4 ft. from the center (edge) of the road right of way, 15.2 ft. from a Type IV septic system, and within the bluff. A variance requested for a new septic system 5 ft. from the side and road property lines. Also, a variance to replace an 8.8' x 16.8' boathouse within the bluff and over the OHW with a 10' x 17' boathouse 2.3 ft. from the OHW and within the bluff.

Present: Matt Bronder, Bernie Miller, MSTs

- A. Rhineberger displayed the location map and pictures to show the lot and existing one-story dwelling. Request is to replace the structure with a modified two-story. Plans were viewed and applicant questioned if they were considering a walkout basement rather than the look-out as shown on the building plan? Bronder indicated he would like a walkout. Rhineberger stated the Board should keep that in mind as they review the request. The difference is 3'. The dimensions and several variance distances were noticed for the dwelling and a couple for the sewer. The survey includes the topography. The lake setback is the same as what exists, but there is a significant expansion both in footprint and livable space. The lot is extremely limited by the bluff. The definition needed interpretation and they have received more clarity on it. The existing house exists in front and within the bluff and the expansion is going to the backside. A correction to the wording on the road setback is that it should have read 18.4' from the road right of way and not centerline. The distance from the centerline is 50.3'. Town Board discussion and favorable action was received. Responses from neighbors, Johnson, Bixby, objecting and one neighbor, Crane, submitted a neutral response, with questions on what he can do on his lot. Building plans were reviewed. Design is narrow and long with an attached garage with spancrete for storage area below. The second level is the largest with living space over the attached garage. The existing structure is very old, and no permits were found, does not appear any improvements have been made for years.
- B. Miller stated he felt Bronder has tried to do what is reasonable. First looked at what they could do for a septic system. The first buyer had a house plan designed that was dropped and figured out a plan that is no closer than the existing, is the same square footage in the bluff and expands backwards. The Type IV sewer system was described that allows them to reduce variances. The

15' from drainfield is from the corner of the house and feels that makes sense. There is quite a bit of area from the edge of the road, the property line to the garage. Discussed this setback with the Town Board and they agreed, allows parking out of the road right of way. There is minimal dirt work needed even for a walkout design. The proposal is under 15%, the design maximizes much on a small footprint. The entire line of lots along here have development in the bluff and there has not been any issues with the bluff. Neighbors homes on both sides are sitting in the middle of the bluff, not at the top. Asked the DNR for a response if they are in favor and the response was they only respond if they have a problem with it. The boathouse is pushed back, the grade of it is right at elevation and takes some elevation in the toe of the bluff. Rebuilding where it is, they would be digging about the same amount, but it is an improvement to move back.

- C. Bronder – the coverage calculations have included a stairway.
- D. The public hearing was opened for public comment. No response heard.
- E. Neumann – concerned about the close proximity to the road for snow removal. He would like to see the site because everything is very close.
- F. Mol – is concerned about the boathouse, moving it back into the bluff. Soils are sandy and concerned about that. Could the boathouse be removed and put a slab down there. Miller – asked if they can replace the exact same size and slide it back? Rhineberger they can but would have to reduce the size so it is not over the ordinary highwater mark. Bronder and Miller reviewed what is there for a boathouse is about 170 sq. ft. Rhineberger – Mol pointed out, a slab with a small storage shed down there might be considered. Land alteration for replacement is limited to 10 cu. yds. and limits with the bluff and land alteration. Building over the ordinary highwater mark is not allowed. Miller indicated they are willing to work on something that is reasonable. Felt they can slide it back some, would be pretty close to 10 cu. yds. where it is and felt they can address that. Rhineberger would you be moving dirt to get steps down? Miller – the steps they are showing are on posts. Rhineberger agreed posts are allowed and are not considered alteration. Miller – if the boathouse is moved back, they could come down with steps and walk into the shed. Bronder – the blueprint of the boathouse shows how they would access it and noted how the back of that will hold the hillside and prevents more erosion around it. They could have a design to show how the foundation could be reinforced to help hold the hillside. Mol – supports a site inspection.
- G. Aarestad – when he reviews these projects and considers variances, he wants to see some improvement of non-compliance, a plan that shows it improves water quality, etc. In this case, at least four variances are requested with no attempt to improve anything. In addition, variances for sewer are needed. He is not seeing a hardship or practical difficulty. The site visit might help, but the plan has little wiggle room. He is willing to hear more on the boathouse. Looking at putting a very large structure on a small lot. He appreciates the effort the applicant put into the written description and the plans; but needs improvement on the proposed setback variances.
- H. Mol – did not see any plan to address drainage or how they would eliminate erosion. Bronder – is willing to provide that. Agrees they are intruding on the setbacks; if they could move into the bluff area, they could eliminate some of those. Their effort to protect the bluff and not encroach any closer is what is causing it. Miller – working with a lot of this nature, where do they start? Rhineberger suggests they start with asking for what they want. They had one plan that he did not think would work, so they modified plans and addressed the type of sewer to reduce area needed. They are uncertain what the Board is most concerned about. It will be difficult to get down to see

