

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Meeting of: June 16, 2023
MINUTES

The Wright County Board of Adjustment met June 16th, 2023, in the County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, Paul Aarestad, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. with Board members present: Paul Aarestad, John Jones, Dan Vick, Dan Mol & Bob Neumann. Representing the Planning & Zoning Office was Aaron Ogle, Planner. Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, legal counsel.

ACTION ON MINUTES FOR THE MAY 19, 2023 MEETING

- A. Vick called out page #3 line E stating that he believed what he stated is that 'this Board hasn't usually approved' versus the typed 'has usually approved'.
- B. Jones motioned to approve the May 19, 2023, meeting minutes with the noted correction and as printed. Seconded the Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. **JUSTIN PHILLIPS** – continued from 5/19/23

LOCATION: 3162 62ND Street SW – Lot 1, Block 2, Carrigan Shores, Section 31, Township 118, Range 25, Wright County, MN (Woodland Twp.) Tax # 220-013-002010 Property Owners: Justin Phillips and Tabitha Phillips

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in section 155.026 and 155.003(B)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a storage building that would be over the maximum allowed detached building area allowed on the property.

Present: Applicant not present

- A. Ogle – at the May meeting the item was continued to allow time for the applicant to update plans. At this time no new plans have been received and the applicant does not appear to be stepping forward.

Aarestad held the matter over until the end of the agenda to see if anyone would show.

2. **MICHAEL BUNN** – continued from 4/21/23 & 5/19/23

LOCATION: 1156 State Hwy 25 SE – the W 1/2 of the NW 1/4 of Section 08, Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, MN (Rockford Twp.) Tax # 215-100-082201. Property Owners: Gary R Ilstrup, Roger K Ilstrup & Carol Isltrup, Lee Russeth

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.048(G) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to create a “1 per 40” entitlement division over 10.0 acres with over 2.5 acres of prime soils.

Present: Applicant nor representative present

- A. Ogle stated that the applicant has requested their application be withdrawn and dismissed without prejudice.
- B. Mol moved to approve the withdrawal petition without prejudice. Jones seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **LARRY BERNING** – New

LOCATION: 207 Halsey Ave SE – Lot 21, Oak Ridge View in Section 05, Township 119, Range 24, Wright County, MN (Lake Charlotte - Rockford Twp.) Tax # 215-035-000210 Property Owners: Larry M. Berning and Patricia S. Berning.

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.006, & 155.049(F)(3) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow an attached garage to the existing home. The proposed garage would be inside of the side yard setback and proposed building coverage would exceed the maximum allowed.

- A. Ogle reviewed the property details with a proposed site plan on display. The property is zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R1) and located on Lake Charlotte, which is a General Development Lake in Rockford Township. The property is 0.36 acres with an existing building coverage of 15.4% and existing impervious surface coverage of 40.5%. A Board of Adjustment request in May 2022 was withdrawn for a 28 ft. x 36 ft. (1,008 sq. ft.) detached garage that would have been over the 800 sq. ft. maximum detached accessory building size for a parcel under 20,000 sq. ft. The request was also to have 1,327 sq. ft. of total detached accessory building area on the property, where 1,000 sq. ft. is the maximum allowed for parcels under 20,000 sq. ft. in size. The proposed impervious surface was 38.4% where the maximum allowed is 25%. This request is to construct a 24 ft. x 44 ft. (1,056 sq. ft.) attached garage to the existing home. The attached garage would be 10 ft. from the south side yard and the total building coverage would be 18.5%. A variance is required as the attached garage would be 10 ft. from the south side yard whereas 15 ft. is required and the proposed building coverage is 18.5% whereas 15% is the maximum. The Township approved of the request.
- B. Berning stated that the total impervious is within the State and MN DNR guidelines at 24.6%. He is looking to clean up the yard and get some items under a roof.
- C. No comment from the public.
- D. Mol thanked the applicant for getting the impervious coverage down. Still has a question with the size of the building and if that can get closer to the limit. The 10 ft. side yard setback is okay. Would shortening up the building by 5ft. be feasible? Berning – 5 ft. would be tight for 2 cars next to each other. Essentially there is currently a garage sitting at that 10 ft. and this would be going into that footprint but deeper to connect to the breezeway. When remodeled in 2004 the intention was to attach a garage to the breezeway. Mol questioned where the water flows. Berning – there is drain in front of the house that goes directly to the lake. Intent is to remove the drain and add rain gardens. There will be better control of water management with gutters and have water hit the rain gardens before making it to the lake. With the garage, where it is located, the water management should be better. Mol asked for clarification on the site plan with regards to the driveway location. Berning stated there will be an area of strips to help meet the 25% impervious. Mol – strips for the wheels to drive on and grass or something else in-between. Berning – correct. Mol – not far over but understands the intent and the size of the lot. Impervious has been improved upon.
- E. Vick feels there is an awful lot of building coverage on a small lot. Understand the desire to get 2 boats into the space but a lot of others have been limited to 2 cars. Is there a way to shorten or pull towards the road? Feels 18% building coverage is large, he could go with a few percentages over but not 3%. Berning – shrunk the size as much as he can. When looking at truck, car length and a trailer the overall length and width doesn't work to go less and 24 ft. is standard. It is more about wanting walking space between the cars. Vick – impervious is right under 25%. Berning – total impervious will be under the 25%. In a sense the proposal is right where the state guidelines are. Vick questioned what amount of building needs to be removed to get to 15% building coverage. Berning – roughly calculated 400 sq. ft., which he would not be able to fit 3 cars. Had to go long because he can't go wide. If he goes wide for 3 cars than he has too much impervious. Feels that this proposed plan is a balance of the two and is best to get to 25%. Vick asked if the garage could go into the roof line of the breezeway. Berning – that would take away the look of the breezeway, it is a focal point and

he likes the breezeway. Vick – he voiced his concerns and would like to hear what others have to say. Ogle – approximately 547 sq. ft. of building would need to be reduced to hit 15%.

