

**SHERBURNE COUNTY
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
JULY 13, 2023**

Chairperson Johnson called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M.

Roll call was taken.

Members Present:

Roger Johnson – Chairperson

David Anderson

Kodey Shaw

Steve Demeules

Bud Stimmler

Bryan Adams

Michelle MacMillan

Staff Present:

Lynn Waytashek – Planning & Zoning Administrator

Zach Guttormson – Assistant Planning & Zoning Administrator

Kelly Mittelstaedt – Secretary

Demeules made a motion to approve the minutes from the June 15, 2023 Board of Adjustment Meeting. Anderson seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passed.

Adams made a motion to approve the evening's agenda. Anderson seconded the motion. All in favor. Motion passed.

Johnson informed everyone the meeting would be audio-recorded.

6:01 P.M. MICHAEL WAAGE: Requesting a 26' variance in setback from the right of way of Highway 10 for a detached garage. Required setback from the right of way is 100'. Address: 18625 146th St NW, Elk River, Mn Legal: Twin Pines South Lot 1, Block 1 Sec 36, Twp 33, Rge 27 1.35 Acres Big Lake Township General Rural District.

MICHAEL WAAGE: Requesting a 42' variance in setback from the right of way of Service Drive Northwest for a detached garage. Required setback from the right of way is 67'. Address: 18625 146th St NW, Elk River, Mn Legal: Twin Pines South Lot 1, Block 1 Sec 36, Twp 33, Rge 27 1.35 Acres Big Lake Township General Rural District.

Johnson read the variance requests.

Guttormson stated that Big Lake Township did give a favorable recommendation for the variance from the Service Drive. They did not make a recommendation on the variance from Highway 10 because they are not the road authority. MnDOT did not have any issues on the variance request. The proposed building will be 1,200 sq ft. The proposed garage access will be from the existing driveway. The septic was installed in 1986 and passed a compliance inspection in 2021. The applicant does want to save room for a future septic system due to the age of the existing system.

Michael Waage, 18625 146th St NW, Elk River, Mn was present.

Adams asked if the green lines on the drawing were setback lines.

Guttormson said that was correct.

Adams asked why the applicant was building close to Highway 10.

Mr. Waage explained where there was another shed on the property and the location of a coy pond. The pond is approximately 20'x40'. The coy pond was existing when they bought the property. If he built the shed in the back corner of the lot, he would need to remove 23 oak trees because of where the septic system is located. To the left of the existing septic system is his alternate septic location.

Demeules asked what max amount of storage is allowed on the property.

Guttormson said the max amount would be 1,764 sq ft.

Johnson asked if the RV would be parked in the new shed.

Mr. Waage said it would not because he wants the peak of the new garage to be similar to the peak of the existing garage. The RV in the pictures is no longer there. They have a smaller one now. They now have a 36' class A.

Johnson asked if anyone in the audience had any comments or questions. No one did. Johnson closed the public hearing.

Waytashek explained the first road is the frontage road and Highway 10 is further from the proposed building than the frontage road. MnDOT did have a chance to comment on the variance request and did not have an issue with it. Both variances are from the North side of the property.

Demeules motioned and Shaw seconded the motion to approve the 26' variance in setback from the right of way of Highway 10 for a detached garage with the following conditions and "Findings of Fact"

Conditions:

1. Prior to construction, a building permit must be obtained from the County.
2. The variance is only valid if acted upon by the applicant within one (1) year of approval.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the comprehensive plan. Yes (X) No ()
The shed is a usable building with the comprehensive plan.
2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same district, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since enactment of the relevant Ordinance have had no control. Yes (X) No () This property is too close to Highway 10.
3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance. Yes (X) No () Because of the setback most of the north side of the property is unusable without a variance.
4. The exceptional or extraordinary circumstances do not result from the actions of the current or previous owner(s) under the current Ordinance or State Law. Yes (X) No () I don't know when the setback was presented but probably wasn't when it was platted.
5. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty. Yes (X) No () They put the building where they didn't have to have any other variance from the west.
6. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality and there would be no significant effect on the surrounding properties. Yes (X) No () There's other sheds in the area.
7. Adequate sewage treatment systems can be provided if the variance is granted. Yes (X) No () It has been checked and passed.
8. Granting the variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because the driveway is inadequate length or width. Yes (X) No () There appears to be enough length in the driveway to accommodate construction vehicles.