the boathouse at this time of year. Can take pictures of the boathouse; but will have to resolve what they can do.

- I. Mol – shares many of the concerns with trying to fit a large year around home on these lots; replacing a 1940-1950's cabins used on the weekend. Asked if they can get this down to a two-bedroom home? They are dealing with a very small lot. Miller asked if it is the number of bedrooms or size? Mol – more so size. Aarestad agreed. Bronder noted when these cabins were built, they did not have to plan for these type of sewer systems. Mol – agreed this adds to the challenges today. He grew up on Sugar Lake and these owners came out from the Cities on the weekends. The small cabins on these lots were used occasionally as recreational use. They have to be consistent.
- J. Miller agreed the challenges today are owners wanting to do as much as they can. At the Town Board meeting the Supervisors questioned what is a "hardship"? He feels it is consideration of what is reasonable, what is the character of neighborhood. There is a large portion of the neighborhood that has updated structures and are living here year around on this stretch of road. Most of the structures are closer to the lake. He felt it is up for debate whether it is the plight of the owner or is it about the character of the lot. If these lots were platted today, the road would have been moved back. Now they need to work together to figure out what is reasonable.
- K. Rhineberger – statute after 2006 has made that portion of the Ordinance more difficult. The structure can be replaced without a variance. The criteria, was it created by the owner, is more difficult. The owner can replace as is where is. What is on the owner is they bought the property with the cabin on it, now it is the new owner that wants a larger structure. Miller – cannot rebuild unless they rebuild exactly what is there.
- L. Aarestad – with this request there are large number of concerned neighbors, all have comments about the setback and size, this is of concern.
- M. Jones – often times seeing the site helps. Otherwise, he is not hearing any support. Rhineberger – they have done much to try and fit it in; regardless any change will be marginal because they can only go so narrow. There is not a lot of space to work with. Bronder - 1,125 sq. ft. on the main level which is not very large and the reason they are including some space over the garage. The other things are the coverage is met; the existing building has a deck on the lakeside to be taken off. That is where they have given back. Mol – noted a patio door on the plan, would there be impervious surface coming out that door. Miller – stated they are at about 20%, leaving 200 sq. ft. for additional impervious coverage for walkways and slabs. Bronder – provided documents for the excavation plans to show a lookout or walkout basement. These were handed to Rhineberger.
- N. Aarestad – questioned if there is adequate access to the well? Miller stated that is done before the new house is built. Noted the neighbors well is over the line on this lot.
- O. Discussion on drainage plans. Miller explained in this case it would be handled with a 6" pipe and tile it down the bluff and let it dissipate in a flat area behind rip-rap, parallel along the shoreline. Rhineberger noted there is a small road ditch, could the driveway be drained backwards? Miller it does now. Drainage will not change along here. Putting gutters would be easy to help divert water. Bronder – felt there is a way to grade around the house and let it settle into the grass.
- P. Neumann – moved to continue the hearing to March 12, 2021 for a site inspection.