- F. Jones – concerns have been brought up by other members. The impervious situation was solved but the building coverage is still a concern for him. Is there absolutely nothing that can be done to decrease size of building? Berning – not feasible to park 3 vehicles and garden equipment. Shorten the length you lose the walking distance between vehicles. Neighbors, a few 100 ft. away are in the City of Saint Michael and do not have to follow the 15% building coverage rule, they just follow the 25% impervious rule.
- G. Neumann – no problem with the 10 ft. setback from the side, this Board has approved that before. The size of the building is a want of the applicant. It really does not have anything to do with the function of the property like a septic system or something that has functionality with the house. If this Board is not comfortable with the 18.5%, they could approve a smaller size. Feels that the impervious coverage is fine. Questioned the current building coverage with Ogle responding 15.4%, so already over. The applicant is asking to reduce impervious by 15.9% and increase the building coverage by about 3.1%. Neumann – thought is to request 16% or something of a compromise with the applicant needing to figure out how to make that happen. Berning – regardless he will end up with 25% impervious even with a smaller garage, just because of the lay of the land he needs to have the garage set back that far to minimize a steep driveway. Moving closer to the road the driveway gets steeper and why he chose the proposed location. He is raising the garage a few feet higher than the existing garage to get the driveway to work better. Can't really go closer to the road. The State of Minnesota and DNR guideline is 25% and this is the only County that has the 15% rule. Neumann questioned the size of the current garage. Berning – 22 ft. x 24 ft. and why it is on the same footprint for width so as to not affect the neighbor.
- H. Aarestad – in favor of the variance. The reduction in impervious surface is significant and has a big impact and improvement on the water quality. Appears the current driveway directs a lot of water straight into the lake. Also, the property is a few 100 ft. away from another jurisdiction that has different rules. When looking at a variance the Board looks at consistency in the neighborhood. In this case it is unique that quite a few of the neighbors are able to go above the 15% building amount. He feels that with the significant improvements to the impervious coverage that he could go along with the request. Hearing what has been stated it does appear that the request may or may not pass. There is an option to move forward with a vote, come back with a new proposal as well as an opportunity to withdraw.
- I. Vick – noted there is a boathouse. If there was not a boathouse, he could see a need for some extra storage. Berning – boathouse is mainly life vests, lake items, canoes and not that large. Vick – it is still available storage. Feels that the covered porch and garage could be shifted over towards the house and get down closer to 16.5%. Personal thought is that the plan would be more acceptable at 16.5% as 18.5% is getting up there. Berning – feels the 15% rule is outdated. Kryzer – the statue is not outdated and is the rule that this Board applies. The request is asking for a variance, that under state law requires this Board find a practical difficulty, which they have not yet found. These are the rules and regulations that this Board follows.
- J. Mol – likes the impervious coverage portion but struggles with the 18% because he can't find the practical difficulty. Does not feel this Board is here to negotiate. The request is at 18% and that is a lot of coverage. The proposed impervious is wonderful and where it is supposed to be. The 10 ft. setback is a distance he has voted for in the past. Feels the 18% is a challenge and he does not want to negotiate, as this Board has not done that in the past. The applicant needs to show why there is a need for the variance. A boathouse is needed for those items mentioned but on the same token the building coverage is 3% over. Even though property is next to a different set of rules the County has all sorts of lakes to protect and the ordinance is there for a reason.
- K. Neumann – if the Board set at a percent of building coverage it would be the applicants decision to remove the boathouse and have a bigger garage or shrink the garage.

- L. Berning stated he would like to see a vote because he is not going to want anything smaller or bring closer to the house, as it will wreck the look of the house.
- M. Aarestad called for a motion. Hearing none Kryzer addressed the Board stating that at this point it sounds like a motion will not pass and the Board would be in line closing the public hearing and directing staff to draft findings consistent with denial.
- N. Vick moved to close the public hearing and direct staff to draft findings consistent with denial. Mol seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- O. Vick moved to continue the hearing to July 14th, 2023, to review drafted findings. Mol seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **STEVEN PEDERSON** – New

LOCATION: 7599 20th Street SE - Part of the Northwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter in Section 17, Township 119, Range 24, Wright County, MN (Rockford Twp.) Tax # 215-000-171204 Property Owners: Steven & Elizabeth Pederson

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.047(F)(3), & 152.027(A)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a livestock building and open feedlot within the side yard setback.

Present: Steve Pederson

- A. Ogle displayed a site plan and reviewed the property details and request. The property is zoned Agriculture/Residential (A/R), located in Rockford Township and 10.6 acres. The request is to construct a livestock building and open feedlot 70 ft. from the east side yard. A variance is required as the proposed building and open feedlot would be 70 ft. from the property line whereas 100 ft. is required. The Township approved of the request.
- B. Pederson – setting a building in this location will hopefully get him within all of the rules for the other buildings that are temporarily holding animals. There is a significant drop off to the west and south, which makes building into a side of a hill difficult. Ogle reviewed the site plan and specifically pointed out the location of the well and noted there is a required 100 ft. setback that this Board cannot give a variance to.
- C. Raymond Polson – owns the property directly east and would like to see the 100 ft. setback rule stand.
- D. Vick – his lead question was going to be how the neighbor felt. Now with the comments he would like to see the site or where would the building location if rules were followed.
- E. Jones – same concerns that member Vick stated. Questioned the number of cattle. Pederson stated he does not have cattle, he has a small hobby farm with goats, 2 pigs, 2 donkeys and some chickens. Jones asked the applicant how long he has owned the property with Mr. Pederson stating 5 years. Concern is that in these situations a new owner comes in with cattle. Ogle – there are regulations that apply to this specific zoning district and what animal units are allowed. Pederson – limited animals per acre.
- F. Neumann – owns a feedlot and likes the setback on feedlots because they protect the neighbors from the feedlot but also protects the owner from the neighbors. If a neighbor moves in and complains about the livestock it is easier to defend when criteria is being met. Feels terrain is less desirable but there is the space. To find the difficulty as to why the building can't be moved 30 ft. is tough to find. The building is not that large so adding fill or moving dirt is possible. Pederson – the other part of the setback is that there is a septic mound about 130 ft. from the area. Ogle – used the displayed site photo to show location of the septic system.
- G. Mol asked to see the map that shows topography. Also involved in agriculture and family farmer so he understands feedlots. Tries to always defend the farmer from the neighbor but also has to defend the neighbor with the setbacks. When asking for variances and getting too close, especially on a hobby farm, you have smells and animals that get out. When in compliance it is a little easier for the Feedlot Administrator to work with the situation. There is quite a bit of the property with areas to move the build and meet setbacks, even with added fill or gravel. Feels that in this situation the 100 ft. needs to be met. It is important when you have the property and there is not hardship to make it work within the rules.
- H. Aarestad questioned if at 10.6 acres is there a difference in animal units over 10 acres versus under 10 acres. Ogle – in the A/R district once over 10 acres there is a particular category addressing the limit of animals. Believes they cannot have a traditional feedlot with 100's of cattle, and that based on their zoning believes they are limited to 5 cattle. The Feedlot Administrator would be the one to give the exact details but he does

