

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Meeting of: July 18, 2025
MINUTES

The Wright County Board of Adjustment met on Friday, July 18, 2025 at 8:30 a.m. in the County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Paul Aarestad. With members present being Bob Neumann, Sandy Greninger, & Dan Vick. Absent: Dan Mol. Representing the Planning & Zoning Office was Aaron Ogle, Planner. Brian Wold, Assistant County Attorney, legal counsel, was also present.

ACTION ON MINUTES FOR THE June 27, 2025 MEETING

Neumann motioned to approve the minutes with no corrections. Motion seconded by Vick.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

1. **Robert O'Connor** – Continued from 6/06/2025

LOCATION: 7856 NORRIS AVE NW – BAY VIEW 1ST ADDN LOT-004 in Section 26, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Pleasant Lake - Southside Twp.) Tax #: 217 017-000040. Property owners: ROB O'CONNOR& DANA STRAND-O'CONNOR

REQUEST: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 and 155.057(E)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to convert the existing home's crawl space into livable space that is located within the shoreland building setback.

Present: Robert O'Conner, applicant

- A. Ogle presented his overview of the property stating that this request is located at 7856 Norris Ave NW in Southside Township. The riparian property portion is 0.43 acres, zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R-1). Located on Lake John which is classified as recreational development. This specific request is to convert the homes' existing crawl space into livable space within the shoreland building setback. And the request was continued from the June 6th meeting so the applicant could meet with the Township. A site inspection was also conducted on 6/23/2025. No updated plans were submitted. Their proposal is to remain in the same footprint and that the lowest floor elevation would be met. The Township approved the request to convert the existing crawl space into livable area as the footprint will not change. Ogle received a written public comment saying they support the variance request and believe it offers a more environmentally sensitive and community- minded alternative to new construction. Another written comment said they support the variance.
- B. O'Conner had no added remarks nor did anyone from the public in attendance.
- C. Vick was able to go to the site for an inspection. He asked Ogle how much the applicant would need to raise the elevation? Ogle stated that the applicant was in the process of getting a survey done and

he didn't know if a survey had come back yet with the elevations. The lidar data showed it at about a foot. O'Conner told the board that it was their plan to bring it up by a foot anyways. It meets the requirements but just barely according to the survey, so they are going to bring it up 18 inches. Vick's biggest concern was run-off after construction and how or if they were going to fix the issues with the foundation. Vick also preferred the lower deck to be held back to the same as the upper deck if possible. Vick acknowledged that the home needs a new foundation. O'Conner spoke to the board providing more detail on the existing retaining wall and referenced it in the pictures presented on the PowerPoint. They will have to remove the retaining wall to get in to lift up the cabin during construction but will be replacing it with something similar, if not the same thing, and set it back a little further too. Vick agreed with that plan because something needed to be done for the drainage. He also didn't mind a full basement being put into the cabin, but he did want to see the lower deck pushed back in-line with the upper deck.

- D. Greninger stated that even though she could not attend the site inspection, she did talk to member Dan Mol, who did attend. She would also like to see the lower deck even with the upper deck because currently the lower one is very close to the lake.
- E. Neumann asked O'Conner how much livable space would be added into the lowest level of the cabin. O'Conner stated roughly a 25 ft. x 38 ft. area. Neumann added that since O'Conner will be disturbing the dirt for a foundation replacement, construction on the basement at the same time would be a good decision. If O'Conner can meet the requests of the other board members, and since the Township supported it, Neumann was in support of the request.
- F. Aarestad agreed with the rest of what the board members had discussed and suggested.
- G. Vick moved to approve the request to convert the existing crawl space into livable space within the shoreland building setback. Conditioned: 1) The lower level deck does not further encroach the ordinary high-water of the lake than the existing main level deck; 2) Survey submitted at time of building permit application showing the existing homes proximity to the ordinary high-water line and property lines; 3) Elevation Certificate submitted prior to building permit final showing the lowest floor elevation is 4 ft. or more above the highest-known water level; 4) Septic compliance inspection submitted prior to building permit application or new septic system design submitted at time of building permit application. Exhibits: Site plan Exhibit A and Building plans Exhibit B. Motion seconded by Greninger.

