

WRIGHT COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
Meeting of: March 18, 2022
MINUTES – (Informational)

The Wright County Board of Adjustment met March 18, 2022, in the County Commissioner's Board Room at the Wright County Government Center, Buffalo, Minnesota. Board members present were: John Jones, III, Dan Mol, Dan Vick & Bob Neumann. Absent was Paul Aarestad. Representing the Planning & Zoning Office were, Tracy Janikula, Feedlot Administrator and Barry Rhineberger, Planning & Zoning Administrator; Greg Kryzer, Assistant County Attorney, legal counsel.

ACTION ON MINUTES FOR THE February 11, 2022, MEETING

Motion made by Mol to delay acting on the minutes for the February 11, 2022, meeting until the April 8, 2022, meeting. Seconded by Jones.

1. **MITCH THEISEN** – Cont. from 2/11/2022

LOCATION: 2749 27th Street SW – The SE 1/4 of the SW 1/4, and the SW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 15 and part of the East 1/2 of the NW 1/4 and the NE 1/4 of Section 22, Township 119, Range 26, Wright County, MN (North Fork Crow –Marysville Twp.) Tax # 211-000-153401, -153400, -221101, -151301 Property Owner: Cynthia M. Theisen Trust

Requests a variance as regulated in Section 155.026(E)(2) & 155.048(G)(4)(c) & 155.057 Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to divide off roughly 20 acres with existing house, from tax parcel 211-000-153400.

Present: Mitch Theisen and Paul Otto of Otto Associates

- A. Rhineberger reminded the Board the item was continued to allow time for the applicant to work on the cartway with the Township, for a legal means of access to the new parcel. There appears to be some misunderstanding regarding the cartway and what is required from the Township. The Township reply indicated the cartway is a private matter. Reality is, cartways are a legally adopted resolution to be approved by the Township.
 - B. Theisen – provided the Township a proposal drawing with the cartway where the existing driveway is located. The Township simply said they were fine with the cartway and there was no additional discussion about accepting or adopting the cartway. Rhineberger – The response did not indicate they agreed on accepting the cartway. Theisen questioned if he would need to go back to the Township. Rhineberger – that is up to the Board. The reply indicates the Township feels the cartway is not a Township issue and they will not have anything to do with the cartway. This could be a simple clarification matter reviewing what is required of a Township regarding the adoption of a cartway. Theisen asked for clarification on what he should be asking of the Township, so they fully understand what is required for the cartway. Otto stated the Township did not make a motion or take a vote on this matter. Surprised to see the reply because there was no formal discussion or motion. The Township Attorney will be at the next meeting. Rhineberger – there is time to meet with the Township before the next Board of Adjustment meeting.
 - C. Vick questioned if the next item is related to this request how the other members feel about visiting the site. Rhineberger – the house variance is the next request. A site visit can be discussed during that review. Mol – moving forward with a motion to continue this item will still allow discussing a site visit for the next agenda item.
 - D. Mol moved to continue the hearing to the April 8, 2022, to allow time for the applicant to meet with the Township. Seconded by Vick.
- VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **MITCH THEISEN** – New

LOCATION: 2749 27th Street SW – The SE 1/4 of the SW 1/4, and the SW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 15, Tax # 211-000-153400, and the NE 1/4 of the NW 1/4, and the NW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 22, Tax #211-000-221101, Township 119, Range 26, Wright County, MN (North Fork Crow –Marysville Twp.). Property Owner: Cynthia M. Theisen Trust

Requests a variance as regulated in Section 155.026(E)(2), 155.048, 155.057(D)(1) & 155.057 (E)(2)(a), Chapter 155, of Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to build a new dwelling 170.2' and pool 141.2' from the Ordinary Highwater Mark of a Transition River.