know there are feedlot regulations related to A/R zoning that would limit the number of allowed animals. Aarestad – at a crossroads based on conversation there is a likelihood the request will not pass. There are options to vote, withdraw without prejudice or come back with revised plans. Pederson – revised plans would be meeting requirements because it sounds like a variance will not be allowed. Aarestad – could come back with an adjusted setback with reasons as to why. Withdraw without prejudice does give ability to come back at a later date. If continue the item and come back with a revised plan that is part of the same meeting process so no additional fee.

- I. Tracy Janikula – Feedlot Administrator stepped forward. Aarestad questioned how many animal units allowed at over 10 acres versus under 10 acres. Janikula – allowed $\frac{1}{2}$ animal unit per acre. So, the difference between 5 and $5\frac{1}{4}$ animals units is not significant. Allowed up to 5 cattle but currently has small animals. Vick questioned if part of the 100 ft. setback is there for overspray and safety for the animals. Janikula – rule is more for a distance related noise, smell, and flies.
- J. Aarestad – back to deciding what direction the applicant is wanting to go. Pederson questioned if this is the time to ask the Board to visit the site and decide if building into the side of a hill is a good idea. Mol – feels that is up for the applicant to decide. For him this is a 10 acre parcel that has plenty of room for proposed building. The property is large and open. Sometimes as a farmer you have to think outside of the box and plan out how the farm will grow. He needs to have the setback met. Aarestad stated it does not sound like a site visit is appropriate. Pederson – if vote is no and he comes up with a plan that meets requirements, what is the next step. Ogle – if no variance is needed an application would need to be made with Planning & Zoning for the building. Vick – can also come back to the next meeting with a revised plan and reasons. Pederson – there is a distance from the mound system that the building also needs to meet. Aarestad – trying to find a hardship as well. Pederson questioned distance requirements to the mound system. Ogle – 20 ft. to absorption area but there could be a conversation had with the Environmental Health staff. Aarestad – continuing provides a chance to work with staff and there is also a chance to withdraw before the next meeting. Pederson stated he was good with continuing to the next meeting.
- K. Mol moved to continue the item to the July 14th meeting to allow the applicant time to revise plans. Motion seconded by Neumann.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **COLTON HENTGES** – New

LOCATION: 2078 Cameron Ave SE - Part Gov't Lot 4, Section 16, Township 119, Range 25, Wright County, MN (Dean Lake - Rockford Twp.) Tax # 215-100-162116 Property Owners: Alyssa Hentges

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F)(3), & 155.057(E)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a single-family dwelling and attach it to the existing detached garage. The home & garage would be inside the shoreland and side yard setback.

Present: Colton Hentges

- A. Ogle displayed property map and request details as he reviewed. The property is zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R1), located on Dean Lake in Rockford Township. The property is 0.33 acres with an existing impervious coverage of 9%. Variance in 1996 approved a 24 ft. x 24 ft. garage 58 ft. from the centerline of the road and allowed the replacement of the existing foundation 98 ft. from the lake. The request is to construct a single-family dwelling 81 ft. from the ordinary high-water of Dean Lake and attach it to the existing detached garage that is 10.7 ft. from the east side yard. A variance is required as the proposed single-family dwelling is 81 ft. from the ordinary high-water whereas 100 ft. is required. A variance is also required as the newly attached garage would be 10.7 ft. from the side yard whereas 15 ft. is required. The Township approved of the request which included all setbacks and proposed second level of the home. There is an existing home with the request looking to go slightly up with the addition.
- B. Hentges – even with the addition he is technically reducing impervious coverage. Currently garage door is on east side and will be moving the garage door to the north side, which will reduce overall impervious coverage. By not pushing the home back to 100 ft. from the lake he will be able to maintain a Type III septic system, as most homes on the lake have holding tanks or failing systems. He would like to build in same footprint, go up with addition and attach a breezeway.
- C. No public comment.
- D. Neumann questioned if the current home will be removed or build up on existing. Hentges – current home has fire damage; the plan is to demo the house and build a slab on grade in the same foundation, at 81 ft. from the lake. Neumann questioned the proposed building coverage with Hentges replying 12%. The proposal meets his criteria and he does not have a problem with the request.
- E. Mol – looked at ability to set the house back but also looking at the type of septic system proposed he feels there is some practical difficulty. Anytime a better septic system can be installed it better protects the lake and is an improvement. Height of the home was questioned. Hentges – under 35 ft. Mol – important to improve the sewer and get away from holding tanks is a positive.
- F. Vick – no problem with request and likes that the plan is staying on the same footprint.
- G. Jones – agree with other members. As long as on the same footprint he does not have a problem with the request. Aarestad agreed.
- H. Motion by Mol to approve the construction of a single-family dwelling 81 ft. from the ordinary high-water of Dean Lake and attach it to the existing detached garage that is 10.7 ft. from the east side yard with site plan noted as Exhibit “A”, building plan Exhibit “B” and septic plan Exhibit “C”. Neumann seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **MARK BARTHEL** – New

LOCATION: 7153 Rosewood Ave NW – Part of the Southwest corner of the Southwest 1/4 of Section 30, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, MN (Lake Union - Southside Twp.) Tax # 217-000-303312 Property Owners: Mark A. and Dianne M. Barthel

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F)(2), & 155.057(E)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow an addition to the existing home that would be inside of the shoreland building setback. The request is also to allow a detached garage that would be inside of the road setback.

