

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Meeting of: May 2, 2014

MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Board of Adjustment met May 2, 2014 in the County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Chairman, Bob Schermann, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. with the following members present: Schermann, Don Schmidt, Dan Mol and Paul Aarestad. Absent was Charlotte Quiggle. Sean Riley, Zoning Administrator, represented the Planning & Zoning office and Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, was legal counsel present

1. **KEVIN L. GEISINGER** – New Item (re-scheduled from 4/4/14 agenda)

LOCATION: xxx Mitchell Avenue NW - Part of E 1/2 of NE 1/4, Section 36, Township 121, Range 28, Wright County, Minnesota. (Southside Twp.) Tax #217-000-361400 & -361401 Owners: Arthur Geisinger Revocable Trust & Olean

Requests an “after-the-fact” variance of Section 502.2 & 604.6 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to allow a division out of a “lot of record” exceeding 5 acres on a 33’ access strip to public road.

Present: Kevin Geisinger and his father, Arthur Geisinger

- A. Riley presented maps of the property to show how one tax parcel was physically separated. He explained how this happened was a portion of the farm was annexed and developed into a golf course in Annandale. The city limits were illustrated on the map. This left a non-contiguous lot which the owner has now sold off. The owner had believed and understood it was separate but since that portion had never transferred ownership it was not a separate piece. The owner was informed the sale was illegal and the road frontage would have to be addressed. When the County became aware of the division the owners were notified and that it would have to go to the Board of Adjustment. Since that time the owner has reached an agreement with the owners of the golf course to get access and has met with the City. This hearing is to determine if that portion can be sold with the remaining “entitlement” and restrict the farmland.
- B. K. Geisinger – indicated the building “entitlement” for the parcel would go with the 12 acres. Riley explained Board action has to address if they could approve this division and where the entitlement will be assigned.
- C. Schermann asked if the access road to the 12 acres has been purchased? K. Geisinger – explained this was an error in the original transfer. His father was always supposed to have had access and it was missed. The owners of the golf course have agreed to provide a 33’ wide access strip out to the town road. Riley explained the owner has obtained a purchase agreement for the strip pending this action.
- D. Mol – indicated he has no problem with this as long as the City and Town Board have agreed. This will provide access to the 12 acres and restrict the rest of the acreage. Schermann agreed. Schmidt felt as long as this provides legal access he could agree.

- E. Aarestad – noted it is not a big deviation, the strip is supposed to preserve farmland, but nothing is changing and this property is in a “Transition” area.
- F. Kryzer suggested action include a condition that a deed be recorded transferring the property to be used for access. Riley noted the 12 acres could not be divided again, unless it goes into the City or something else takes place. A deed restriction would have to be signed acknowledging that.
- G. Schermann moved to grant a division of 12 acres with the remaining “entitlement” that is physically separated from the rest of the parcel on the condition the 33’ wide strip to the town road is deeded to the 12 acres and the owner files a deed restriction on the balance of the acreage that is approximately 27 acres. Mol seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **KIM SKANSON** - Cont. from 3/7/ 14 & re-scheduled from 4/4/14 agenda

LOCATION: 4331 58TH Street NW – Pribyl’s Shore, according to the recorded plat thereof, Section 5, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Maple Lake–Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #210-023-000320

Requests a variance of Section 403, 404.2, 405.2, 502.2 & 612 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to allow expansion of the existing nonconforming structure as follows: Removal of existing 10’ x 12’ porch that is 39’ from the ordinary high-water mark of lake (OHW) and removal of a deck that exists 36.41’ at the closest point to the OHW and replace with a new 13.5’ x 24’ porch over the existing lakeside deck that will be 36.41’ from the OHW and 11’ from the side property line. Also construct a new 5.5’ x 12’ entry and 5.5’ x 12’ covered porch on the east side of the structure 11’ from the side lot line (existing house line is 16.5’ from the side line); construct a loft over that portion of the dwelling that is 36.41’ from the OHM and 11’ from the side line. Replacement of existing 288 sq. ft. garage with a 16’ x 24’ garage 5’ from the side property line and 30’ from the centerline of road (10’ off the road right-of-way) and 10’ from the septic treatment area. The new sewer system to be a Type III system installed 5’ from the side property line and 10’ from the new garage with the tanks at 5’ from the property line. Applicant is proposing to remove a shed to bring lot coverage within limits.

