

JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

*Dale Weis, Chair; Janet Sayre Hoeft, Vice-Chair; Don Carroll, Secretary;
Paul Hynek, First Alternate; Aari Roberts, Second Alternate*

PUBLIC HEARING BEGINS AT **1:00 P.M.** ON SEPTEMBER 14, 2017 IN ROOM 205, JEFFERSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

CALL TO ORDER FOR BOARD MEMBERS IS AT 10:00 A.M. IN COURTHOUSE ROOM 203, PRIOR TO THE HEARING

SITE INSPECTION FOR BOARD MEMBERS LEAVES AT 10:10 A.M. FROM COURTHOUSE ROOM 203, PRIOR TO THE HEARING

1. Call to Order-Room 203 at 10:00 a.m.

Meeting called to order @ 10:00 a.m. by Weis

2. Roll Call (Establish a Quorum)

Members present: Weis, Hoeft

Members absent: Carroll

Staff: Matt Zangl, Laurie Miller

3. Certification of Compliance with Open Meetings Law Requirements

Hoeft acknowledged publication. Staff also presented proof of publication.

4. Approval of the Agenda

Hoeft made motion, seconded by Weis, motion carried 2-0 on a voice vote to approve the agenda.

5. Approval of August 10, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Hoeft made motion, seconded by Weis, motion carried 2-0 on a voice vote to approve the meeting minutes.

6. Communications and Public Comment

Zangl informed the Board that there were some updates on legislation that the Board may be interested in. A copy will be sent to the Board so they can review.

Weis noted that he and Hoeft attended the Planning & Zoning Committee meeting regarding consideration for a change to the ordinance to allow for a reduced access for Natural Resource zoned properties. The Planning & Zoning Committee is taking this under advisement. The Zoning Department will be drafting the ordinance text amendment.

There was a discussion on the 11.10(k) ordinance interpretation.

- . **Site Inspections – Beginning at 10:10 a.m. and Leaving from Room 203**
V1609-17 – John Kane, N6640 County Road E, Town of Concord
V1611-17 – Matthew Bertelson, N9261 Ash Road, Town of Watertown
V1607-17 and V1608-17 – Jeff & Laurie Dresen, 384 Sandy Beach Road, Town of Lake Mills
V1610-17 – Paul Halverson and Sherri Willborn, W8990 Ripley Road, Town of Oakland

7. Public Hearing – Beginning at 1:00 p.m. in Room 205

Meeting called to order @ 1:00 p.m. by Weis

Members present: Weis, Hoeft

Members absent: Carroll

Staff: Matt Zangl, Laurie Miller

8. Explanation of Process by Board of Adjustment Chair

The following was read into the record by Weis:

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Jefferson County Zoning Board of Adjustment will conduct a public hearing at 1:00 p.m. on Thursday, September 14, 2017 in Room 205 of the Jefferson County Courthouse, Jefferson, Wisconsin. Matters to be heard are applications for variance from terms of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance. No variance may be granted which would have the effect of allowing in any district a use not permitted in that district. No variance may be

granted which would have the effect of allowing a use of land or property which would violate state laws or administrative rules. Subject to the above limitations, variances may be granted where strict enforcement of the terms of the ordinance results in an unnecessary hardship and where a variance in the standards will allow the spirit of the ordinance to be observed, substantial justice to be accomplished and the public interest not violated. Based upon the findings of fact, the Board of Adjustment must conclude that: 1) Unnecessary hardship is present in that a literal enforcement of the terms of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome; 2) The hardship is due to unique physical limitations of the property rather than circumstances of the applicant; 3) The variance will not be contrary to the public interest as expressed by the purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. **PETITIONERS, OR THEIR REPRESENTATIVES, SHALL BE PRESENT.** There may be site inspections prior to public hearing which any interested parties may attend; discussion and possible action shall be occur after public hearing on the following:

V1607-17 and V1608-17 – Jeff & Laurie Dresen: Variances from Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance Sec. 11.10(k) Non-Conforming Uses and Structures; and from 11.10(i) Impervious Surface Standards to vary minimum requirements. A mitigation plan may be submitted as part of this request. The site is at **384 Sandy Beach Drive** in the Town of Lake Mills, on PIN 018-0713-2321-014 (0.147 Acre), and is zoned Residential R-1.