Present: Mark Barthel

- A. Ogle displayed the property and reviewed the request. The property is zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R1), located on Union Lake, which is a Recreational Development lake in Southside Township. The parcel is 0.73 acres with an existing building coverage of 5% and impervious coverage of 7%. A variance was granted in 1980 for a dwelling 75 ft. from the lakeshore conditioned that a proper septic system be installed, two lots be administratively joined as one lot for zoning purposes, and the mobile home is removed by 1/1/1983. The mobile home to be removed was extended to 7/1/1986 by the Board. This request is to construct a 12 ft. x 24 ft. (288 sq. ft.) addition to the existing home. The addition would be 62 ft. from the Ordinary High-Water of Union Lake. The request is also to construct a 26 ft. x 36 ft. detached garage that would be 30 ft. from the centerline of Rosewood Ave NW. A variance is required as the existing home and deck are 53 ft. from the Ordinary High-Water (OHW) of the lake and the addition would be 62 ft. from the OHW whereas 100 ft. is required. A variance is also needed as the proposed detached garage would be 30 ft. from the centerline of the road whereas 65 ft. is required. The Township approves of the request as the addition would be further from the lake than the old deck and the new garage being further from the road than the existing shed.
- B. Barthel – started working with Planning & Zoning last fall and decided to add onto the house and use as retirement home. After meeting a number of times, he feels this plan as the best option for adding on. Because of the mound system and set up of the yard, this will work best.
- C. No public comment.
- D. Mol asked if the old building being removed and converted to parking will it be left as hard surface. Barthel – yes. Mol – adding on but not closer to the lake. Barthel – removing 8 ft. deck on side and will be adding 4 ft. to the surface. Mol – what will happen with water running towards the lake? Barthel – gutters and with the hill water is soaked up into the yard. Mol – proposed at no closer to the lake, still within impervious and building coverage limits and increase distances. This lot is only so big, he feels he can go along with the request.
- E. Vick – from what he sees it does not appear that the site significantly drops and the applicant is doing the best they can. Can go along with the request.
- F. Jones – agree with other members.
- G. Neumann stated he does have some questions. How old is the current home? Barthel – father in-law built in 1982 or 1983. Neumann – variance was granted at 75 ft. from the lake so he is wondering why the existing home is at 53 ft. Barthel – not touching the location existing house or deck. Neumann – the approved variance in 1980 is different than where the house is now so there is some confusion. Looking at the purposed garage being 30 ft. from the center line of the road, does get into the road right of way. The Township did approve so if they are okay, he should be as well. Barthel – current road is a cartway and the property owner to the north will be widening the road this summer. Neumann – does that affect the new garage? Barthel – proposed

garage would be further back than neighbors. Neumann – normally this Board does not approve anything closer than 65 ft. but being that the existing home is there he would be supportive of this request.

- H. Aarestad stated he can go along with the 30 ft. from the road as this is a dead end road and the Township stated no issue. The Board has been firm at 65 ft., however because he feels the addition is modest and not encroaching any closer to the lake, he can make the exception to the 65 ft. and approves of the request.
- I. Neumann – being that there is new construction, would a stormwater management plan be prudent? Aarestad – there is an elevation drop to the lake and would agree. Mol – is this something the Board wants to see or can staff approve? Neumann stated a stormwater management plan could be part of the approval with staff reviewing.
- J. Neumann moved to approve the request to construct a 12 ft. x 24 ft. (288 sq. ft.) addition to the existing home. The addition would be 62 ft. from the Ordinary High-Water of Union Lake. The request is also to construct a 26 ft. x 36 ft. detached garage that would be 30 ft. from the centerline of Rosewood Ave NW. Conditioned that a stormwater management plan be submitted at time of building application. Motion seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. **LUCAS JOHNSON** – New

LOCATION: 13886 101st Street NW – Lot 1, Block 2, Spring Beach First Addition, and portion of the West 50 acres of the Northwest Quarter, Section 14, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, MN (Lake Augusta - Southside Twp.) Tax # 217-052-002010 & 217-000-142204 Property Owners: Hunt, Kimberly & Jeff

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F), & 155.057(E)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a single-family dwelling located within the shoreland, side yard, and road setback.

Present: Jeff Hunt – owner

- A. Hunt – Lucas Johnson is the home builder and was delayed so he was hopeful his item could be moved to a later time in the agenda.
- B. Aarestad and members agreed the item will be moved to the end of the agenda.

8. **MICHAEL LUEDEMANN** – New

LOCATION: 1211 50th Street NW – Lot 3, Block 1, Oak Shore Terrace Third Addition in Section 08, Township 120, Range 25, Wright County, MN (Lake Constance - Buffalo Twp.) Tax # 202-043-001030 Property Owners: Michael Luedemann & Nancy Luedemann

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.049(F)(2) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a single-family dwelling within the setback from the centerline of the road as traveled.