Present: Mitch Theisen and Paul Otto of Otto Associates

- A. Rhineberger – site map with topography lines displayed. The request is for a setback variance of a new home to be 170 ft. from the Crow River. Without the division and approval of the cartway or additional road frontage, the house cannot be built. This discussion will need to continue until the cartway, and road frontage is figured out. Suggest the Board hear the request and have some discussion with the knowledge that if the cartway is not figured out there is no point in a variance for the house. The property is expansive with the northwest 20 acres, around the existing house, being divided off and the applicant retaining the remainder for the house site. The area of the proposed house is a portion of the property that has not been involved in the mining operation. The house location fronts the north shore of the North Fork Crow River. Survey was displayed with property layout explained. Topography map was shown and discussed. House is slab on grade. There is a bluff area that the house does not impact. Township did reply they approve of the house setback variance
- B. Theisen – father purchased in 2000's, at that time the main channel of the river was in a different location. When mining started his father left this area of property as another building site. The location of the river, at that time, was much farther from the building site. Several aerial photos were displayed to show the progression of the river route. The main channel was to the south. A portion would flood, like a marsh, but we could still drive tractors and hay the area that is now river. Assumption is his father based the location of the homesite far enough from the river and over the course of time the river changed direction. Rhineberger – reviewed the route of the river and basic process of how a river cuts its path. Theisen – the building site originally had plenty of room to build back from the river. Photos show that the mine was started in an area that is now river. Feel this is the least impactful area. There is a lot of low areas or areas that have been mined. These areas are set up so they can grow grass and be hayed, there is not a suitable building site. Not sure where the home could go without cutting trees. There are not a lot of trees, and the plan is to plant more trees. Intentionally did not remove trees for mining to keep integrity of the land.
- C. Otto – site plan displayed. Pool is located 53' from the bluff. Plan will require fill in of slope area to keep as far away from bluff as possible. Front side of house area will require roughly 6' of a hill to be cut out. Around 2% slope from bluff to pool, this will keep water running slower to the river. On the north side, the water will run towards the mining area. Rain gutters can be positioned to run north into the mine with some additional drain tile. Not meeting the river setbacks but trying to meet the intent of the river and bluff setbacks.

- D. Vick questioned if the river runs north and if there is concern with erosion from the river continuing to move and cut away more into the homesite. Theisen – yes, river runs north. Not too worried about the homesite. Canoeed the river since the 80's and knows it well. Places he has seen, relative to this location, have changed little. There is a pretty big bank, not worried about continued erosion. Feels there is another location that the river will change direction to. Rhineberger – displayed river map and reviewed the theory of river hydrology and what could potentially occur with the river moving. Generally, rivers want to drain more efficiently and become a straight line. Theisen – does not feel the river will push and keep moving towards the house location. Really feels in 20 years the river will go more to the south. Does not feel the river will impact the house. There is a tall bank that he has thought about installing a fence or bushes. Knows the 200' is the setback but is confident the 150' is safe. Vick – would like to make a visit to the site for both requests.
- E. Jones – concerned with some of the same issues that have been mentioned. The cartway is troublesome. Theisen – at the end of the day if there is no cartway there is still a building entitlement, with the house that used to be there. Rhineberger – once the house was gone there is no more entitlement. Theisen – did not realize that was the case. Otto – there are separate PID's. Rhineberger – separate parcels, but without proper road frontage. Otto – there is an option to build up the cartway to the north and purchase wetland credits. Jones – agree that this is confusing and many times when the Board visits the site there is clarification. Otto – this site has a bluff, but it isn't what the Board is used to seeing as a normal bluff. By definition it is a bluff but standing at the site it looks like a nice slope to the river. Theisen – there are areas hay is cut right to the river. A site visit would be good. Jones – the gravel pit causes confusion as well. Theisen – this site looks different at the site than on paper.
- F. Mol – agrees that a site visit is a good idea. Having a hard time agreeing to new construction when the hardship was created by the mining operation. There needs to be a hardship more than the mine creating the issue. There is possibly something to the river moving over time and affecting the homesite. Does not want to set a precedence set for river setbacks. The right reason for allowing the variance needs to be present.
- G. Neumann – is the 200 ft. setback there to protect the river from the people or the people from the river? Rhineberger – no different than other shoreland with intent to protect the river from the people. The DNR shoreland rules intent is to protect the water quality and aesthetics. But with a river it could very well be the intent to protect people from the river. Unlike a lake, rivers rise and fall with more flooding. The DNR built into shoreland rules the intent of shoreland rules to include floodplain areas. In the case of the Crow River the shoreland can extend a distance with the floodplain included. There to protect the river quality. Neumann – as proposed on a fairly large piece of property but would like to hear the animal unit's limit. There is mention of 5 animal units. Janikula – that would be with the 1st request. Neumann – how many animals are allowed on this PID? Janikula – on the large parcel, theoretically not restricted, with the river cannot go beyond 999 animal units. The setback from river is 300' and not allowed in floodplain.
- H. Mol moved to continue the hearing to April 8, 2022, for a site inspection. Jones seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