Laurie Dresen, 384 Sandy Beach Drive, presented her petition. She wanted to make sure that the staff got the last plan she had sent. She stated that the hardship is due to the unique limitations of the property, rather than the circumstances of the applicant due to the non-conforming lot size. On May 6, 2008, the owner of this property deeded 6' to the property to the east which allowed for the well to be on the lot line for shared easement, and additional land was given to the west neighbors. Starting in 1980, DNR offered 30' of property on the south side of the lot. Three properties to the west acquired the adjacent DNR property; however the past owner of this property did not acquire the additional lands offered though they still maintain the property. In June 2009, a prospective buyer hired an engineer to evaluate the existing home for adding on a 2-story addition. According to the engineering report, the new load to the existing bearing walls would include a new roof, floor and wall requirements for structural reinforcement. Additionally, more footings would need to be poured to the adjacent footings. The home was built in the 1930's or 1940's. All of this information should be included in the engineering report packet. After reviewing the engineer report, she felt that there were too many risks by building onto the existing structure.

Regarding the first variance request (non-conforming use and structure), they are requesting a variance of 174 square feet, basically a 10' x 17' room. The proposed structure would total 1,966 square feet, and the existing structure is 1,592 square feet which is a difference of 374 square feet.

Subtracting the 200 square feet allowed, it would be a variance of 174 square feet that they are requesting. The 174 square foot variance would allow them to build a reasonable sized home. The proposed structure meets all lot line setbacks, and will fit in nicely with the two, year-round homes to the west. Without the variance, the home and footprint size would limit what they can build.

The cottage was built in the mid 1900's. The landscape in that area was mostly small cottages. Now the landscape around the lake is mostly year-round homes. The 2016, non-conforming use and structure ordinance has the potential to devalue lake property. She believes that we all need to work with the proper administration to make changes to this ordinance to be less restrictive to those property owners that are looking to repair, replace, or expand. Regarding a lot of these cottages, with a catastrophic event, if they need to rebuild, they are going to be facing the same ordinance. As a property owner, they feel their investment is protected and the value of their property does not decline.

She asked that the Board take into consideration that this would be their year-round home and not a seasonal cottage. The 174 square feet will make their home a reasonable size.

Regarding the second variance (impervious surface standards), they have hired an engineer to determine the existing site plan, and the grading and erosion control plan. Those maps are all included in the engineering packet. The proposed home will reduce the impervious surface by 22% because they will be removing the two-car width cement drive, and will be reducing the driveway down to one lane. The current lot coverage without outlot 1 is 53%, but with outlot 1, it is 42%.

Abutting the south lot of the property is the DNR property which is 100% non-impervious surface. She wanted to include the DNR lands in the impervious surface calculations, and further explained. They will also be redirecting the water from the rain gutters and downspouts away from the neighbor's property to control the water runoff. Their request is 12% with the inclusion of outlot 1, or 3% to include outlot 1 and DNR lands.

The proposed home will increase the impervious surface by 22% of the main lot, will decrease the impervious surface by 47% by including outlot 1 and DNR lands. They meet all lot line setbacks and will also increase property tax revenues as well as neighboring property values.

Donna Gruszynski, N6720 Lake Lane, was in support of the petitioners. Also in favor was Jerry Gruszynski, N6720 Lake Lane. Mr. Gruszynski stated that area

should be developed with some of the cottages being run down, he would like to see new buildings. Bob Niebler, 229 Circle Drive, was also in favor. He stated that the request was not unreasonable. The property has been compromised, and they are making the most of the property. Jan Niebler, 229 Circle Drive, was also in favor. She noted that the old cottages do not have good foundations, they need re-doing, and this should be allowed.