Mol seconded the motion.
VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **ROBERT R. SUTHERLAND** – New Item

LOCATION: 7177 Newcomb Avenue NW – S ½ of Lot 6, Annandale Beach, according to plat of record, Section 26, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, MN. (Lake John/Southside Twp.) Tax 217-013-000060

Requests a variance as regulated in Section 155.003 (147), 155.026, 155.049(F)(2) & (3), 155.057, 155.090(C) Table 3, & 155.102, Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to replace the existing 568 sq. ft. one-level dwelling that is 33.5 ft. from the ordinary highwater mark (OHM) of lake, 7.7 and 8 ft. from the side property lines with a new 660 sq. ft. one-level dwelling (22' x 30') with a 308 sq. ft. loft that has 6 ft. of headroom, and 330 sq. ft. attached garage. Setback variances proposed are 60.2' from the OHW, 10 ft. from both side lot lines and 18.8 ft. from a new Type IV septic system that will be 5 ft. from the property line and 2 ft. from the road right-of-way.

Present: Jean Sutherland & Bernie Miller of MSTs

- A. Rhineberger informed the Board this 6,573 sq. ft. lot is on the east side of Lake John and has much different topography than on the other side of the lake. The existing dwelling to be replaced is one-level 568 sq. ft. along with non-conforming setbacks were reviewed. The new plan for a 22' x 30' house with storage space above and attached garage with proposed setbacks were reviewed. This is outlined on the survey. The Type IV sewer is proposed with variance setbacks needed. The lot coverage is not exceeded, with a 113 sq. ft. of impervious coverage for walkways or patios available before reaching the 25%. The detached garage was recent, but not permitted, so is not to be considered part of the replacement category. Pictures of the existing structure was displayed. Town Board written favorable action and comments were received. Disapproval from Loney, who included pictures of their site that shows water issues; Isaacson approve of the variance. Those two residents are on the virtual meeting.
- B. Sutherland – explained the deterioration of the existing 40-50 year old cabin. There are water issues they must deal with. They would like to keep the generational property and want to sell their existing home to make this their year around home. The Loney lot is higher and they get water from that lot. The neighbor to the south put a swale in along their line and that has helped. They have told Loney they do not want to shed any water onto them; talked with Miller about directing water away from the neighbors.
- C. Miller – the dwelling is a one-bedroom, but sewer codes start with two-bedroom. The smallest sewer system for Type IV was designed and they pushed it back as far back as possible. Have tried to stay 10' from the sideline, otherwise it would be difficult to build, taper or create swales for the water. They have worked a full year to work through the issues, the house has been downsized, is the smallest he has worked with as well as the garage that is very small. The garage space has less square footage than what is there. The plan is an improvement from the lake and road, they are pulling everything away. The owners do not want to live out here on a holding tank.
- D. Carol Loney – explained the biggest concern is they are between the Isaacson lot to the north when they were allowed to raise the lot and build a new home and they were supposed to put in rain gardens, but that never happened. She submitted pictures of their lot that is a bowl, always wet and turns into a pond of standing water at times. The Sutherlands have put in a drain from their

bathroom shower that drains into the property line to deal with the amount of water they contain in the holding tank. The garage there was never permitted, they are not making things smaller because that was not supposed to be there. They are trying to force a new house on a small lot. This lot is probably one of the smallest lots on the lake, if the property is raised what will result. These lots are small and seasonal; they also plan to hand their property down to the next generation, if there is anything left. They have a shallow well and is anyone looking out for them. They had opposed the construction on the north end and now they have to on the south end. Asked if pictures showing the flooding could be displayed. She noted this shows what they have on their lot on a regular basis. Sutherland responded the water shown in the picture is on the north side of the Loney lot. She confirmed rain gardens were never installed.