3. **TIMOTHY KINSKY** – New

LOCATION: 4406 Fillmore Ave NW – Lot 40, Ramsey Lake Heights, Section 07, Township 120, Range

26, Wright County, MN (Ramsey – Maple Lake Twp.) Tax # 210-024-000400

Requests variances as regulated in Section 155.008(B), 155.026, 155.049(F)(3) & 155.057(E) of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances and allow the construction of a 13' x 22' single-story addition with storage underneath and livable space above along with a 21' x 6' single-story addition with livable space above and crawl space below. The addition would be 9 ft from the north property line and 14.1 ft from the southern property line. Also proposed is replacement of the existing 16' x 20' deck. Proposal increases the living space of an existing structure that is nonconforming to the side setback.

Present: Timothy Kinsky

- A. Rhineberger – the property is 18,158.90 Sq. Ft. lot on Ramsey Lake. The request is for a 13' x 22' single-story addition with storage underneath and a 6' x 21' addition, all part of the same addition in an “L” shape. Setbacks are 9 ft. from the north property line and 14.1 ft. from the southern line. Does meet road and lake setbacks. The applicant has not had the opportunity to meet with the Township.
- B. Kinsky – was out of town at the last Township meeting, is on the agenda for the next meeting. The site plan was displayed with review of the current footprint and what is proposed. Looking at replacing existing deck and adding mudroom. Purchased in April 2020 and realized it was not large enough. Living area added with no bedrooms. Building on slab. Landscape on left side will stay and right side of stairs will need to be removed to allow access to the lower area. Rhineberger – questioned cutting into the retaining wall. Kinsky – plan is to knock down the wall to get equipment in for foundation work. Rhineberger – will the storage area be a look out? Kinsky – yes, and utilities.
- C. Jones – concerned the Township has not yet responded. The history of the Board is considering their response before a decision is made.
- D. Mol – agrees, would like to see the Township response. At this time, does not see anything jumping out that is a concern or needs to be addressed.
- E. Neumann – questioned the applicant if he has spoken with the neighbor. Kinsky – confirmed he has spoken with the neighbor that lives on the addition side. Original thought was to take the house down and build new. At that time, conversation started with the neighbor on what might work for his existing house and the limits of the lot. Instead, a plan for the addition was created. Neighbor has since passed away, but conversation has continued with the children. They do not have issues with the addition. The other side of the lot is vacant and undeveloped. Neumann – will there be a septic upgrade. Kinsky – certified as is and not going to be replaced. Rhineberger – the vacant lots to the south are 3 lots that, as of now, have to be owned in common. Kinsky – considered purchasing those lots but there is just no way to build on those lots without a lot of headaches. Rhineberger – the way those 3 lots sit there is very limited buildable area.
- F. Vick – agree with the Township needing to respond. Worried about the drainage between the properties and if that is part of the plan. Kinsky – currently there is no tile or swales. Are working

with the excavator on a plan to add swales. Drain tile will be added across the entire front of house, rain gutters and rain barrels will also be used. There was some drainage work done with a prior addition, but it is not sufficient. Rhineberger – based on topography there is not much more that needs to be done. Gutters would help with directing water. The lot is very flat, and water will be absorbed before hitting the lake. A lot of lots in this area have a high-water table and heavy soils, so the water tends to not seep or drain quickly. Vick – wants to make sure no water is diverted towards the neighbor.

- G. Rhineberger – The Township will not meet by April 8th. To allow time for the Township to review this request will need to be heard at the May 6th meeting. Kinsky – tried to get on the Township agenda but the Township did not respond to emails or phone calls.
- H. Vick moved to continue the hearing to May 6, 2022, to allow time to meet with the Township. Jones seconded the motion.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. **GAYLE MURRAY** – New

LOCATION: 5185 Clementa Ave NW – Part of E ½ of SE 1/4, Section 3, Township 120, Range 26, Wright County, Minnesota. (Maple Lake Twp.) Tax #210-000-034403

Requests a variance as regulated in Section 152.025(A), Chapter 152 & 155.048(F), Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to allow 6.33 animal units on a property limited to no more than 5 animal units.