DISCUSSION: Neumann questioned requiring a storm water management plan with Vick agreeing and so noted by Greninger.

- H. Amended motion to include a stormwater management plan is submitted at time of building permit application.

DISCUSSION: Ogle clarified the survey submitted at time of building permit application would be to ensure the home goes back in the same spot, the elevation certificate would verify the 4 ft. above highest known water level, and the septic compliance or new design would ensure a septic is capable of handling the proposed home addition.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **Joseph Lindell** – Continued from 6/06/2025

LOCATION: 13010 79TH ST NW – Part of Gov't Lot 1 along with PRT OF SE1/4 OF SE1/4, Section 26 & 23, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Lake John - Southside Twp.) Tax #: 217-000-261104 & 217-000-234402. Property owners: JODI A WALLNER

Request: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 and 155.049(F)(2) 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 within the road setback.

Present: Joseph Lindell, applicant

- A. Ogle presented his overview of the request. The property is located at 13010 79th St. NW in Southside Township. The property is 0.92 acres, zoned General Agriculture, and located across the road from Lake John which is classified as Recreational Development. The request is to construct a 14 ft. x 14 ft. 4-season addition to the existing home and was continued from the June 6th meeting so the applicant could speak with the Township at their July 1st meeting. No updated plans have been submitted. A variance is required to construct a 14 ft. x 14 ft. 4-season addition to the existing home that would be 25 ft. from the centerline of the road that services additional properties as 65 ft. is required. A previous variance was approved in 2005 allowing a 19 ft. x 30 ft. addition 8 ft. from the east property line on the condition it was guttered to prevent runoff onto the neighbor. The Township approved of the request because the property is located at the end of a dead-end road, the road is not maintained by the Township, and the proposed structure does not encroach onto the road or adjacent property. No written comments from the public were received.
- B. Lindell added that the neighbors and owner had a discussion, and everyone agreed that it wouldn't hinder any kind of heavy equipment or any trucks that may come in. There is enough space that there would be no damage incurred.
- C. There were no comments from the public in attendance.
- D. Greninger recapped the Townships approval for the request because the applicant is at a dead-end road. She supported the approval of the request.
- E. Neumann asked how close the main part of the existing house is to the road. Lindell said it was about 39 ft. or 41 ft. minus the overhang. Neumann stated that regardless of being a township road or a private road, sometime in the future it will need maintenance. He reminded Lindell that setbacks are measured from the center of the road, but any way you look at it this addition is very close to the road and any type of maintenance vehicle or reconstruction and reshaping of the road would be right up against the house. He doesn't feel that if this was a garage request, the board would approve because the length of a vehicle is almost 25 ft. Neumann said he would have a problem with approving this request because of that. Also, when thinking about the practicality, the situation and the house has been functioning thus far without the addition. He asked where the hardship is in the whole situation.

- F. Vick agreed with some of what Neumann had to say, but he did see the hardship for the owner where the whole end of the road is basically on their property. He asked what the proposed measurement is from the edge of the road? Lindell said he measured 65 ft. from the center of the road to the existing house and that he did not know where the 25 ft. listed on the shown plat came from. Ogle using the Beacon program's 2025 aerial photo and measuring tool from the overhang to the edge of the road came up with 37/38 ft. and figured about 39 ft. to the building. With the addition there would be roughly 25 ft. to the center line of the road. Ogle confirmed it was about the same distance as scaled out on the site plan. Vick asked what the possibility would be that the road may be continued through the end of the existing dead-end. Ogle stated that it serves a few properties already and that the City has started to annex some properties in the area, but Ogle did not want to speculate on the future of the road. Vick said that he had mixed feelings about the request but due to the Township approving the request with the existing dead-end road shows him that it would be okay to approve it.
- G. Aarestad understood what Neumann was saying but wanted to add a different perspective. If you go into Minneapolis, you will see a lot of homes that are very close to the edges of the roads. He thought the neighborhood in this request was somewhat similar where there were a lot of existing homes that are already close to the road. So, he thinks this house would fit in nicely with the added addition. He likes that the neighbors and the Township are all in agreement and that it seems like a very modest request. It's very reasonable, so he has no issue with supporting it.
- H. Vick motioned to approve the variance request as regulated in Section 155.026 and 155.049(F)(2) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a 14 ft. x 14 ft. 4-season addition to the existing home that would be 25 ft. from the centerline of the service road. Exhibits: Site plan Exhibit A. Building plans Exhibit B. The motion was seconded by Greninger. There was no further discussion.