Tammy Peterson, W8116 Caterberry Lane, was in support of the petitioners. Pam and John Reich, 398 Sandy Beach Road, were in support of the petitioners as well. Mr. Reich stated that they want to improve the property. He explained his concerns that if something happened to his property, there would be problems. He explained the limitations to his property, and was concerned about being forced to comply with the current standards. It is a very non-conforming neighborhood. The existing structure is an eye sore. Mark Kern (Jill), N6790 Shorewood Hills Road, were also in support of the petitioners.

Hope Oostdik, Chairperson for the Town of Lake Mills, stated that this did pass at the town with herself being opposed. At that time, she felt she did not have enough information on what the mitigation would be. She noted that all these properties are non-conforming, and would ask that we be careful and cautious about what was decided today. It is the job of the Town of Lake Mills not to recruit more people to pay more taxes or to upgrade any of the facilities that they have so they pay more taxes. This is a different area with only eight properties there. If there was a catastrophic event, she questioned how the city would view these areas and how they would view any regrowth or redevelopment. She felt a review with the city manager was needed, and will be meeting with them on September 20th. She would like to know how the Board views the new shoreland ordinance, and would like to see what the true hardship is for this property.

Hoelt asked staff for an explanation of NR115 and where it was referenced in the ordinance. Zangl explained that NR115 is produced by the DNR. It is the county's responsibility to adopt it. At certain times, the county has been given some lee-way in what they adopt and what they enforce. As an example, the county could go stricter and go beyond what NR115 outlines. The DNR came out with a model ordinance that reflects the changes and what's in NR115, and the county has the ability to adopt that. One of the documents submitted from the petitioner has some sections of NR115.05 for the non-conforming section, and there's a little bit of language difference from what is in there and what is in the ordinance. The section the petitioner referred to was for the model ordinance which gave the ability of different regions throughout the state to adopt the language; however, that was not what we adopted and not what the County Board or Planning & Zoning Committee recommended for the ordinance.

What we go by is the ordinance, Section 11.10 and that is directly reflected upon NR115. Zangl also noted that any variance does not set precedence. Each variance is unique, each property has separate limitations and features that allow the ability or do not allow the ability for a variance to be granted, and rules are constantly changing. Regarding a catastrophic event, having a legal house, it does allow you to rebuild. Flooding areas do have different rules and regulations. The variance goes with the property and does not change anything, though there are regulations. Expansion is different than rebuilding.

Weis stated his biggest concern was NR115.05 and the county ordinance parallels that. He was concerned that the Board does not have the authority, and if they would be falling into the realm of violating state statutes or rules by granting a variance. Zangl stated that no, the Board has the ability to grant a variance by the three findings. Weis asked if it was demolished and replaced, could they rebuild with the cumulative of the square footage taken into account. Zangl explained the structures are separate with two footprints which are now one footprint. He stated it's open to interpretation and read the definition of a footprint from the ordinance. Weis stated, based on the testimony of the last hearing, there been improvements regarding the impervious surface. Zangl noted all the variances in front of the Board today and the options of the Board. Weis asked if DNR was notified and if they responded. Zangl stated there has been no response from them through the whole variance process.

Zangl noted that in 2009, there was a variance approval to exceed 50% of the Fair Market Value for a new porch. However, there was no permit and it was not built. It is a non-conforming structure. They needed the variance for the setback to the OHWM. There are multiple sections in the ordinance that apply, so this does not specifically fit into one section. He further explained. Zangl also explained requiring mitigation to look into or maybe a surface runoff plan and further explained.