Present: Gayle Murray

- A. Rhineberger displayed aerial photo of the site. The request is to allow 6.33 animal units on a parcel that is limited to no more than 5 animal units. The site has 6 horses, 2 goats, and up to 10 chickens. The lot was created in 1976 and allowed 5 animal units. Previous owner, in 2018, had 8 animal units. When the non-conformity ceased, the parcel had to become conforming according to the feedlot ordinance. In 2020 the property was approved for a variance to expand the house. This request has yet to be acted on. The Township did deny the request.
- B. Murray – provided the Board with written details on each animal and why they are owned. They are part of the family, do not want to get rid of any animals. Grandkids, self, and husband ride.
- C. Ryan Bode – neighbor to the north. Oppose the request from the standpoint that horses have been in his yard multiple times. Feel the animals have not been contained. There are possibly 2 goats that come into the yard and his kids are afraid of them. Does not believe the variance should be granted. They should not have to worry about his kids being in the yard. Appears like the issues are the very reason the rules are put in place, to go against those rules would not make logical sense.
- D. Bill Ebnet – neighbor to the south. Self and wife, Maureen, have lived here for 35 years. Against wavier to the livestock units. There is too much concentration of horses, goats and barking dogs. Last summer, within the first 6 months of the new owners moving in, the horses were on his property 3 times and with the 4th time Gayle was contacted. Maureen has numerous garden beds and the animals run through these beds. Livestock itself is concentrated on 4-5 acres, with the house, shed and barn all on that acreage. The rest of the property is marsh and watershed with a lot of standing water. For the free-range chickens, there is no closed fence along the property line. Chickens crossing the property line were also a problem with the previous owner. Maureen does a lot of work outside in her gardens and does not like the smell of manure. They did not start the issue, but they are willing to contribute their opinions. There is another neighbor that is planning on obtaining horses and currently has free-range chickens. If they want to have animals, they will go buy their own. Provided the Board with a letter from another neighbor, Bill Triplett.
- E. Murray – if horses have caused damage, no one has said anything. Have plans to put up fencing. Live on 10 acres in the county, people are going to have animals, that's why we live in the country.
- F. Neumann questioned if the letter could be passed around. Rhineberger summarized the letter that indicated Bill and Kari Triplett oppose granting the request. The letter was passed to the Board members to review.
- G. Janikula – over 4 acres the free-range chickens are allowed. The crossing of the property lines becomes a private matter. The property is 9.97 acres with history of the property and lot line adjustment that allowed the round up to 10 acres. The wetland is a DNR wetland. All livestock

buildings are meeting the wetland setback. The big shed was built decades ago as a livestock building when the ordinance was different. Therefore, is allowed to be that close to the property line. Neumann – how is manure handled? Murray – permission from the farmer across the road to spread the manure on his 400 acres. Neumann – Temporary stockpile.