Present: Kim Skanson

- A. Riley noted the request has been revised since the original hearing in March. The applicants have decided to start over, tear down and build a new structure. He referred the Board to the last paragraph in the Staff Report where the Staff has summarized the variances needed are 65’ from the lake and variances needed for the septic system. The dwelling will meet side setbacks. The applicant will have to free up about 584 sq. ft. of impervious coverage to bring that into compliance. A survey showing elevations was viewed along with the plans for the structure. The existing one-stall garage would remain.
- B. Skanson stated since the last meeting they have given it more consideration and met with Rhineberger. The new plan moves the house back considerably, although it is crowded up on top with the septic and where the garage is. This improves some of the issues. The design of the house is about the same, but changed the location on the lot.
- C. D. Schmidt indicated he likes the changes made. He is pleased to see the improvement on the lake setback and they have centered the structure on the lot. There are limits on what they can do with this lot he supports the revisions.
- D. Mol agreed with Schmidt, looked over the two requests and felt the applicant complied with what the Board asked.
- E. Aarestad stated he read the minutes from the first meeting and felt this is an improvement. Schermann concurred with the statements made by the Board members.

- F. Skanson – noted the current driveway will be shorter and they are confident they can comply with impervious coverage. Kryzer – noted they have not asked for a variance of the impervious coverage. Riley stated it is not part of the request, but it is one of the issues. Staff had been discussing with them how to bring it into compliance. The Board should make that a condition of their action. Setback variances were summarized.

- G. Schmidt moved to approve variances to allow new construction of a dwelling to be 65' from the ordinary high-water mark of lake. Allow construction of the sewer system within 5' of the property line. Condition: Impervious coverage to be reduced to bring it into compliance and not exceed 25%. Mol seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **STEVEN THAL** - New Item (re-scheduled from 4/4/14 agenda)

LOCATION: 10656 County Road 13 SE – Part of S ½ of NW ¼ & N ¼ of SW 1/4; also NW ¼ of SW ¼, all in Section 28, Township 118, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Franklin Twp.) Tax #208-200-292400 & -283200 Property owners: Leland and Sharon Thal

Requests a lot line adjustment as regulated in Section 502.2, 604.2 & 604.6(5) of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to separate the south 40 acres off the farm using the existing drainage ditch as the new property line. Existing house to be divided off on five acres and an “entitlement” shall be designated to the remainder of the NW 1/4 of SW 1/4.

Present: Steve Thal, representing his parents who are the property owners

- A. Riley presented maps to show the acreage and proposed division line that follows a ditch adding about 1.5 acres of that part of the farm with the land on the north side and assign the remaining entitlement. Staff has no major issues with this type of an adjustment; but, it cannot be handled administratively.
- B. Thal stated he attended the Town Board meeting and they had no objection. The Township suggested they run the division down the center of the ditch. He stated they would resurvey to meet that suggestion.
- C. Mol stated he understood why the Township suggested running the line down the center. Both owners would share in the responsibility of the ditch. Having a small portion landlocked on the other side of the ditch does not make sense, he supports the adjustment.
- D. Schmidt agreed with Mol, noting they have allowed several adjustments of this nature. The Board avoids isolating portions of land.
- E. Schermann and Aarestad agreed with those statements, the ditch makes a natural division line.
- F. Mol moved to grant a lot line adjustment as regulated in Section 502.2, 604.2 & 604.6(5) of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to separate the south 40 acres off the farm using the center of the existing drainage ditch as the new property line. Existing house to be divided off on five acres; and an “entitlement” shall be designated to the remainder of the NW 1/4 of SW 1/4. Schmidt seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **KEITH A. DUSKE** - New Item (re-scheduled from 4/4/14 agenda)

LOCATION: 5700 Cushing Avenue SW – Part of Gov't Lot 2, also part of W ½ of SE ¼, Section 34, Township 119, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Marysville Twp.) Tax #211-000-343100

Requests a variance of Section 502.2 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance and Wright County Feedlot Ordinance Section 6.005 A(4) & 8.003A(1) to allow a 20' x 42' addition to existing animal building that is less than 100' to property line. Also, replace and enlarge existing building. A variance is requested to expand the feedlot within Transition Area of the City of Waverly.