Present: Michael Luedemann

- A. Ogle displayed property details and the proposed site plan. The property is zone Urban/Rural Transition (R1), located on Lake Constance which is a Recreational Development lake in Buffalo Township. The property is 1.83 acres in size and the request is to construct a single-family dwelling that would be 47 ft. from the centerline of the road as traveled along the east property line. A variance is required as the proposed home would be 47 ft. from the centerline of the road as traveled along the eastern property line whereas 65 ft. is required. The Township approved of the request giving the Board of Adjustment the final authority. A neighbor commented that the properties to the east have been facing water drainage issues from the west. They strongly recommend a comprehensive stormwater management plan and noted the lot in question is considerably large with several areas that would easily satisfy the required setback.
- B. Luedemann – the reason for the variance is related to concerns with the septic system. Requesting the 47 ft. as it would put the home 32 ft. off the east property line, garage side. At present the home to the east is 18 ft. off of the property line so he feels there is quite a bit of space. Kevin Bursch with Bursch Brothers Excavating will be doing the septic system and will be able to explain the trouble with septic location. The property is unique where the 100 ft. setback pushes back off the prime piece of property and they choose to comply with that setback. This then pushes to the lowest part of the property, which is the side the Type III tanks will be located. Kevin Bursch with Bursch Brothers – the displayed site plan is the one that was approved by the County. The property site plan and required setbacks for the septic system, well, home and property lines was reviewed in detail. If the tanks are pulled forward it does intrude on the proposed building and would cause the building to be in a location requiring significant fill. Luedemann – this is a unique property with the 100 ft. lake setback that does push the home off the prime piece of property. Will need to build a new driveway 300 ft. long otherwise driveway would need to be at an 8% slope.
- C. Kimberly Onuma – owns the property directly east – the County already approved a site plan that meets the setbacks. She is having a hard time understanding why a new site plan, based off of esthetics, would be a hardship. This property is over 1.8 acres. There are variance requests all the time for small lake lots or where there is nowhere else to build but this property is very large and there shouldn't be a reason new construction cannot meet the setbacks. Their property is an old lot of record and the home meets the 65 ft. setback. At the Township meeting it was stated there being a problem with the septic system not fitting and that is why the Township thought it would be best for this Board to decide. She had not heard or seen anything on that concern and therefore did not know it was an issue.
- D. Vick questioned setback of 47 ft. from a private drive that services 2 properties. Luedemann – correct. That is an old easement that was given by the owner they purchased the property from. The majority of the drive cuts across their property. No problem with the easement road. If they move the house another direction the land drops off and is lower and lower. Ideally if the house could be closer to the lake, they could meet the 65 ft. setback and not have problems but they are looking to not vary from the 100 ft. setback. Vick asked if there is a good stormwater management plan. K. Bursch – the County did not put forth that one was required. When first approved it was overlooked where the tank location needed to be. Ogle – the original plan submitted had all setbacks being met and the grading plan was different than what is shown in this request. The original grading plan was not going to require any stormwater management plan but would have still required proper

erosion control. In this case the proposed grading plan is different so it was not addressed and will be discussed by the Board. Vick – there appears to be a chance of a lot of water running down the driveway going to the neighbors. K. Bursch – no.

- E. Jones – asked for the area of the septic system to be reviewed. Luedemann – Type III system will be installed. Displayed survey is the original survey used when first applied for the home and is when the 65 ft. setback came up. Once the 65 ft. setback came into play and the property was staked it became clear there would not be room for the septic system. Jones – would not have problem with request.
- F. Neumann questioned the size of the home. Luedemann – 2,200 sq. ft. rambler with one floor. Neumann – feels 47 ft. from the centerline is 18 ft. short of where needed and but is further back than others that have been approved. He can support the request because of the issue related to the septic system. On new construction he would normally really want all setbacks met. Because this makes the septic system work, he is willing to support the request. Questioned the Board if a stormwater management plan should be required.
- G. Mol – plans submitted show main level 2,100 and lower level 1,800 sq. ft. with another 257 sq. ft., which is over 4200 sq. ft. overall. He is not going to design a house but if the garage is reconfigured into another position the 47 ft. could potentially be met. This is new construction on over an acre lot. Giving variances to new construction is a challenge for him. Allowing a non-compliant house on a vacant lot that has no existing building structure this is not something this Board would normally allow. Hears the concerns but there are options where a variance would not be required. Luedemann – can the garage be 10 ft. off the east property line? Mol – he would like to see every setback met. This is a large lot that is wide open with no existing buildings. Bursch – pushing the garage back requires extra walls and soil corrections.
- H. Vick questioned if a hardship could be related to the easement driveway and if that driveway was not running through the property there would be plenty of room to meet the 65 ft. Bursch – correct.
- I. Mol – concern is a very large home with required ordinances to be followed. Luedemann questioned what the required setback is for that east line. Ogle – side yard for house or anything attached is 15 ft. unless a further restrictive setback is present. This property has the road that services more than 1 property so there is a 65 ft. setback off the centerline as traveled. Whichever is more restrictive needs to be followed.
- J. Aarestad – concerned with the neighbor having concern with water drainage. He does not want to see an issue for the neighbor created and will want to absolutely be sure no water will be going onto the neighbor's property. The topography was reviewed and discussed. Bursch – noted there is a lower swale along the property line along with a culvert that directs water into the swamp. Aarestad – he would like to see a berm or swale shown on the plan that will provide assurance measures and steps are taken to prevent drainage from going onto the neighbor's property. Ogle – does not foresee issue on the west side but the east side could be a problem. Discussion continued with Luedemann displaying a revised plan with details reviewed. This plan had not yet been presented to staff.
- K. Neumann stated he would like to do a site visit. Mol – agreed with drainage issues would like to visit the site. Still struggles with new construction of such a large home on over an acre vacant lot. Not saying there is a hardship with the lay of the land but feels the home can be built to meet the required setbacks.
- L. Vick – does see other houses closer and likes that they meet the 100 ft. from the lake. Pushing back would almost be a punishment. Mol mentioned these smaller homes that were built in the early 50's or built before the ordinance. If there is ability to move back or follow the ordinance the Board has tried to follow the ordinance.

M. Vick moved to continue the hearing to July 14th to allow time for a site visit. Motion seconded by Jones.
VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. **CRAIG HERTZENBERG** – New

LOCATION: 2405 62nd Street NW – Lot 8, Block 2, Sherwood Forest, Section 34, Township 121, Range 26, Wright County, MN (Maple Lake - Maple Lake Twp.) Tax # 210-129-002080 Property Owners: Stanley D Jensen & Dawn Damart Revtr

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F)(3), & 155.090(Table 3) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct an addition to the existing home that would be inside of the side yard setback and setback to the septic tank.