Patricia Cicero, Land and Water Conservation Department, stated that she was taking a look at the public interest in the waterway of Rock Lake. She noted that they are reducing the impervious surface, but they are still going over what the state says is the limit which would require mitigation. There are concerns of the hardship law which is not understood relating to the constraints the property has. They could reduce the impervious surface by reducing the size of the driveway and garage. Weis asked if there was a variance approval, would it be in effect today. Zangl stated yes, it is with the life of the property and available to all owners of the property. The petitioner stated they want to make sure they are doing it correctly.

Zangl noted that the impervious surfaces are in the findings of fact. He went over ordinance 11.10(i) requirement of being within 300' of the OHWM. He further explained. Zangl also explained 11.10(6) existing impervious surface area.

Weis noted that they are not setting a precedence, but they kind of are. They should be showing engineering proof that this is being done correctly. It would be foolish to allow rebuilding without the engineering support. Zangl referenced NR115.

Weis and the petitioner went over the existing and proposed square footage. There was a discussion on having a separate house and garage, or if the square footages were together. The petitioner stated they could do pavers and further explained. Weis stated that he would think they would want them to show engineering proof.

Hope Oostdik stated she would like to see a plan with storm water runoff, and would like the assurance they have a plan in effect.

Zangl noted there were some letters in the file including some new submittals.

V1609-17 – John Kane: Variance from Sec. 11.09(c) of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow for additions and structural alterations to an existing non-conforming structure at **N6640 County Road E** in the Town of Concord. The site is on PIN 006-0716-0931-001 (17.984 Acres) in An A-1, Exclusive Agricultural zone.

John Kane, Madison, present his petition. The property is at N6640 County Road E. He noted this is the second half of a building project. He was granted a variance a year ago. The hardship is that the structure was built in the 1960's and close to the road. The barns are collapsing and he needs to fix the buildings up. It is set on a concrete footprint that can't be moved away from the highway. There is a big slope to the back of the property. He is rebuilding the buildings that are still standing there expanding to the south and make one big barn.

Weis asked the petitioner if they would be any closer to the road or interstate. Kane stated no, and, they would be replacing a cracked slab on the east end of the facility.

There was a response in the file from the town in favor of the petition which was read into the record by Weis.

Staff report was given by Zangl. He explained the requirements Section 11.09(c) of the ordinance (non-conforming structures), which states in part they can add up to 50% of the structural members, and up to 50% of the existing footprint. The petitioner is proposing to be over by both of those by quite a bit.

Zangl asked the petitioner if he was connecting the two buildings. Kane explained they actually won't be connecting the buildings. He further explained. Zangl questioned the small shed. Kane stated he would not be adding to it, it would probably be coming down.

Staff and Kane met at the table with the Board to review the petitioner's plan. The petitioner explained what was approved by variance, what was being expanded upon, what was existing, and what was being connected. There would be a 10' alleyway if it is not connected.

There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of the petition.

V1610-17 – Paul Halverson & Sherri Willborn: Variance from Sec. 11.09(e) of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow the creation of a substandard lot, 75 feet in width. The site is in the Town of Oakland, **W8990 Ripley Road**, part of PIN 022-0613-0842-004 (0.29 Acre) and is zoned Residential R-1.

Sherry Willborn, W8990 Ripley Road, presented her petition. She stated that they would like to build a 1,200 square foot, single story home with a two car, attached garage on their substandard lot that is 75' wide by 169' in depth. The footprint of the new home and garage would take up 16% of the lot. The cabin they are in now next door was built in the 1960's and has very steep and narrow steps. She noted she had the house plans.

Weis stated that most pertinent was the site plan which is in the file. He questioned what they were proposing. The petitioner stated she had a new plan and brought it to the front to show and explain to the Board. Weis noted the setbacks are from the foundation, but not from the roof overhang with an 8' side lot line setback, 50' from the ROW, and approximately 67' from the rear taking into consideration of the roof overhang. There was a discussion at the table with the Board and the petitioner regarding the location of the proposed. Weis stated that the variance request was for the size of the lot. The existing house is on a lot of 75' width, and this lot is proposed at a 75' width. It is currently zoned R-1 and is on public sewer. Zangl noted that we need a copy of the new plan for the file.