Present: Keith Duske

- A. Riley presented location maps to show the city limits of Montrose and Waverly in relation to the farm. The Board is asked to review a feedlot expansion is both an addition and numbers of animals. The setback not being met is from the edge of the road right of way. The Wright County Feedlot Ordinance does not allow expansion of a feedlot within a Major Growth/Transition area. Schermann noted the City of Waverly has responded favorably. Riley stated that is correct, however, City of Montrose has not responded and they are closer. Two neighbors responded favorably.
- B. Tracy Janikula, Wright County Feedlot Officer, stated the expansion of the feedlot is to some buildings and are increasing from 251 animal units to 292 animal units. The map shows the City of Montrose is across the street to the northeast, but is undeveloped. Duske indicated it was annexed a long time ago and the owner is trying to un-annex the property. Riley explained the importance of the issue is that it is a conflicting land use. Although animals can be removed, the buildings would be there if the City develops. The County does not want conflicting land uses, on the other hand if it is not in the near future, perhaps it makes sense.
- C. K. Duske – stated he farms in a partnership with a brother. His nephew is interested in taking over the operation. They would like to facilitate that so he does not have to go somewhere else to farm.
- D. Schmidt – in talking about the increase to 292 is a huge increase. He did not feel that is an issue. City of Waverly and neighbors responded favorable. If Montrose did not object, he would agree as long as they have not heard an objection.
- E. Mol –asked how far the 500' separation for a new dwelling would be. Would that create an issue for some one. The map was used to view the ownership. Riley felt the only place left with an entitlement is west of the road and the applicant owns that. The issue would be if the City comes out. Janikula the t00' does not reach to the northeast. Duske would have to sell his own land to create a problem. Mol – since the addition proposed does not go closer to the road and other expansion is within the farm site. They are already hauling manure out for the animals they now have. He has no objection.

- F. Aarestad – small expansion and buffer zone looks good. Since Montrose did not respond and the other City approves. He would agree.
- G. Schermann – because this is a small expansion and no negative responses he would agree. He felt supporting young farmers was important.
- H. Schmidt moved a variance of Section 502.2 of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance and Wright County Feedlot Ordinance Section 6.005 A(4) & 8.003A(1) to allow a 20' x 42' addition to existing animal building that is less than 65' to property line. Also, replace and enlarge existing building. A variance is requested to expand the feedlot within Transition Area of the City of Waverly. No negative response received, no response from city of Montrose, City of Waverly approves and the Town Board approves. Aarestad seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. **JOSHUA J. GALLUS** - New Item

LOCATION: 3669 105TH St. SW - Part of the NE ¼ of SW ¼, Section 28, Township 118, Range 26 Wright County, Minnesota. (Woodland Twp.) Tax #220-000-283100
Property owners: Gallus & Seaburg

Requests a variance of Section 502.2 & 604.6(4) of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to divide existing 25 acre lot of record (Tax #220-000-283100) owned by Gallus by attaching the west 10 acres to existing 15 acre parcel with a dwelling that bisects #-283100 (owned by Seaburg). The east 15 acres of #-283100 to retain the “building eligibility”.