- E. Rhineberger - stated in this area rain gardens are not going to work, there is no slope. Miller indicated he has talked with Rhineberger about the effectiveness. That is why he was adamant about keeping 10' on the side for swales to address the water. With all the disturbance and flat terrain, the water is perched on top. There are ways it can be done. Loney – they were promised rain gardens with the lot to the north for the fix and why were they proposed then? Rhineberger –that was probably the best idea at the time. He noted the structure will have to be elevated, the existing cabin does not meet the minimum lowest floor elevation required, even though this is not a flood plain. Because the lake does not have a designated flood plain, that 4' minimum height standard above could be varied by the Board. J. Loney is concerned this project would shed more water unto their lot, what about their shallow well? Rhineberger – right now this sewer design cannot be issued a permit without a variance from the MN Department of Health. Miller – have looked at numerous ways to proceed, they could not get anywhere last summer with COVID from MN Dept. of Health to come out to look at it. Because of that, decided to come to the County first to see if they can get the house variances. If they cannot get a variance from the well, they would have to come back to ask for a holding tank or replacement. The owners do not want to put money into it unless they can have a sewer system. Rhineberger – stated it depends on how it is done, perhaps an amendment to notice. If this project does not go forward, the garage will have to be removed. Sutherland stated it is gone. Miller felt it is common you can get 50-75' from a shallow well if there is no other way. They have done research on what is on the other adjacent lot because the new well on this lot must meet the minimum separation from that neighbors' sewer. He felt they are a few days from getting the request sent to St. Paul.
- F. C. Loney – what is the limit on the number of variances they can get. Rhineberger it is property specific, no limit. J. Loney – what kind of well is going on this lot? Rhineberger – a deep well is part of the project. C. Loney – variances needed for the new well? Rhineberger – not for the new one. J. Loney – questioned the depth of the proposed well? Rhineberger – the well driller would determine that. County does not get involved because it is permitted through the State.
- G. Isaacson – they would support the variances, when they built, they put in swales on both the north and south property lines to help drain the water, but it takes time for the water to drain. Usually gone between 24-36 hours. Their well is 110' deep. The swales were described that have 6" drain pipes from the back to front. C. Loney – they don't work.
- H. Rhineberger – the elevation difference will require the lowest floor elevation for the new house to be 3' higher than existing one. Miller – further explained that is the floor of the cabin, does not mean the entire lot has to be raised to that same elevation. The height of the cabin is not what makes a difference, but the amount of material around. Based on Miller's experience on several sites out here, he explained most people don't know that the composition of the soil is 6-8" of peat

above the sand. The peat holds water, with dry sand below. Clay fill has been placed on top of the peat, not sand. The goal is to try to come up with a plan that is reasonable, it must drain without pushing water onto someone else. There are ways to make it work, have proven with certain drain fields. Understanding there are always instances where something can go wrong.