There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of the petition.

Zangl gave staff report. He explained substandard lots, and two substandard lots next to each other in common ownership together are considered as one conforming, standard lot. They need the variance to separate the lots because it does not meet the 80' width requirement. Zangl further explained proposed new legislation. There is a state bill on the table to create a state statute to allow these types of lots to be separated. With today's ordinance, they are substandard lots in common ownership. This is an old area, and the subdivision was platted in April 1939. He stated there are substandard setbacks, or the setbacks for the R-1 zone, but it should be noted as substandard lot setbacks.

There was a town decision in the file approving the petition which was read into the record by Weis.

V1611-17 – Matthew Bertelson: Variance from Sec. 11.04(f)6 Minimum Yards of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow a residential garage 18 feet from a side lot line in an A-1, Exclusive Agricultural zone at **N9261 Ash Road**. This is proposed on PIN 032-0815-1221-001 (0.681 Acre) in the Town of Watertown.

Matthew Bertelson nor a representative were present to provide information on this petition.

9. Discussion and Possible Action on Above Petitions (See following pages & files) @ 2:13 p.m.

Weis noted that they would be considering the Kane and Willison petitions first, and then consider the Dresen petition for decision.

10. Adjourn

Weis made motion, seconded by Hoeft, motion carried 2-0 on a voice vote to adjourn @ 3:02 p.m.

If you have questions regarding these variances, please contact the Zoning Department at 920-674-7113 or 920-674-8638. Variance files referenced on this hearing notice may be viewed in Courthouse Room 201 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. Monday through Friday, excluding holidays. Materials covering other agenda items can be found at www.jeffersoncountywi.gov.

JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

A quorum of any Jefferson County Committee, Board, Commission or other body, including the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, may be present at this meeting.

Individuals requiring special accommodations for attendance at the meeting should contact the County Administrator at 920-674-7101 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting so appropriate arrangements can be made.

A digital recording of the meeting will be available in the Zoning Department upon request.

Additional information on Zoning can be found at www.jeffersoncountywi.gov

Secretary

Date

**DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN**

FINDINGS OF FACT

PETITION NO.: 2016 V1607
HEARING DATE: 09-14-2017

APPLICANT: Jeffery & Laurie Dresen

PROPERTY OWNER: SAME

PARCEL (PIN #): 018-0713-2321-014

TOWNSHIP: Lake Mills

INTENT OF PETITIONER: To reconstruct a nonconforming structure

THE APPLICANT REQUESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 11.10(k) OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE.

THE FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO THE GRANT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE:

-2009 V1309 – to allow addition to non-conforming structure in excess of 50% of FMV, new porch closer to road and lake (approved, never permitted)

-Nonconforming structure, does not meet OHWM setback

-11.10(k) expansion, relocating, etc. nonconforming structures in shoreland

-Town meeting 8-8-2017

-Do any sections apply? Is a variance needed from the non-conforming section?

-11.10(k)3?

FACTS OR OBSERVATIONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections conducted. Observed property layout & location.

FACTS PRESENTED AT PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.

**DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN**

FINDINGS OF FACT

PETITION NO.: 2017 V1608
HEARING DATE: 09-14-2017

APPLICANT: Jeffery & Laurie Dresen

PROPERTY OWNER: SAME

PARCEL (PIN #): 018-0713-2321-014

TOWNSHIP: Lake Mills

INTENT OF PETITIONER: To reconstruct a single family home, attached garage, driveway, porch and patio exceeding the impervious surface standards in 11.10(i)

THE APPLICANT REQUESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 11.10(i) OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE.