Present: Kari Hiltner – representing the applicant.

- A. Ogle – displayed property details and reviewed the details of the request. The property is zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R1) on Maple Lake, which is a General Development lake located in Maple Lake Township. The lot is 0.38 acres with an existing building coverage of 10.3% and impervious coverage of 27.5%. In 1974 a variance was granted for a garage located within the road setback. In 2004 a variance was granted for a 12 ft. x 15 ft. addition on the lakeside of the home and a 9 ft. x 16 ft. addition on the northeast side 13 ft. from the property line. The request is to construct an addition to the existing home. The addition would be 13.8 ft. from the east side yard and footings from the deck would be 5 ft. from the septic tank. A variance is needed as the proposed addition would be 13.8 ft. from the side yard whereas 15 ft. is required and 5 ft. from the septic tank whereas 10 ft. is required. The Township has yet to respond as it sounds like the applicant has yet to meet with the Township.
- B. Aarestad – normally this Board waits for township response before making a decision. Would the Board like to have a discussion or wait for response. Hiltner – was unaware that Mr. Hertzzenberg did not get Township approval. Ogle – it does not sound like the applicant has met with the Township, which is stated in the application packet and mentioned at the time of applying. Aarestad asked if continuing to the next meeting to allow time to meet with the Township was acceptable. Hiltner agreed.
- C. Motion made by Jones to continue the item to the July 14, 2023, meeting to allow time for the applicant to meet with the Township. Motion seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

10. **MARTIN LATZIG** – New

LOCATION: S 1/2 of the NE 1/4, also the SE 1/4 of the NW 1/4, also the NW 1/4 of the NW 1/4 all in Section 17, Township 118, Range 27, Wright County, MN (Victor Twp.) Tax # 219-000-171400 Property Owners: Ruth Latzig Revtr

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 & 155.048(G) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to create a “1 per 40” entitlement division over 10.0 acres with over 2.5 acres of prime soils.

Present: Martin Latzig & Randy Latzig

- A. Ogle displayed the property maps and narrowed in on the portion of the property involved in the request. The property is zoned General Agriculture (AG) at roughly 146.3 acres. Three entitlements remained on the farm after a 2021 Deed Restriction. The area of the prosed request is part of that remaining farm. The request is to create an approximately 11 acre entitlement division with approximately 4.6 acres of prime soils. A variance is required as the proposed division would be approximately 11 acres whereas 10 acres is the maximum. The division would also have approximately 4.6 acres of prime soils whereas 2.5 acres is the maximum. The Township approved of the request as the field is small and adding a couple more tillable acres wouldn't hurt. Ogle displayed and reviewed the prime soils map and noted there is a road to access the southern portion of the property.
- B. R. Latzig – they are wanting a variance at 11 acres versus a smaller parcel to allow for a building site with possibility to make more obtainable for someone to have a small number of animals.
- C. No public comment.
- D. Jones asked if the proposed lot line would run east and west. R. Latzig – with site plan displayed he explained the lot line would go north and south with the northern wooded area at roughly 2.5 acres. The area behind the woods quickly turns into swamp so going father back past the wooded area is not an option. The top portion, where trees are, was a perk tested and meets septic requirements. Going south the line would run along the creek. Jones questioned access. R. Latzig – bottom of parcel is a dead-end road with an existing road approach to get to the west portion of the property. The creek is crossed on a township gravel road. Jones – a lot of the center is swamp and not farmable. R. Latzig – correct, maybe can get grass hay. Jones stated he does not have a problem with the request.
- E. Neumann stated he does have a problem with the request. His stance has been that parcels this size are too small to farm and too big to mow. This Board has not approved situations where this amount of prime tillable soil is involved. There are 3 entitlements that could be utilized with no need for a variance. This Board tends to protect prime soils and have turned away requests because of prime soil issues. He does not see a hardship; this is a desire of the applicant and he is not in favor of the proposal.
- F. Mol – has tried his best to protect agriculture land. If done administratively by only going up to 10 acres and following the ordinance it would not reviewed by this Board. When a situation like this comes before the Board, he tries to protect agriculture land and prime soils. The area by the trees can have a home at 2.5 acres without a variance. He has a challenge with granting this variance.
- G. Vick – dose not like to see prime tillable used up. Feels there are options to change lines and not using as much prime tillable. At this time, he will not agree with the proposed plan. Mol – asking to split 11 acres from the entire 40 is the majority of the prime tillable with the remainder being mostly swamp. The buyer could buy the entire parcel and use the not so farmable area for hunting. Understands the want related to finances but that is not a factor for this Board. Vick questioned if they looked at the line going back into the swamp land. R. Latzig – yes, but it would be someone buying mostly swamp land. The 11 acres came about due to

the natural creek line being followed. If cut in half, going to the south there will be a 4 acre tillable piece of land that would be hard to farm. This proposed option was well thought out and designed to be more usable and desirable. The creek and swamp caused some of why they came up with the 11 acres. They are not trying to take up farmland, they are simply trying to make the property obtainable and desirable. Vick – not in favor of over 2.5 acres of prime tillable being used. Feels the line can be adjusted and not take as much tillable.