- H. Mol – hearing concerns from neighbors. A list of the animals, with age, was provided. There is a 27-year-old Morgan horse that likely has 4-5 years of life left. Murray – correct. Mol – allowed to have 5 animal units and this one horse would be 1 animal unit. If this horse would pass, in the next 3-4 years, and not be allowed to be replaced, the property could be complying. Normally, in these situations there is not as much neighbor response. Would ask that fences be installed and maintained. Murray – plan is for fencing. Can't build fence in the middle of winter. Mol – there is not one animal that will live another 20 years, they are all up in age. Five animals make just as much smell as 6 animals. The property is located in the country. When an animal passes, would not want to see another added.
- I. Neumann – seems like with 10 acres one should be allowed more than 5 animal units. Questioned applicant how long they lived here? Murray – a year next month. Neumann – knew when purchased the limit of animals? Murray – did not occur there was a limit. Knows several others in Wright County that have way more animals on less property. Neumann – tough when the neighbors are not in favor.
- J. Vick – difficult when the Township and neighbors are not in favor. Highly encourage a good fence. Hate to see the loss of a family member because there is one to many. Agrees that with the animals up in age, when animal does pass away, they are not replaced. This could be a condition.
- K. Jones – difficult decision. Allowed animal units should have been questioned before purchase. Knows how a relationship with animals goes and would not want to put an animal down that could possibly have only 4 years left of life.
- L. Janikula – would want clarification on bringing down the animal units to 5 animals. The goats and chickens are .33 animal units, with the horse being 1 animal unit. With one horse gone that leaves the animals units at 5.33, not 5. Would need clarification with some additional discussion. Vick - three horses are in that 25–30-year range. Rhineberger – the Board is looking to approve the variance with a condition that additional animals cannot be added or replaced until the property comes into compliance. Mol – with free-range chickens, how many are an animal unit? Janikula – a laying hen, if under 5 lbs., is .003 animal units, it takes 333 to equal 1 animal unit.
- M. Vick – how would it be known if 1 animal is deceased another animal wasn't brought in? Rhineberger questioned the registration requirements. Janikula – registration requirements are by the animal units themselves. Rhineberger – how often is registration reviewed. Janikula – every 4 years if 10 or more animal units. An exception can be made if that is something the Board wants, they just need to be specific in the motion. Easily can include the site in the feedlot registration rotation. Just finished the review last year, would review again in 4 years. Vick – would like to see reviewed every 2 years until in compliance. Rhineberger – hearing the Board is leaning towards a condition regarding registration as well as no additional or replacement animals until in compliance.
- N. Vick motioned to approve the request for 6.33 animal units to remain on the property. Conditions: new or replacement livestock cannot be brought to the site unless or until animal unit numbers are

brought into full compliance, and registration with Feedlot Program Administrator every two years until full compliance is attained. Seconded by Mol.

VOTE: CARRIED, Neumann opposed

5. **WADE SILTALA** – New

LOCATION: 14953 20th Street SW – Part of the NW ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 15, Township 119, Range 28, Wright County, MN (Cokato Twp.) Tax # 205-000-152201

Requests a variance as regulated in Section 155.026(C), 155.048, 155.029 & 155.103(N) Chapter 155, of Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances to use a building for an auto repair business that is less than 500 feet from the neighbor to the north.

Present: Wade Siltala

- A. Rhineberger displayed the air photo with the location of the building and proposed parking areas. The property is 5.06 acres in Cokato Township. The request is to run an auto repair shop in 2,000 sq. ft. of an existing 4,460 sq. ft. accessory building. The building is 395 ft. from the neighbor to the north. The structure to the northwest is not a residence, it is a church. Parking for customer vehicles will be on the north end of the building, so closer to the residential neighbor. The applicant will go through the Planning Commission for the business CUP. If the variance is not approved the CUP is not needed. A separation wall is in place and divides the 2,000 sq. ft. business area from the rest of the building that is used as personal storage. Township did approve the request. An email was received from the Township chairman, responding as a local businessowner, stating he is personally in favor of the request and feels this type of business is needed in the area.
- B. Siltala – spoke with neighbor to the north and they stated they would not have an issue.
- C. Neumann – mostly surrounded by farm field on other sides. Familiar with the location. Since the building is existing, is okay with the request. Hazardous materials would come under review with the CUP. Rhineberger – business related items are issues that the CUP addresses and can be a condition. This Board could address concerns to ensure the Planning Commission is aware of concerns.
- D. Vick – concerned the number of vehicles could add up. Is there a way to limit the number of vehicles? Rhineberger – the CUP can limit the number of vehicles waiting to be serviced and parked outside. Vick – does not want to see 20 junk cars pile up and is fine with that getting addressed with the CUP. Jones – questioned the applicant on how many cars parked and working on is realistic. Siltala – proposed 8 and feels that would be about the limit. Rhineberger – the outside parking would be vehicles waiting to be repaired or picked-up, there will be cars inside as well. The outside cars would be addressed by the CUP. Jones – would less than 8 put you out of business? Siltala – not sure, does not feel it would be an issue. Has not operated the business so not sure yet. Jones – deal with the entire County and there have been private business applicants that were required to take off portions of a building. Rhineberger – the Planning Commission receives copies of these minutes, so they do see the discussion. If the Board doesn't want to add a condition to this motion, the discussion should be enough for the Planning Commission to be aware of concerns. Mol – reminded the Board he serves on the Planning Commission as well.

