JEFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Lloyd Zastrow, Chair; Janet Sayre Hoeft, Vice-Chair; Don Carroll, Secretary; Dale Weis, Alternate; Paul Hynek, Alternate

<u>PUBLIC HEARING</u> BEGINS AT **1 P.M.** ON THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2008 ROOM 205, JEFFERSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

<u>CALL TO ORDER FOR BOARD MEMBERS</u> IS AT 10:15 A.M. IN COURTHOUSE ROOM 203, PRIOR TO THE HEARING

<u>SITE INSPECTION FOR BOARD MEMBERS</u> LEAVES AT 10:30 A.M. FROM COURTHOUSE ROOM 203, PRIOR TO THE HEARING

1. Call to Order-Courthouse Room 203

Meeting was called to order @ 10:18 by Lloyd Zastrow, Chair

2. Roll Call

Members present: Lloyd Zastrow, Don Carroll, Janet Sayre Hoeft

Members absent: ----

Staff: Rob Klotz, Laurie Miller

3. Certification of Compliance With Open Meetings Law Requirements

Janet Sayre Hoeft acknowledged publication. Rob Klotz also made not of publication in the paper.

4. Review of Agenda

Janet Sayre Hoeft made motion, seconded by Donald Carroll, motion carried 3-0 to approve the review of the agenda as presented

5. Approval of January 10, 2008 Meeting Minutes

Janet Sayre Hoeft made motion, seconded by Donald Carroll motion carried 3-0 to approve the minutes with a correction under the Dennis Kieck petition, last page of minutes – change name of "Dave" Ludwig to "Dan" Ludwig.

6. Site Inspections – Beginning at 10:30 a.m. and Leaving from Room 203

V1268-08 – Thomas Kiplinger, W3429 USH 18, Town of Jefferson

V1269-08 – Rodney Lee Jandrt, N6057 S Farmington Rd, Town of Farmington

V1267-08 – Gary Kincaid/Dean Kincaid Inc Property, N3734 CTH E, Town of Sullivan

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

Meeting called to order @ 1:00 p.m. by Lloyd Zastrow, Chair

Members present: Lloyd Zastrow, Donald Carroll, Janet Sayre Hoeft

Members absent: -----

Staff: Rob Klotz, Laurie Miller

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 p.m. on Thursday, March 13, 2008 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; decisions shall be rendered after public hearing on the following:

<u>V1267-08 – Gary Kincaid/Dean Kincaid Inc.</u>: Variance from Sec. 11.04(f)7 of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to create a farm consolidation lot where the residence exists on the proposed lot in an area that does not meet minimum A-1 zone width requirements. The property is at **N3734 CTH E** in the Town of Sullivan, on PIN 026-0616-1434-001 (11.831 Acres).

Corey Kincaid presented this petition. Todd Wilkham, realtor, also spoke on behalf of the petitioner. There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of this petition.

Janet Sayre Hoeft questioned the location of the land to the south. Donald Carroll questioned the driveway(s). Janet also questioned their plans on moving or replacing the existing home.

Staff report was given by Rob Klotz. There was a response from the town in the file of no objection which Donald Carroll read into the record.

<u>V1268-08 – Thomas Kiplinger:</u> Variance from Sec. 11.07(d)2 of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to construct a pole building at less than the required right-of-way and centerline setbacks from USH 18. The property is at **W3429 USH 18** in the Town of Jefferson, on PIN 014-0615-0312-005 (0.72 Acre).

Thomas Kiplinger presented his petition. There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of this petition.

Donald Carroll read DOT letter into the record and questioned access and site plan.

Rob Klotz gave staff report. Donald Carroll read the response from the town of no objection into the record.

<u>V1269-08 – Rodney Lee Jandrt:</u> Variance from Sec.11.07(d)2 of the Jefferson County Zoning Ordinance to allow an addition to an existing shed previously permitted by variance at 55 feet from the centerline of the town road. The site is at **N6057 South Farmington Road** in the Town of Farmington on PIN 008-0715-2422-000 (40.5 Acres).

Rodney Jandrt presented his petition. There were no questions or comments in favor or opposition of this petition.

Donald Carroll questioned the sketch and location of a shed not included on the sketch. Janet Sayre Hoeft questioned staff about the addition. Donald Carroll questioned the size of the addition.

Rob Klotz gave staff report. There was a response from the town in the file of no objection which Donald Carroll read into the record.

8. Decisions on Above Petitions (see files and attached)

9. Adjourn

Janet Sayre Hoeft made motion, seconded by Donald Carroll, motion carried to adjourn @ 2:08 p.m.