Present: Josh Gallus

- A. Riley displayed a map to show how the two tax parcels are situated. Land to the west and east of a division are not contiguous, but are under the same tax parcel. A lot of record with the house is in the center. Previous action tied the 15 acre home site with that part of the acreage to the east. The owners want to flip that and keep the remaining entitlement with that portion lying east of the building site and tie that portion west of the home site together. The Board is looking at a parcel that exceeds ten acres allowed for a building lot and the entitlement has to be assigned. For this reason, the Office could not approve the adjustment. Assuming there is a feedlot the new house must meet the 500’ setback.
- B. Gallus explained the previous adjustment was a different owner and he bought both parcels. He sold the center parcel and the owner of the 15 acre lot approached him about purchasing the portion west of his house. He discovered he only has a 60’ setback from the house and wanted to add the land to the west. They are asking to combine that together.
- C. Mol asked the location of the existing feedlot. Gallus indicated there is no feedlot or animals. The purchase agreement states there has to be less than ten animal units. In the event there is one in the future, Mol questioned the 500’ perimeter where a house could be built. He asked if the house would have to be located in the back of the field. Gallus felt the portion of the property on the east side would give the best opportunity to build. He noted a location in the far northwest corner is not very high and the southwest corner is very low. The 15 acre parcel includes a good building site in the southeast corner which is high.
- D. Riley was not sure how the County would enforce a private agreement on limiting less than 10 animal units. Gallus – the buyer is aware of it and it is in their agreement. Gallus stated the building site was purchased on a contract for deed and he has not given fee ownership yet. The owner is aware of the feedlot limits and does not have animals. Schermann asked if their action should include that condition. Riley noted that is a private agreement. Kryzer noted that is a private matter between owners and they can only enforce the Ordinance. Mol – noted if they were to build within the 500’ that would restrict the other owner from going over the ten animal units. Riley agreed, if the house is built within the 500’.
- E. Schmidt, Mol & Aarestad agreed with the proposal.

- F. Mol moved a variance of Section 502.2 & 604.6(4) of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to divide existing 25 acre lot of record (Tax #220-000-283100) owned by Gallus by attaching the west 10 acres to existing 15 acre parcel with a dwelling (tax #220-000-283200 owned by Seaburg) that bisects #-283100. The east 15 acres of #220-000-283100 to retain the “building eligibility”. Condition: Administrative Order is signed by the property owner combing the two parcels. Schermann seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **TROY P. FLEISCHACKER** - New Item

LOCATION: 5513 30TH Street NE – Part of the NW ¼ of NE ¼ and part of the NE ¼ of NW ¼
Section 24, Township 120, Range 25, Wright County, Minnesota. (Buffalo Twp.)
Tax #202-000-241201

Requests a variance of Section 502.2 & 604.5(2) of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to construct an addition and attached garage to existing dwelling that is 43' from centerline of town road. (New construction will move away from road.)

Present: Troy Fleischacker

- A. Riley reviewed the location and noted there is no way to add to the dwelling without a variance. Pictures of the structure and property were viewed.
- B. Schmidt stated the Town Board looked at the property when out on road tour. This is a dead-end road with only three homes on the road. Low traffic and the Township did not feel there is a problem for snow plowing. The owners want a garage and addition onto the house and he felt it is a good plan.
- C. Aarestad indicated he lives on a similar dead-end road and does not see an issue from his experience.
- D. Mol since the Town Board agrees with the road setback and Schmidt is familiar with the property, he would go along with it.
- E. Schmidt moved to construct an addition and attached garage to existing dwelling that is 43' from centerline of town road. Reason: New construction will move away from road. Town Board approves. Mol seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

7. **ROBERT R. HOLLIS** - New Item

LOCATION: 2517 – 62ND Street NW – Lot 9, Block 1, Sherwood Forest, according to plat of record, Section 34, Township 121, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #210-129-001090

Requests a variance of Section 502.2 & 716.3 Table 3, of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to allow replacement of existing sewer with a new sewer 6' from the edge of the road right-of-way and 6.3' from the west side lot line at the closest point.