- E. Mol – related to the distance variance the question is, will all of the work be done inside the shed and contained? Concern is air wrenches and other equipment causing a noise nuisance and complaints with neighbors. Aware the location is surrounded by farm field and the distance to the neighbor shouldn't be an issue, but would like to know how much work could potentially be done outside? Air wrenches have been a nuisance in other areas of the County. Siltala – does not plan to work outside. If someone needs a flat tire filled or a tire changed, he could see that being done outside. The plan is not to do work outside the building.
- F. Vick – possibility of a 6-8' high fence or sound barrier? At least on the side closest to the neighbor. Rhineberger – that is the side of the business doors. The shop noise, even inside with doors closed, the decibel of air tools is megaphoned out the door. The Planning Commission could condition a row of evergreens or some type of buffer. Mol – it sounds ridiculous but there have been times where the room has been full of neighbors complaining of the noise. It is a way to keep good neighbors. Siltala stated he is not opposed building a fence or planting a row of trees. Mol – that can be addressed as a condition with the CUP.
- G. Kryzer questioned if the motion should state under 500 ft. or exact feet? Would like to make sure the motion doesn't state 395 ft. and it comes in at 393 ft. Mol – motion can be under 500 ft. because it is all farm field around, besides those 2 residences. Rhineberger – that can be the motion and the Planning Commission can set parking limits. The business includes the inside work being done as well as the outside parking. The 395 ft. is to the building, preference the motion with no closer than 350 ft. to any portion of the business. This gives area for parking and turning around a tow truck. The notice was to the building, but there is business related parking that is less than that 395 ft. Kryzer – would recommend the motion stating no less than 350 feet. There will be enough parking on the side and still provide area to operate.
- H. Mol motioned to approve the variance request to operate a home-extended business in a building 395 ft. from the nearest neighbor, with business activities, such as parking, limited to no closer than 350 ft. from the nearest neighbor. Seconded by Vick.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **BARRY ZANDER** – New

LOCATION: 3487 Hendricks Drive – Part of Gov't Lot 4, 5 & 6 except those areas which are part of the Zander Addition, Section 14, Township 120, Range 27, Wright County, Minnesota. (Henshaw Lake - Albion Twp.) Tax #201-000-141300 & 201-000-144300 Property Owners: Barry J. & Susan Zander and Barry J. & James H. Zander.

Requests a lot line adjustment to allow a division of approximately 6.9 acres from parcel #201-000-144300, to be added to parcel #201-000-141300 as regulated in Section 155.026(E)(2), 155.048 & 155.057 of Chapter 155, Title XV, Land Usage & Zoning of the Wright County Code of Ordinances.

Present: Barry Zander

- I. Rhineberger displayed the site plan with proposed property line. The applicant owns a 70.78- acre parcel which has approximately 6.9 acres on the north side of Hendricks Drive. The proposal is to divide the 6.9 acres, using Hendricks Drive as the dividing line, and join the acreage with the 57-acre parcel. This would result in the portion north of the township road being roughly 64 acres. There will be no entitlement transfer with this request. The Township did approve.
- J. Kryzer – questioned if there is a section line that could cause an issue with combining the parcels. Rhineberger – no section line. It would be a quarter/quarter line. The parcels are able to be combined.
- K. Vick stated he has no issues with the request. Make sure the parcels are combined under a single tax number. Jones – is good with the request. Mol – the request makes sense and has no issues.
- L. Rhineberger reviewed the transfer process with the applicant, making it clear that the property needs to transfer with the exact same Fee Ownership as the existing parcel. Suggested the Board condition tax parcels must be combined by 12/31/2022.
- M. Neumann – will an entitlement be moved? Rhineberger – entitlements will not be moved.
- N. Mol motion to approve a division of approximately 6.9 acres from parcel #201-000-144300, to be added to parcel #201-000-141300. Subject to legal description and combination of parcels with an Administrative Order or tax parcel combine form, no later than 12/31/2022. Seconded by Jones.

VOTE: CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

SITE INSPECTION

Board scheduled Monday, April 4th at 8:00 a.m. for site inspection.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Rhineberger
Planning & Zoning Administrator

BR:sld

Cc: Board of Adjustment
Applicants/Owners
Twp. Clerks