JEFFFERSON COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Lloyd Zastrow, Chairman

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

DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN

FINDINGS OF FACT

V1267-08 0313-2008
Dean Kincaid, Inc.
Dean Kincaid, Inc.
026-0616-1434-001
Sullivan
ER: Create a farm consolidation lot with less than 150' width at location
JESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION11.04(f)7
DUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE. E PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH IT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE:
on – A-3 zoning controls apply
lth – 200' minimum lot depth
ONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Property layout &
PUBLIC HEARING: See tape & minutes

DECISION STANDARDS

UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPEI FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY W. SUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME BECAUSE the are 2 existing structures which, when they were constructed, were in compliant with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. 2. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. 3. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED.		VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED WHICH WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF OWING A USE OF LAND OR PROPERTY WHICH WOULD VIOLATE STATE
STRICT ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE RESULTS IN UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP & WHERE A VARIANCE IN THE STANDARDS WI ALLOW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SUBSTANTIAI JUSTICE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, & THE PUBLIC INTEREST IS NOT VIOLAT BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, THE BOARD CONCLUDES THAT: 1. UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP IS PRESENT IN THAT A LITERAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WO UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPEI FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WE SUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME BECAUSE the are 2 existing structures which, when they were constructed, were in complian with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. 2. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. 3. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTERES EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3	LAW	/S OR ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
 UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP IS PRESENT IN THAT A LITERAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOUNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPEIFOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WE SUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME BECAUSE the are 2 existing structures which, when they were constructed, were in compliant with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3 	STR UNI ALL	ICT ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE RESULTS IN NECESSARY HARDSHIP & WHERE A VARIANCE IN THE STANDARDS WII OW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SUBSTANTIAL
ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOUNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPEI FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WE SUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME BECAUSE the are 2 existing structures which, when they were constructed, were in compliant with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. 2. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. 3. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTERESTRANCES BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3		
are 2 existing structures which, when they were constructed, were in compliant with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. 2. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. 3. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTERES EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3	1.	ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOLUNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPER FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WI
with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would mak unsalable. 2. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. 3. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTERES EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3		
2. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. 3. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTERES EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This doe not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3		are 2 existing structures which, when they were constructed, were in compliance
PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICA BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. 3. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTERES EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3		with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make
EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. *A VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET* DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3		with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make
DECISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3	2.	with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICAN
MOTION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3		with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICAN BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does
	3.	with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICAN BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection.
CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:	3. *A V	with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICAN BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET*
	3. *A V DEC	with the ordinance at that time. The initial placement of the home would make unsalable. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICAN BECAUSE they only have a substandard distance between the existing homes. THE VARIANCEWILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE application would have the agreement that it would be built back into correctly sited, conforming area if ever reconstructed. This does not impact other property owners in this area. Town has no objection. VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET*

BOARD DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO CIRCUIT COURT.

DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN

FINDINGS OF FACT

PETITION NO. : _ HEARING DATE : _	
APPLICANT:	Thomas S. Kiplinger
PROPERTY OWNER:	SAME
PARCEL (PIN)#:	014-0615-0312-005
TOWNSHIP:	Jefferson
	NER: Variance to construct a pole building at less than the centerline setback from USH 18.
JEFFERSON COUNTY THE FEATURES OF TI RELATE TO THE GRA	UESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION11.07(d)2 OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE. HE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH NT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE: ack = 140° centerline & 70° R.O.W.
	IONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Property layout &
location.	
location.	
FACTS PRESENTED A	T PUBLIC HEARING: See tape & minutes Speed reduction in this area. Building will be outside the R.O.W.

DECISION STANDARDS

NΩ	VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED WHICH WOULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF
	OWING A USE OF LAND OR PROPERTY WHICH WOULD VIOLATE STATE
	/S OR ADMINISTRATIVE RULES
	JECT TO THE ABOVE LIMITATIONS, VARIANCES MAY BE GRANTED HERE
	ICT ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE RESULTS IN AN
	NECESSARY HARDSHIP & WHERE A VARIANCE IN THE STANDARDS WILL
	OW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SUBSTANTIAL
JUS.	TICE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, & THE PUBLIC INTEREST IS NOT VIOLATED
	ED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, THE BOARD CONCLUDES
THA	AI:
1.	UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP IS PRESENT IN THAT A LITERAL
	ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE WOULI
	UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE PROPERTY
	FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONFORMITY WITH
	SUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME BECAUSE of the
	size of the lot & the hill in the back. Could have serious erosion problems if cut
	into the hill. This is the only place for the shed. The road was not built in the
	into the fill. This is the only place for the shed. The foad was not built in the
	center of the R.O.W.
2	center of the R.O.W.
2.	center of the R.O.W. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE
2.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT
2.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the
2.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT
	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound.
2.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound.
	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING
	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A
	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structure along this road are even closer to the road. The DOT states access is safe. There
	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structure along this road are even closer to the road. The DOT states access is safe. There
3.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structure.
3. *A V	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structure along this road are even closer to the road. The DOT states access is safe. There is no visibility impact or problems with the driveway location which is pre-existing TARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET*
3. *A V	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structure along this road are even closer to the road. The DOT states access is safe. There is no visibility impact or problems with the driveway location which is pre-existing
3. *A V	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structure along this road are even closer to the road. The DOT states access is safe. There is no visibility impact or problems with the driveway location which is pre-existing TARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET*
3. *A V DEC	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structure along this road are even closer to the road. The DOT states access is safe. There is no visibility impact or problems with the driveway location which is pre-existing TARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET*
A V DEC MO' CON	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATIONS OF THE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE APPLICANT BECAUSE of the steep incline on the property, the position of the highway, and the location of the mound. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST A EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE BECAUSE visual inspection of the property indicated other structur along this road are even closer to the road. The DOT states access is safe. There is no visibility impact or problems with the driveway location which is pre-existing ARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED IF ALL THESE CONDITIONS ARE MET CISION: THE REQUESTED VARIANCE IS GRANTED. TION: Donald Carroll SECOND: Janet Sayre Hoeft VOTE: 3-0 NDITIONS OF APPROVAL: Structure is to be used for personal use only – no busine