VOTE: Greninger, Aarestad, Vick NAY: Neumann

MOTION CARRIED

3. **Anthon Ellis** – New

LOCATION: 7075 Pilger Ave NW – Portion of Gov't Lot 2 in Section 28, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Southside Twp.) Tax #: 217-000-284300. Property owners: JEFFREY HARMSSEN & STACY HARMSSEN

Request: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.049(F)(2), 155.057(E)(1) and 155.090(Table 3) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a new single-family dwelling that would be within the road and shoreland building setbacks while the septic absorption area would be within the setback from the home.

Present: Anthon Ellis, applicant

- A. Ogle gave an overview stating that the request is located at 7075 Pilger Ave NW in Southside Township. The property is 0.60 acres, zoned Urban/Rural Transition (R-1), and located on West Lake Sylvia which is classified as General Development. The request is to construct a new single-family dwelling that would be 65 ft. from the ordinary high-water of Lake Sylvia and 18 ft. from the centerline of Pilger Ave NW while the septic absorption area would be 15.5 ft. from the home. A variance is required to construct the proposed new single-family dwelling within the 75 ft. shoreland building setback, within the 65 ft. road setback, and within the 20 ft. septic absorption area setback. The Township approves of the request because the new home would be built further from the lake than the existing home and a neighbor is in support of the variance request.
- B. Ellis added that the setbacks for the property leave a 1,400 sq. ft. buildable area and really doesn't allow for a conforming single-family dwelling with an attached garage. Also, another obstacle is the full width of Pilger Ave runs clear across their property pushing the front setback further into the property than all the other properties East of theirs. Those are the 2 challenges they would like to overcome with their request.
- C. There were no comments from the public in attendance.
- D. Neumann stated 18 ft. from the center of the road is very close to the proposed building. He thinks that is way too short of an area to turn around even though they showed on the plans their intentions of how to turn around. He felt that due to this being a brand new building, with a half-acre of space, there should be no problem meeting the setbacks. He suggested adjusting the building plans and possibly shirking the home to meet the setbacks. He saw several problems with the request. Yes, the road may encroach on the property, but he feels they still have plenty of room to work with. If approved, any addition to the home would require a variance and it is a brand new build. Neumann felt there needed to be new plans drawn up meeting the setbacks.
- E. Vick agreed with Neumann. He felt that a new build should be able to meet the setbacks by downsizing the house plan. He added the board doesn't usually like to hand out variances on new construction if they don't have to and the applicant was requesting 3 variances. He advised the applicant to look at situating the house a little differently with in the property lines and setbacks.

- F. Greninger agreed with Neumann and Vick and thought 3 variances on a new construction was a little much when the applicant could reconfigure the house and fit the property better.
- G. Aarestad was in agreement with the other board members. So, he offered some options to Ellis on how they could proceed with the request. He stated that it sounded like the request as is would probably not pass so the options are to take the advice given, go back and rework the house plans and assess the garage, especially since it was the biggest issue with the road setbacks and come back to the August meeting with revised plans. The applicant could ask the board to vote on what is presented or the applicant could withdraw the request all together.
- H. Ellis said he did not want to withdraw but instead would like to explore the option of reconfiguring the plans. He also wanted to respond to the garage location. The existing garage on the property sits about 17 ft. from the center line of Pilger and they are planning on moving it back a foot to 18 ft. Ellis stated that they are making improvements with the plans that were submitted. The topography on the west side is much higher than the east side so they have a retaining wall running along almost the whole property and the garage is situated how it is because of the entry and being embedded into the hill already. They went back and forth looking for different ways to reconfigure and the plans as they are proposed are what they thought would be the best and again, still an improvement to the existing garage.
- I. Ogle used the Beacon program to show approximate buildable area on the property outside of setbacks.
- J. Aarestad asked Ellis what he would like to do going forward. Suggesting a possible site visit and stating that a foot of improvement is not as big of a deal. He added that if Ellis thought the topography issues seen in person would benefit this request, then a site visit would certainly be an option. Otherwise, he could go back to reconfigure the layout on the plans or withdraw the request.
- K. Ellis stated he would like a site visit and to reconfigure the plans as well. Vick thought it would be a good idea for a site visit as well.
- L. Greninger motioned for the board to make a site visit. Vick seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