THE FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO THE GRANT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE:

-Impervious surfaces permitted with mitigation up to 30% of lot coverage, however the impervious surfaces on this lot were in place prior to the ordinance change

-Existing impervious coverage = 59.3% (see breakdown of percent on plot plan)

-Proposed impervious coverage = 46.2% (see breakdown of percent on plot plan)

-Reducing overall coverage by 13.1%

-11.10(i)6 Existing impervious surfaces (specifically 11.10(i)6c)
-can relocate or modify imp. surfaces, as long as overall % does not increase

-Is a variance needed for impervious surfaces? Or does the project fall under section 11.10(i)6?

FACTS OR OBSERVATIONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections conducted. Observed property layout & location.

FACTS PRESENTED AT PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.

**DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN**

FINDINGS OF FACT

PETITION NO.: 2017 V1609
HEARING DATE: 09-14-2017

APPLICANT: John Kane

PROPERTY OWNER: SAME

PARCEL (PIN #): 006-0716-0931-001

TOWNSHIP: Concord

INTENT OF PETITIONER: To create an addition to a building that received a variance in 2016 and to create an addition exceeding 50% of the existing footprint and 50% of structural members

THE APPLICANT REQUESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 11.09(c) OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE.

THE FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO THE GRANT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE:

-11.09(c) legal, non-conforming structures are limited to 50% footprint expansion and 50% structural members expansion

-According to 2016 variance, structures are 30' from ROW and 51' from CL
-2016 permit – 44'10" to CL and 11'10" to ROW

-2016 letter from Town explaining use of buildings and business

-2016 Permit 61119 (Roof and 1 wall)

-2016 Variance V1582

FACTS OR OBSERVATIONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections conducted. Observed property layout & location.

FACTS PRESENTED AT PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.

**DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN**

FINDINGS OF FACT

PETITION NO.: 2017 V1610
HEARING DATE: 09-14-2017

APPLICANT: Paul Halverson & Sherri Willborn

PROPERTY OWNER: SAME

PARCEL (PIN #): 022-0613-0842-004

TOWNSHIP: Oakland

INTENT OF PETITIONER: To create a substandard, buildable lot zoned R-1

THE APPLICANT REQUESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 11.09(e) OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE.

THE FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO THE GRANT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE:

- 11.09(e) Substandard lots in common ownership cannot be sold separately
-viewed as 1 large lot and can have only 1 residence
- Minimum Lots size is 80' x 80' and 8,000 sq. ft.
- Proposed lot is 168.87' x 75' and 1,2665.25 sq. ft.
- Subdivision was recorded 4-6-1939 , old neighborhood w/ many substandard lots
- Setback requirements if approved? Standard or reduced for substandard lot?
- Plat for existing home shows setback is 9.8' from lot line, required is 5'
- Have submitted a plot plan for both lots

FACTS OR OBSERVATIONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections
conducted. Observed property layout & location.

FACTS PRESENTED AT PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.

**DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN**

FINDINGS OF FACT

PETITION NO.: 2017 V1611
HEARING DATE: 09-14-2017

APPLICANT: Matthew Bertelson

PROPERTY OWNER: SAME

PARCEL (PIN #): 032-0815-1221-001

TOWNSHIP: Watertown

INTENT OF PETITIONER: To sanction a garage at 18' from the side lot line

THE APPLICANT REQUESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 11.04(f)6 OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE.

THE FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH RELATE TO THE GRANT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE:

- 11.04(f)6 – all structures need to be at least 20' from a side lot line
- Permit 55719 for detached garage applied by Douglas Grover, issued at 22'
- Permit 60582 for Home attached to existing garage
-site plan from plumber shows garage at 20'4"
- Bertelson applies for a Deck permit, shows garage at 18.0' from side lot line
-Michelle starts violation
- Plat of Survey shows garage at 18.0' from side lot line
-Unknown 3.03'? Recently brought to our attention
-Found by recent survey? Were passed plot plans using the 3'?

FACTS OR OBSERVATIONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Site inspections
conducted. Observed property layout & location.

FACTS PRESENTED AT PUBLIC HEARING: See tape, minutes & file.