Present: Marcia & Robert Hollis

- A. R. Hollis presented a copy of a letter from a neighbor. Riley entered Danielson's favorable response into the record and noted the Town Board response indicates they approve and there is a representative in attendance.
- B. Air photo and a site plan were displayed and the existing drainfield location noted. The new drainfield to be installed is 5' at the closest point from the property line and less than 10' from the road right of way. The requirement is a 10' setback from property lines. Years ago when the original drainfield was installed the setback was not caught; however, they have to formally act on the setback before the new one can go in.
- C. Schermann recalled past problems after a couple of mound sewers were allowed to go in too close to the town road. Because of the close proximity of the systems the snow plow had taken off the top. He asked the Township Supervisor present if this is a concern here. Ron Wolff, Township Supervisor present – responded no. Riley indicated this is further down the road then the case Schermann referred to and they refer to the Town Board on these matters. This system is a drainfield and the road is higher along this stretch of road.
- D. Schmidt indicated if the Town Board is in agreement he would not object. This site is limited in what they can do.
- E. Aarestad asked if the system will include new septic tanks? R. Hollis indicated yes. Aarestad had no objection.
- F. Mol noted the new system seems to be moving back from the road from where the existing system. This is an improvement and would agree to the variance.
- G. Schermann agreed, but noted the problem they had run into in the past and wanted to make sure they do not repeat a problem. The applicant was questioned to where Danielson lives. Hollis stated they are to the west. Riley noted the Danielson well is close, just meets the separation requirement.
- H. Aarestad moved to approve a variance of Section 502.2 & 716.3 Table 3, of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to allow replacement of existing sewer with a new sewer 6' from the edge of the road right-of-way and 6.3' from the west side lot line at the closest point. Schmidt seconded the motion. VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. **DANIEL J. & KIM K. HOLLAND** - New Item

LOCATION: 1994 Dempsey Avenue NW – Part of N ½ of NW ¼, Section 27, and part of SW ¼ of SW 1/4, Section 22, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Albert Lake – Chatham Twp.) Tax #203-000-223301 & -272202

Requests a variance of Section 502.2, 604.6(4) of the Wright County Zoning Ordinance to allow a division of the 76.64 acre parcel as follows: Existing dwelling to be separated on approximately 24 acres leaving the balance of 52 acres (approx.) with less than 300' wide on the public road to encompass the farm buildings and the remaining "building entitlement" . with 300' wide on a public road.

Present: Dan & Kim Holland

- A. Riley reviewed air photo and maps to show the property lines of the existing parcels. The history of the parcel was summarized. This was one large farm parcel, with a fairly new home. The owners have been working with Staff to see how they could sell the house off and keep the farm parcel with the outbuildings. The large ag parcel would retain the remaining "entitlement". The difficult part is with the road frontage, division includes more than 2.5 acres out of prime farmland and there is not a good way to make the 300' width required for the division and remainder parcel. An access strip is proposed but the Ordinance stipulates an access strip is only allowed to preserve tillable or to get to a wooded site. Questioned the best way to divide off the house and leave access to the balance and be able to use the access for a future house. The applicant's proposal has shown an access strip (existing driveway) to the ag land that is a little over the 66' wide owned access strip at the road, narrowing to 66' wide; this division leaves more acreage with the existing house than is allowed. There is wetland and lake in back as shown on the air photo.
- B. D. Holland explained they have 100' in width by the road because there is a drainage area and because of the way the existing driveway was built. This makes for straight boundary lines. K. Holland explained they have been working with Riley to see what the options were and this seemed the best. D. Holland stated he wants to keep the farm buildings with the acreage. Seems to be the cleanest way and avoids cutting it up in pieces.
- C. Aarestad asked if more lakeshore would be cut off. Riley – explained the house on 24 acres and question is how they would get access. D. Holland the house lot is 450' wide and they would put in a new driveway to serve it. He noted how the access strip would be drawn. Riley noted the lot with the house meets the 300' in width, but it would be 24 acres and has some field but more of the wetland. Aarestad – asked if they are you cutting more lakeshore off. D. Holland no, it would have the lakeshore. Riley reviewed the boundary and where the future entitlement would be used. K. Holland – stated they met with the Town Board and they approve.