- M. Ogle asked what meeting they would like to push the item out to? Ellis asked if he would need to go back to the Township. Ogle said that it would be up to the Board.
- N. Vick motioned for the item to be continued to the August 8th, 2025 meeting. Greninger seconded it.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **Robert Morris** – New

LOCATION: 5256 Quinn Ave NW – Lot 4, Block 1, Bridal Beach, Wright County, Minnesota in Section 05, Township 120, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (French Lake Twp.) Tax #: 209 012-001040. Property owners: ROBERT A & MARY KAY T MORRIS

Request: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026, 155.057(E)(1) and 155.090(B)(12) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct a new single-family dwelling that would be within the shoreland building setback, have the lowest floor elevation lower than required, and serviced by a holding tank.

Present: Robert Morris, applicant, Bernie Miller with MSTs, and Brandon Scheuble with KC Custom Home Design

- A. Ogle gave his overview with the property site plan displayed. The request is located at 5256 Quinn Ave NW in French Lake Township. The property is surveyed at 0.43 acres above the ordinary high-water, which in this situation there is a creek that is not a classified stream but due to the depth of the creek it has some areas that are below the ordinary high-water line. So, the lake setback off of Lake Sylvia “proper” extends into this creek area. The property is zoned Urban/Rural Transition and located on West Lake Sylvia which is classified as General Development. A previous variance was granted in 1986 for a 24 ft. x 34 ft. storage building to be 50 ft. from the edge of the creek. It is not known if the creek has changed since then and there were no elevation numbers referenced. This request is to construct a new 832 sq. ft. single-family dwelling that would be 50 ft. from the ordinary high-water (OHW) line of Lake Sylvia, with the lowest floor elevation at 1054.4 ft. (NGVD 29 datum) and be serviced by a holding tank. A variance is required to construct a new single-family dwelling within the 75 ft. shoreland building setback and for a lowest floor elevation less than 4 ft. above the highest-known water level. A variance is also required for a new home to be serviced by a holding tank. The Township approved of the proposed location of the cabin with variances on the lake and creek side. Also, a neighbor has no problem with the “good improvement”.
- B. Morris added they have owned the property for 9 years and are wanting to make a few improvements to the existing cabin. Miller used the displayed property photos to explain and described that the existing cabin is close to the lake with the deck sitting partially over the lake, which seems to be common for other properties around this particular bay area. The property is unique with the creek running down the side. It was determined that the ordinary high-water line would continue at the current elevation due to the land being fairly flat. When they revisited the options there was no way around avoiding a variance to the creek. Miller referenced the existing garage/storage building stating that it has been there since the variance was granted in the 80’s and is in great shape, so the applicants don’t want to remove it and leave it as is. The cabin they are wanting to build is comparable to the existing cabin, only 832 sq. ft., which is only like 100 sq. ft. larger. Miller discussed with the applicant the holding tank and if there would need to be a full septic system installed. Morris, being in the septic and excavation business, decided the holding tank is fine for their use and size of the cabin, plus they have been using a holding tank for the past 9 years with no issues. Miller also stated the percentages of 7.8% existing building coverage going to 9.1% which is still almost 6% under the total amount allotted. And the impervious would go down by 0.3% due to removing the current deck.