- I. Jones noted this Board could grant the variances and the State deny the well variance. Rhineberger – indicated if that should happen, they would need to come back on the sewer design, or the Board could condition their action. Miller stated this owner has said they won't do the project on a holding tank. Rhineberger – it is suggested they condition it accordingly.
- J. Mol – much discussion on the drainage which was going to the first issue he wanted to raise. Water is a concern and it is the applicant's responsibility for handling it. He would like a plan to show that. Moving further from the lake is positive, the 10' setback is something the Board has approved in the past; but makes room tight to handle the water. Questioned access to the new well? Sutherland explained the well would go in first. Miller asked if the drainage plan could be a condition of the variance? Mol – agreed they have done that; but helps to have a plan on file. The concern is that it gets done.
- K. Aarestad – is the driveway planned for and the impervious included in the calculation? Miller – there is an existing one and on the plan. Aarestad – where is the lot flooding? Rhineberger pointed out the location to the north. Sutherland pointed where they get water on their property. Aarestad – the neighbor is higher, but says she is a bowl. Sutherland – the neighbor to the north is a little higher, water comes off their roof and comes down on them. Lot is lower back by the tree. Miller – the contours were noted. The slight depression holds water and cannot soak in. Aarestad – plans that reduce impervious coverage and removing the accessory structure is favorable. Thinks the width of the house is agreeable. Don't want to create another problem, wants to see a plan to address that. Access to the well to service it in the future was questioned? Miller – the well drillers tell them some have small all-terrain equipment that could get down there. Aarestad – if they could move the structure back a few feet would the other setback improve? Miller – looked at different tank manufacturers and a 10' setback from the tank to the house is advisable. The drain field area needed was described, did not feel they would gain much. Rhineberger – on lakeshore lots they like to see storage, this attached garage will not accommodate it. Sutherland stated their son lives in Maple Lake and the garage was moved to his lot and is where they are storing all their boats and kayaks, etc. In the summer they will move the snowblower and winter equipment into that shed.
- L. Neumann – questioned why they are opposed to a holding tank, noted a couple neighbors have them. She prefers to put the water back into the ground, does not want to depend on having someone to come out and pump all the time. She does not want to limit her water usage. Neumann – some owners have the pumper on a regular schedule, agreed they may not be able to use as much water as they like. Sutherland – they have a holding tank now and the cost keeps going up. Although the pumper is allowed to spread the waste on farm fields now, when would that be prohibited in the future. Miller – reviewed the changes in regulations, on the east coast they pay \$300-\$400 to pump 1,000 gallons. The prices are going up there and in time there will be more regulations. Referred to studies in Wisconsin where they thought they were going to clean up their lakes and put in sewer. The aquifers dropped a couple hundred feet and the lakes became concentrated with higher levels of phosphorous and nitrogen; and they destroyed water needed for municipal wells. The holding tank is fine for a seasonal cabin, but not practical for a year around

home. Adds much stress to the homeowner by limiting the amount of water they can use and getting a pumper out.

- M. Rhineberger – suggested a continuation. Mol asking for a drainage plan, noted the Board will be visiting another site on the lake and questioned whether they want to see the property. Aarestad asked the applicant to consider when they have equipment out there for demolition and grading, on a joint effort to come up with a drainage plan with the neighbor. There is no obligation, but a good time to explore it. Miller suggested working a plan, anything would benefit the neighbor too.
- N. Mol moved to continue the hearing to March 12, 2021 for a site inspection and drainage plan. Aarestad seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **JOHN J. PETERSON** – New Item

LOCATION: 599 County Road 37 NW - Part of the E ½ of SW ¼ lying south of CR 37, Section 36, Township 121, Range 26, Wright County, MN. (Maple Lake Twp.) Tax 210-100-363101

Requests a variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.048(F)(2), Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow replacement of the existing 16' x 20' detached garage that is 1.8 ft. from the side property line with a new 16'4" x 23'5" living space and 22' x 26' attached garage onto the existing dwelling. Proposed additions to be 6.2 ft. from the side property line at the closest point and back side of dwelling away from the county road. Existing dwelling is 120' from the centerline of County Road 37.