BOARD DECISIONS MAY BE APPEALED TO CIRCUIT COURT.

DECISION OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT JEFFERSON COUNTY, WISCONSIN

FINDINGS OF FACT

PETITION NO. : _	
HEARING DATE :	03-13-2008
APPLICANT:	Rodney Lee Jandrt
PROPERTY OWNER:	SAME
PARCEL (PIN)#:	008-0715-2422-000
TOWNSHIP:	Farmington
	NER: Modify existing variance to allow an addition to an existing centerline of a town road.
	UESTS A VARIANCE FROM SECTION 11.07(d)2 OF NTY ZONING ORDINANCE.
RELATE TO THE GRA	HE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION AND PROPERTY WHICH NT OR DENIAL OF THE VARIANCE APPLICATION ARE: original shed.
Proposed addition is	
	ONS BASED ON SITE INSPECTIONS: Property layout &
location	
FACTS PRESENTED AT	Γ PUBLIC HEARING: See tape & minutes

DECISION STANDARDS

	VARIANCE MAY BE GRANTED WHICH WOULD HAVE THE E	
	OWING A USE OF LAND OR PROPERTY WHICH WOULD VIO	LATE STAT
LAW	S OR ADMINISTRATIVE RULES	
STR UNI ALL	JECT TO THE ABOVE LIMITATIONS, VARIANCES MAY BE GITT ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ORDINANCE NECESSARY HARDSHIP & WHERE A VARIANCE IN THE STATOW THE SPIRIT OF THE ORDINANCE TO BE OBSERVED, SURICE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED, & THE PUBLIC INTEREST IS NOT THE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED.	RESULTS IN NDARDS WI JBSTANTIA
BAS	ED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT, THE BOARD CONCLUDES AT:	
1.	UNNECESSARY HARDSHIP IS PRESENT IN THAT A LITER ENFORCEMENT OF THE TERMS OF THE ZONING ORDER UNREASONABLY PREVENT THE OWNER FROM USING THE FOR A PERMITTED PURPOSE OR WOULD RENDER CONSUCH RESTRICTIONS UNNECESSARILY BURDENSOME ENTER THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO	NANCE <mark>WO</mark> 'HE PROPE FORMITY W
	are numerous other buildings on the property. There is a steep	·
		THIS WINCE HITH
2.	where he could add on a building or add a new building. THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIOUE PHYSICAL LIMITAT	IONS OF TH
2.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BECAUSE	HE APPLICA There is a steep
	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BECAUSE	HE APPLICA There is a steep of the parcel
2. 3.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BECAUSE	HE APPLICA There is a steep of the parcel JC INTERE NING s building will
3.	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BECAUSE	HE APPLICA There is a steep of the parcel LIC INTERES NING as building will ration.
3. *A V	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BECAUSE it's no closer than the existing shed he's adding onto. The standard and he has limited area to construct. The topography (terrain) of limits the placing of barns for reasonable use. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLEXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZOORDINANCE BECAUSE all buildings are close to the road. This no closer. Will continue to use the land for his agricultural operation.	HE APPLICA There is a steep of the parcel LIC INTERE NING as building will ration.
3. *A V DEC	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BECAUSE it's no closer than the existing shed he's adding onto. The same and he has limited area to construct. The topography (terrain) of limits the placing of barns for reasonable use. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLE EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZOORDINANCE BECAUSE all buildings are close to the road. This no closer. Will continue to use the land for his agricultural operation.	HE APPLICA There is a steep of the parcel LIC INTERE NING as building will ration. RE MET*
3. *A V DEC	THE HARDSHIP IS DUE TO UNIQUE PHYSICAL LIMITATE PROPERTY RATHER THAN THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BECAUSE it's no closer than the existing shed he's adding onto. The same and he has limited area to construct. The topography (terrain) of limits the placing of barns for reasonable use. THE VARIANCE WILL NOT BE CONTRARY TO THE PUBLE EXPRESSED BY THE PURPOSE AND INTENT OF THE ZOORDINANCE BECAUSE all buildings are close to the road. This no closer. Will continue to use the land for his agricultural oper the same and	HE APPLICA There is a steep of the parcel LIC INTERES NING as building will ration.