- C. There were no comments from the public in attendance.
- D. Vick stated he thought the existing garage could be pulled back and asked if it was on a floating slab? The applicant responded with a “yes”. Vick suggested that this would be a great time to pull it back and meet the 65 ft. road setback while doing other construction on the property. He also thought it would be a good idea to conduct a site visit with the board to be able to see the full scope of the hardship in this request.
- E. Greninger had a similar question of whether they are moving the existing cabin already, then she would like to see 65 ft. setback. Her original thought was to turn the garage and move the cabin back than all setbacks could be met. She would rather be closer to the creek than the lake. Ogle clarified that there would not be a way to meet 65 ft. from the OHW because of the creek to the west. Ogle asked for clarification if she was speaking about 65 ft. off of Lake Sylvia “proper”. Greninger clarified that she was referencing Lake Sylvia “proper”. She does not feel the creek is as big of challenge of being within 65 ft. of Lake Sylvia “proper”. She also added that she wouldn’t mind a site visit as well.
- F. Neumann said this situation is different to him because the applicant doesn’t have a lot of space and the setbacks are not conducive to really doing much. For him the creek is a hardship. Neumann stated he would also like a site visit. He felt that it would not be a big deal to move the garage and went on to ask Miller if the garage was moved out of the way, and the proposed cabin moved to the south to get further away from the main lake area, would some sort of a septic system be possible? He liked that the applicants were only building a small cabin, under 1,000 sq. ft., but if future owners would want or need a full system he doesn’t want to create an issue. Miller answered, stating that if you slid the cabin back towards the road then they would only be 30 ft. away from the high-water level of the creek side. Miller stated that they did review the current elevation of the existing garage and if they had slid it back and attached to the new cabin, it would have been 3 ft. more, doesn’t have footings and wouldn’t meet the elevation, which would cause a need to raise the land and there would not be enough space in-between for drainage and other things. Also, on the side there would be an issue with closeness to the current retaining wall, and they would not be able to get in there to fix anything if needed on that side. The existing garage sits considerably lower and at the time of building there was no discussion about having to meet elevation requirements and as far as they know it still hasn’t flooded. In regard to the septic system question Miller stated it would require a variance no matter what someone does. As they planned the size of the cabin it was thought about and being in a sensitive area by the lake, with the fact that it is categorized as a seasonal site they feel that having just a holding tank keeps it in that category limiting the usage for that area. Miller asked Ogle to pull up a visual on Beacon stating that many of the other houses around the lake going towards the west aren’t meeting the 50 ft. setback from the lake. He feels that a site visit would help make sense of the request and plans presented. Miller added that other than the garage there may be some other options for adjustment, but they don’t feel that moving the garage is an option.

- G. Neumann built onto what Miller said, and that his main thought was if they could meet the main lake setback at 75 ft. that would be one less variance. He understood that they would need one for the creek, but Neumann would rather that variance than one for the setback of the lake. He also said in regard to the elevation that if they just added a foot of fill that it would be one less variance there as well. Those are the things that Neumann would like to see. Ogle did mention the DNR minimum is 3 ft. above the highest-known water level and that the County ordinance is 4 ft. above. Vick asked about the flat topography and clarification on the garage being 3 ft. lower than the proposed house. Miller addressed this stating they looked at the contours and worked on how they would get the drainage around the house. They would have to raise the cabin up to about 3 ft. to meet the minimum floor elevation. Vick said he would like a site visit.
- H. Aarestad stated that what Neumann suggested would make things more in-line and consistent with what the board has allowed in the past. He added the proposed size of the cabin is good and the proposed site is reasonable, but he thinks it can be better. If they could move it back further with some elevation changes Aarestad would be more willing to give it a setback variance to the creek than the lake. Aarestad suggested the option of a site visit and allow for the applicant to have time to possibly reconfigure what is being proposed. Miller recommended a site visit as well and continuing the item to another meeting.
- G. Greninger motioned for the board to conduct a site visit and continue the item to the August 8th, 2025 meeting. Vick seconds the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **Gary Nierengarten** - New

LOCATION: 10820 Ellingwood Ave NW – Lot 13, 14, and 15, Silver Shores, Wright County, Minnesota in Section 08, Township 121, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Silver Creek Twp.)
Tax #: 216-026-000130, 216-026-000140, 216-026-000150. Property owners: Gary & Carol Nierengarten

Request: Variance as regulated in Section 155.026 and 155.057(E)(1) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to construct an addition to the existing home that is within the shoreland building setback.