- H. Mol questioned if on the total 40 acres there are any other buildable area. R. Latzig – with site plan displayed it was explained there might be an area high enough but no perk tests have been completed. This is the area he has his deer stands and uses for hunting. At this time, they will be keeping this area.
- I. Aarestad – agrees with what has been stated. If divided the parcel will be made even smaller. Not a farmer but wonders if the 10 acres will be big enough for large equipment or would it be more of a smaller tractor hobby farm type equipment. Neumann – as it stands now large equipment can get in but once it is sold, he does not feel a person will build in the woods but would build in the field. This is going to become an odd shaped piece. Aarestad – hearing what has been said by others he would agree that another building site needs to be found, he would not want to disrupt the large parcel, as proposed.
- J. R. Latzig – the wooded area has an existing well. M. Latzig explained the well was installed in the early 70's for cattle.
- K. Aarestad – at a point where the Board can vote, with a chance the request might not pass. Choice to allow a vote, come back with a revised plan based on the concerns mentioned or choose to withdraw the request. R. Latzig questioned if they move the line back to the west with a 5 acre parcel, would that need a variance. Ogle – depends on the prime tillable with an allowance of 2.5 acres of prime tillable. Must be one to ten acres, 2.5 prime tillable acres or less, and meeting road frontage requirements. R. Latzig stated they could look into revised plans.
- L. Motion made by Vick to continue the item to the July 14th meeting to allow the applicant time to revise plans. Motion seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

11. **WHOLEMYSTIC ENTERPRISES LLC** – continued from 3/3/23 & 3/31/23 & 5/19/23

LOCATION: 815 Greer Avenue NW – Part of Gov't Lot 1, NE ¼, Section 36, Township 120, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Rock Lake - Albion Twp.) Tax #201-000-361200 Property Owner: Wholemystic Enterprises LLC

REQUEST: Appeal of the Zoning Administrator's interpretation of a feedlot and the denial of a single-family dwelling and septic permit, as regulated in section 155.026 of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: No applicant or representative present.

- A. Ogle stated he does not believe that the applicant was going to be present. They did request their application be dismissed without prejudice.
- B. Mol moved to dismiss the application made by Wholemystic Enterprises LLC without prejudice. Motion seconded by Neumann.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Aarestad called for a 5 minute break with the meeting called back to order at 10:21 am.

7. **LUCAS JOHNSON** – New Item was held over from beginning.

LOCATION: 13886 101st Street NW – Lot 1, Block 2, Spring Beach First Addition, and portion of the West 50 acres of the Northwest Quarter, Section 14, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, MN (Lake Augusta - Southside Twp.) Tax # 217-052-002010 & 217-000-142204 Property Owners: Hunt, Kimberly & Jeff

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F), & 155.057(E)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a single-family dwelling located within the shoreland, side yard, and road setback.

Present: Jeff Hunt & Lucas Johnson

- A. Ogle displayed the property photo as well as proposed site plan. The property is zone Urban/Rural Transition (R1) on Lake Augusta, which is a General Development lake located in Southside Township. The property is 0.42 acres. In 1975 a variance was approved for a building without a permit and sewer problems. In 1983 a variance was granted to replace the existing mobile home with another no closer than 83 ft. from the lake or 40 ft. from the centerline of the road. In 2013 a lot line adjustment was approved which divided the northern portion of Tax # 217-000-142204 and attached to Tax # 217-052-001090. The remainder of Tax # 217-052-002010 was joined to Tax # 217-000-142204 via an administrative order. The request is to construct a single-family dwelling 70.8 ft. from the ordinary high-water (OHW) of Lake Augusta, 11.0 ft. from the east side yard, and 49.6 ft. from the centerline of the road serviced by a holding tank. A variance is required as the proposed single-family dwelling is 70.8 ft. from the ordinary high-water whereas 100 ft. is required, 11.0 ft. from the side yard whereas 15 ft. is required, and 49.6 ft. from the centerline of the road whereas 65 ft. is required. The Township approves of the request. A neighbor commented asking how much fill would be added and how tall it would be to the roof.
- B. Hunt stated the family dwelling will be located on the larger of the 2 properties. They do not have plans to build on the smaller parcel. He did purchase the properties from his uncle, who currently owns the property next door.
- C. No public comment.
- D. Neumann questioned why the parcels are not combined. Hunt – was told the two lots are considered ‘lots in common’. He has asked about combining into a single lot but has not got that far with the County yet. Neumann – combination could help with building and impervious coverage. Ogle – those numbers have been adjusted as there is an Administrative Order stating the parcels must be owned in common. There is also a civil easement that covers the entire portion of the unplatted section, which is the smaller lot. Planning & Zoning does not enforce those easements. Neumann stated the Township is okay with the road setback, at almost 50 ft., which is 15 ft. short of the requirement. The side setback at 11 ft., which is 4 ft. off the requirement and therefore he is okay with that setback. The lake setback, at 70.8 ft., looks like the proposed building is further back than the next-door cabin, so he is okay with that part request. Questioned the location of the holding tanks. Hunt – using the displayed site plan and Beacon photo the holding tank and well location was described. Neumann stated he would like to hear what others have to say.
- E. Mol – questioned why the parcels were not combined and would like to see as a single lot. By combining, the building could be moved and possibly get further from the lake or at the 81 ft. distance that the existing trailer is located. Appears the new structure will be moving closer to the lake but if that other lot is considered as one the building could be reconfigured. He is looking at the site as removing the trailer and having an open lot. Ogle – both parcels are looked at as one, the survey shows the line but it is not considered for zoning purposes. If the Board requires pushing the building over to get further from the east line, there is a civil easement that Planning & Zoning does not enforce. Mol – if all considered a single lot the building could be moved over to meet setbacks and moved back so not any closer to the lake than existing. His other concern is

with the septic system. Holding tanks, on new construction, has not been favorable for this Board. Questioned the applicant if a holding tank is the absolute only option because of the height of the land. Hunt – non-conforming lot and a small lot that he is trying to fit a dwelling. The existing holding tank has not been used in years so the idea is to replace that holding tank and keep in that same location or in those parameters. His proposed setback is much further back than his neighbors buildings. Location of the dwelling was done with the intention of keeping the vacant lot and working with the neighbors, regarding the easement, to make sure all are cooperating and there is no problem with the established easement. Feels that the proposed dwelling is in the most fair location for his property and working with the neighbors to make sure all get along. Mol questioned if the vacant lot is the easement for backlots to get to the lake. Hunt – there are 2 people that can use the easement. Mol – that easement really ties hands; it is your property but you can't use it to its fullest capacity. Hunt – at this point he spoke with neighbors and they are all in favor of moving forward. He is willing to look into turning the parcels into a single lot but at this time he is trying to move forward with the variance to build a home. Mol – would like to hear what others have to say but is concerned with moving closer to the lake.