Present: John & Yolanda Peterson

- A. Rhineberger reviewed the 2.59-acre lot that is surrounded by a wildlife-recreation area. The request is to remove a detached garage and replace with a 16'4" wide living space addition and 22' attached garage to the existing dwelling. The survey with the existing structures and proposal was reviewed. The required setback from the sideline is 30'. Although it is non-conforming, it is much further from the line than the existing detached structure. There was a change to the plan after meeting with the Town Board. The Town Board's response was to require a minimum of 5' from the line. No other responses or public on virtually.
- B. J. Peterson explained they have been working on this plan for a long time and need to know what the options are. This will provide parking inside, had originally wanted an entrance from the front, but because of the restrictions they tried to reduce the size. All the utilities such as the electric, well and propane tank are on the other side of the house, this is the only direction they can expand.
- C. Aarestad – the new garage is a similar footprint of what is there and the addition fits. This is a rural area and there should not be a conflict with anyone. He agreed the location makes sense and the applicant did a good job with the design.
- D. Neumann – other than re-arranging things with the addition to the house, they are improving things by moving further from the property line. He can see the options are limited. Questioned if the topography is flat? J. Peterson – responded yes, the property is marshy behind. This side is level and drops off toward the east side. Neumann – agrees with the plan because of the limitations and they have rearranged the garage location.
- E. Mol – asked why the existing garage was 1' from the line? Rhineberger – stated it appears it was before permits were required; he found no record. Y. Peterson – replied the property line was established after the buildings were there. Mol –consider that a hardship and the Town Board agrees.
- F. Aarestad moved to grant a variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.048(F)(2), Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow replacement of the existing 16' x 20' detached garage that is 1.8 ft. from the side property line with a new 16'4" x 23'5" living space and 22' x 26' attached garage onto the existing dwelling. Additions to be 6.2 ft. from the side property line at the closest point and back side of dwelling away from the county road. Existing dwelling is 120' from the centerline of County Road 37. Mol seconded the motion.

VOTE:

CARRIED

UNANIMOUSLY

4. **LESTER N. HOIKKA & JEROME J. HOIKKA**– New Item

LOCATION: Part of the SE ¼ lying south of CR 37; also that part of SW ¼ lying south of CR 37; all in Section 18, Township 120, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Albion Twp.) Tax 201-000-183302 & -183300

Requests a lot line adjustment as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.026(E)02, 155.048 Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to add approximately 2.5 acres of tillable land from tax parcel 201-000-183300 to land to the south, tax parcel 201-000-183302. Also 13 acres (combination of tillable and non-tillable land) from tax parcel 201-000-183302 to be added into parcel 201-000-183300, parcels to be combined into existing tax parcels owned by Hoikka.

Present: Lester & Jerry Hoikka

- A. Rhineberger displayed an air photo with a site plan of the farm. In 1997 the Board reviewed divisions and assigned “entitlements”. The property north of the County Road was part of that request and three of the “entitlements” were assigned there. Area south of the road is before the Board and the lot line adjustments were outlined. The 2.53 acres will add road frontage and is tillable ground. The land on the east side would be incorporated and not change “entitlements”. This is a land swap and was required to come back to the Board because they had approved a specific layout.
- B. J. Hoikka stated they met with the Town Board in November and they did not have a concern.
- C. Rhineberger – stated they did not get a recommendation on file. Neumann, Town Board Supervisor, confirmed they did come before the Township. He asked the applicants to explain their reason for the adjustment. J. Hoikka stated his brother lives on the homestead and wants to own the entire pond/wildlife area. L. Hoikka added this is under a Fish & Wildlife easement and wants to protect it and prevent other people coming in there. J. Hoikka – noted the small field would be put back with the rest. Neumann – noted the land area expanded by the road would give a second access if the Highway Department approves; the other adjustment is about 50% field, but not a significant amount of farmland. In the end, Township accepted the plan.
- D. L. Hoikka indicated what is tillable now will remain farmed. Neumann agreed, just under different ownership. Rhineberger – noted as land changes there is no guarantees. Rhineberger asked about access to the area in back. J. Hoikka stated there is access on his property.
- E. Mol – asked if there is a way to get 300’ wide on the road? Rhineberger stated in this case it is not necessary because the parcel has it on the west side. Mol – wanted to make sure there is enough. Rhineberger noted if someone wanted a mortgage split in the future, they may have to come back to the Board.
- F. Aarestad felt the 2.5-acre tillable land adjustment is modest and had no objection to the plan.
- G. Aarestad moved to approve the adjustments according to the site plan on file, subject to the Auditor combine parcels to avoid separate tax parcels; if that is not possible, the owners sign Administrative Orders. Neumann seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE INSPECTION

Board scheduled site inspection for Friday, December 5 at 8:00 a.m.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Rhineberger
Planner

BJR:tp

cc: Board of Adjustment
Applicants/Owners
Twp. Clerks