Present: Gary & Carol Nierengarten

- A. Ogle gave his overview of the request with the site plan on display. The request is located at 10820 Ellingwood Ave NW in Silver Creek Township. The property is 0.95 acres, zoned Urban/Rural Transition, and located on Silver Lake which is classified as Recreational Development. The request for a variance is to construct a 1,376 sq. ft. addition to the existing home/deck that is 88.5 ft. from the ordinary high-water (OHW) of Silver Lake. A variance is required to construct a 1,376 sq. ft. addition to the existing home/deck that is 88.5 ft. from the ordinary high-water of Silver Lake because 100 ft. is required. The Township approves of the request and there were no written responses from the public received.
- B. G. Nierengarten added that his uncle built the cabin and deck in 1960, and it is still the same since. They purchased in 2004, and are finding some things within the cabin set up that are not functional for them as they age. C. Nierengarten mentioned that they have 2 bedrooms upstairs with a steep staircase and no bathroom upstairs. They are wanting to add on an attached garage to the cabin so they can someday add a ramp inside the garage. They are proposing the addition be built to the side of the existing home. There is only one corner of the existing deck that does not meet the 100 ft. lake setback.
- C. There were no comments from the public in attendance.
- D. Greninger didn't have any questions or comment.
- E. Neumann stated the impervious coverage he saw would be 10.21%, putting them under the maximum. The large lot means the building coverage for this is not a problem, the proposed building plans meet the required setbacks, and the Township approved so Neumann was in support of the request as well.
- F. Vick was also in support but asked for clarification on the 88.5 ft. deck setback or if the house was not in compliance of the lake setback. C. Nierengarten using the site plan clarified the area of original deck not meeting the OHW, which was not relevant when built. Vick asked about the possibility of the lot being divided. Ogle verified that based on current Statute it's not possible and the 3 different tax ID numbers/parcels must be owned in common. Vick asked about the shed on the lot line. C. Nierengarten clarified that it wasn't really a shed and it could be torn down if need be. Ogle stated that the Board can place reasonable conditions on an approval that are directly tied to the request. Vick would like to see the shed moved to meet the lot line setbacks, otherwise he is fine with everything else.

- G. Aarestad felt that he would like to look at the applicants having a storm water management plan prepared. He liked that they were combining the 3 lots into one and that it added to the quality of the lake and he would definitely support that part of the request.
- H. Neumann motioned to approve the request to construct a 1,376 sq. ft. addition to the existing home/deck that is 88.5 ft. from the ordinary high-water of Silver Lake **CONDITIONED** on a stormwater management plan submitted at time of building permit application and the shed within the side yard setback is moved to meet required setbacks or removed from the property. Site plan noted "Exhibit A" and building plans noted Exhibit "B". Vick seconded the motion.

Discussion: Ogle wanted to clarify the side setback for the shed would be 10 ft. for an accessory building/shed. Neumann said 10 ft. would be sufficient. Ogle asked the Board to clarify what they are looking for with regards to the storm water management plan. Aarestad stated that because they are proposing to double the roof surface area, he wants to make sure that the storm water runoff is managed well. Ogle asked for more clarification from the board as he has to approve of the plan. Aarestad said that most plans are just to slow the storm water down by having sufficient guttering and controlling the runoff into the lake.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE INSPECTION

The Board scheduled a site inspection for Wednesday, August 6th, 2025 with the Commission to meet at 8:30 a.m. at the Government Center.

Meeting adjourned at 9:38 am.

Respectfully submitted,



Aaron Ogle
Planning & Zoning Planner

AO: cb
CC: Board of Adjustment
Applicants/Owners
Twp. Clerks