- F. Vick – has same concerns that have been mentioned. With that lot in common it should be combined right away and moved to the required 15 ft., so that variance is not needed and could help with setback to the lake. He could go along with the request if the building was moved northwest 4 ft. Hunt – with the easement on the undeveloped property at this time he is not able to establish that. The property he does own he can try to obtain the variance and move forward with the dwelling. Neighbors on left and right are closer to the lake than his proposal. Another neighbor is looking to rebuild but plans to reuse his footprint. Vick – using footprint but going closer to the lake. He would like to not see the 11 ft. variance and move the dwelling more to the northwest. Questioned the easement purpose. Hunt – driving access as well as storage of docks. He is working with the neighbors to maintain a rapport as well as be a responsible property owner and move forward with the plans for the dwelling. Vick – understands but would like to see the additional 4 ft. on that one side.
- G. Jones – agrees what was stated by other members. Questioned how long the easement will last. Hunt – until properties are sold. Jones asked which properties are part of the easement with Hunt using the Beacon map to describe. Neither of those owners are going anywhere. Originally there were 10 neighbors involved and concern is drivable access to get trucks and ice houses onto the lake and also room to store docks. Jones stated this is a unique situation. Hunt – location of the dwelling is larger than the current footprint. Tried to stay in same parameters, moving closer to the road might be a happy medium. Could possibly move a little closer to the road and therefore further from the lake.
- H. Aarestad – shares a lot of the same concerns member Neumann stated. A big concern of his is related to the holding tank. With aerial photo displayed there was an area questioned if a full septic system could be installed closer to the visible lake access. Hunt – there is not room. Aarestad – there is 54 ft., an access route would only need roughly 10 ft. so there could be plenty of room for a full system and still have room for vehicles to access the lake. Hunt – concern would be to have something established on that unused property and all of a sudden, a neighbors have concerns and a civil issues comes up. Reason wanting to replace existing holding tank the minimal amount of use at the site. There is one neighbor that has a septic system and all other neighbors have holding tanks. Aarestad – feels there is room for a septic system. He is not comfortable approving a holding tank but the other variances in the request he is okay with approving. At a point where the Board can vote, hears the Board is possibly at a split decision. Choice to allow a vote, come back with a revised plan based on the concerns and setbacks mentioned or choose to withdraw the request.
- I. Johnson – questioned what the concern is with moving 15 ft. closer to the lake when all neighbors are closer than this is proposed. Mol – they are not here asking for a variance. The ordinance states a specific distance from a lake. These other homes and cabins were built pre-ordinance and even pre state guidelines that this Board is required to follow. Feels with a trailer home not being on a permanent foundation this is almost a vacant lot with a variance request to be closer to the lake and side yard line. The easement is doing no good as the neighbors are using the property but you are not able to do anything with your own property and that line

is more of a hindrance. With other requests the Board has not allowed getting closer to the lake. Normally, this Board does not allow closer to the lake than what is existing. This request is closer to lake and lot line as well as proposed to be on a holding tank. Those are all real challenges for this Board and this Board needs to find difficulty and reasoning within ordinance to allow. Vick – the proposed dwelling is also 1 ½ times larger than existing structure. Mol – when these lots were created, they were for people coming out from the cities to camp or have a small cabin and enjoy the lake. These small houses are now more and more becoming large year round homes. The Board needs to try and stay within the ordinance.

- J. Hunt – hearing concerns from the Board he is wondering about a compromise. This is a nonconforming lot that he is trying to do the best he can to stay within the guidelines as well as work with the easement he has his neighbors. The empty lot he would prefer to keep as is for now and will look at eventually combining into a single lot. A solution could be to move the home back towards the road, away from the lake. He is also willing to look into installing a septic system, possibly on that vacant lot. Aarestad stated he would like to see a site plan that shows the location of the dwelling and septic system. Johnson questioned if there were a guideline number the Board would like to see the home back from the lake. Aarestad stated it is up to the applicant to demonstrate why. A septic system could prevent and determine the dwelling location and it is up to the applicant to articulate and show why the setback is what is proposed. Mol questioned if revision could be completed by July 14th with Hunt agreeing.
- K. Mol moved to continue the meeting to July 14th, to allow time for plans to be revised. Motion seconded by Vick.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. **JUSTIN PHILLIPS** – continued from 5/19/23 Item was held over from beginning.

LOCATION: 3162 62ND Street SW – Lot 1, Block 2, Carrigan Shores, Section 31, Township 118, Range 25, Wright County, MN (Woodland Twp.) Tax # 220-013-002010 Property Owners: Justin Phillips and Tabitha Phillips

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in section 155.026 and 155.003(B)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a storage building that would be over the maximum allowed detached building area allowed on the property.

Present: Applicant or representative not present

- A. Aarestad called for the applicant several times, with no one stepping forward.
- B. Kryzer questioned how the Board would like to proceed. At the May meeting the item was reviewed and the applicant was asked to present revised plans at today's meeting. At this time no revised plans have been received. We know of an applicant that has not appeared, which is in violation of Board of Adjustment policies. Proposed Findings For Denial have been drafted for the Board to review or the Board can continue to allow the applicant another opportunity. Mol stated he was not at the last meeting but in reading over the minutes what was stated by Board members indicated not in favor of the request. He would suggest if findings were drafted and the applicant has not shown or submitted revised plans that the applicant is indicating he has moved on. Aarestad asked Counsel to distribute findings for review with the Board then taking a few minutes to review.
- C. On a motion by Vick, seconded by Jones, all voted to approve the Notice and Order of Denial.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

A copy of the adopted and signed Findings will be mailed to the applicant.

SITE INSPECTION

The Board scheduled a site inspection for June 23rd, 202, for the Board members to meet at the Government Center at 8:30 a.m. with all members approving.

Meeting adjourned at 10:53 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Aaron Ogle
Planner
BR:sld
Cc: Board of Adjustment
Applicants/Owners
Twp. Clerks