- D. Schmidt asked how much tillable is included in the residential division. D. Holland stated out of the 24 acres there is about 14 acres tillable. Riley stated that would be part of what is being sold. K. Holland stated that part of the property is hilly. Riley noted adding this acreage puts the size over what is allowed. Normally they would tie it to the rest of the tillable, but in this case it is on the other side of the house.
- E. Mol – suggested an easement to share the driveway. A new house would end up further back on the property. This would eliminate building a new driveway and cutting through tillable land. D. & K. Holland expressed concerns about sharing driveways. To sell and finance properties it would be best for the new owners and themselves to have their own driveways. Mol stated his concern about splitting up the tillable. The tillable land may be useable for the new buyers to have a hobby farm, put in pasture or crop area if they want to have some horses. D. Holland – felt that option would still be there. K. Holland noted an area on the other side of the house that works for pasture.
- F. Riley suggested an alternative is to get a driveway along the proposed line and shift to the north, the Town Board would have to approve another approach. D. Holland – the Town Board approved of this. Riley noted there is a visibility concern here because of the hill. Mol – asked where the Township specified the driveway. D. Holland it was not specified. Kryzer – questioned if a new town road is an option, but he did not expect the Township would want another dead-end road. Riley – they discussed that this land some day could be developed and if that would ever happen, the existing house could come off a new town road. That is future and not in the owner’s plans. K. Holland – they want to keep this land in their family.
- G. Schermann – if the owner should decide to develop, that access strip could be used for a town road. Riley - it would have to be built to the Township standards but it would meet minimum dimensions. Schermann – it could not be turned over until upgraded to township specifications. Questioned if this strip would be wide enough? Riley – yes and is also the reason they widened out the strip near the road.
- H. Schmidt – was having reservations about the proposal. He asked if they are planning to sell off the house. D. Holland stated yes and now have a place on Maple Lake. K. Holland stated they are downsizing and want a one-level home. Schmidt –asked if the buildings are barns or sheds. D. Holland stated there are three sheds, there used to be a dairy barn. They had replaced the farmhouse. Schmidt – although there are not a lot of options agreed with Mol’s suggestion, that if they could just have the one road that would be best.
- I. Schermann – was not hearing a consensus from the Board. Mol asked if a site inspection to get more familiar with the property would help. Building a driveway next to the existing one, would the other one just grow up in weeds. D. Holland – stated he would continue to get in there as he uses the sheds. Mol – knows there are ways to get agreements and easements and the person who has the house would be responsible for plowing it. Did not make a lot of sense to put two driveways next to each other. D. Holland stated he is looking at the future and if this gets developed it would be an issue later. Mol stated they make the split but Holland would retain ownership of it so he can turn it into a town road

later. The buyer would just be using the driveway. K. Holland explained the current buyer is someone they know, but if they should sell they might be creating a future problem by sharing the driveway. Other neighbors to the north have had issues trying to share a driveway. They want to get along with neighbors and don't want to create a situation where there could be problems.

- J. Aarestad – felt with 66' width there is room for a future town road and put in another driveway in for the house would be up against the other. Would this not be quite expensive? He asked about drainage for second drive, would they have to raise a new driveway and ditch it? D. Holland stated he has had excavators look at it and it is doable.
- K. Schermann called for a motion. Not hearing one, Kryzer suggested a site inspection. Schermann agreed and noted no one is real supportive and that might help.
- L. Mol moved to continue to June 6, 2014 for a site inspection. Aarestad seconded the motion. VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

DISCUSSION:

Isabelle Olson was present. Riley explained the action taken at the last meeting for a division for Olson – Monticello Township, specified a 33' wide strip. Olson would like to go up to the 66' width allowed by Ordinance. Riley suggested with future requests the Board allow access strips between 33-66' to allow some variation. This width is allowed by Ordinance. Schermann concurred and no objections were voiced by the Board members.

A motion by Schermann to amend the motion made March 7, 2014 to allow the access strip to a width of 66'. Schmidt seconded the motion. VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MINUTES

On a motion by Schermann, seconded by Mol all voted to approve the minutes for the March 7, 2014 with the amendment to Olson as amended in the above motion - Discussion Item.

SITE INSPECTION was scheduled for Friday, May 30, 2014. Board to meet at 8:00 a.m. at the Public Works Building.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sean Riley
Zoning Administrator

SR:tp

cc: Board of Adjustment/County Board/Twp. Clerks/Applicant/landowner