9. If a shoreland variance, it will not be a greater height or lesser shoreline setback than what is typical for the area immediately surrounding the development site. Yes () No () N/A
10. The variance will not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy of the neighboring properties of the residence were built according to the applicable regulation and height of structure. Yes (X) No () The height of the structure won't be any higher than that of the house.
11. Economic considerations or circumstances shall not be considered so long as a reasonable use of the property exists under the terms of the Ordinance. Yes (X) No () It wasn't because of money it was for more storage.

All in favor. Motion to approve passed.

Demeules motioned and Adams seconded the motion to approve the 42' variance in setback from the right of way of Service Drive Northwest for a detached garage with the following conditions and "Findings of Fact"

Conditions:

1. Prior to construction, a building permit must be obtained from the County.
2. The variance is only valid if acted upon by the applicant within (1) year of approval.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the comprehensive plan. Yes (X) No ()
The shed is a useable building with the comprehensive plan.
2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same district, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since enactment of the relevant Ordinance have had no control. Yes (X) No () The property is too close to Highway 10.
3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance. Yes (X) No () Because of the setback most of the north side of the property is unusable without a variance.
4. The exceptional or extraordinary circumstances do not result from the actions of the current or previous owner(s) under the current Ordinance or State Law. Yes (X) No () I don't know when the setback presented but probably wasn't when it was platted.
5. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty. Yes (X) No () They put the building where they didn't have to have any other variance from the west.

6. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality and there would be no significant effect on the surrounding properties. Yes (X) No () There's other sheds in the area.
7. Adequate sewage treatment systems can be provided if the variance is granted. Yes (X) No () It has been checked and passed.
8. Granting the variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because the driveway is inadequate length or width. Yes (X) No () There appears to be enough length in the driveway to accommodate construction vehicles.
9. If a shoreland variance, it will not be a greater height or lesser shoreline setback than what is typical for the area immediately surrounding the development site. Yes () No () N/A
10. The variance will not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy of the neighboring properties of the residence were built according to the applicable regulation and height of structure. Yes (X) No () The height of the structure won't be any higher than that of the house.
11. Economic considerations or circumstances shall not be considered so long as a reasonable use of the property exists under the terms of the Ordinance. Yes (X) No () It wasn't because of money it was for more storage.

All in favor. Motion to approve passed.

6:16 P.M. DENNIS D MCALPINE II: Requesting a 19' variance in setback from the rear property line for a pool. Required setback from the rear property line is 25'. Address: 17865 227th Ave NW, Big Lake, Mn Legal: River Crest Farms Second Addition Lot 7, Block 2 Sec 5, Twp 33, Rge 27 .69 Acres Big Lake Township General Rural District.

DENNIS D MCALPINE II: Requesting a 7' variance in setback from the rear property line for a deck on existing garage. Required setback from the rear property line is 25'. Address: 17865 227th Ave NW, Big Lake, Mn Legal: River Crest Farms Second Addition Lot 7, Block 2 Sec 5, Twp 33, Rge 27 .69 Acres Big Lake Township General Rural District.

Johnson read the variance requests.

Guttormson explained Big Lake Township recommended approval of both variances. The deck will be 216 sq ft. This is a Planned Unit Development so the area has a community septic system. The detached garage was built in 2017. The applicant has provided a written narrative with reasons for the variance request and why they don't want to use the open space in the back yard for the pool.

Dennis McAlpine, 17865 227th Ave NW, Big Lake, Mn was present.

Mr. McAlpine stated they are requesting a variance for the placement and construction of a pool behind their rear yard shed. This will replace a soft side pool they have had for 3 or 4 years. The existing pool pad is 12'x20' and the new pool would be 12'x24'. The deck would come off of the shed. They have lived at the property for nearly 20 years. They have a fenced in yard and have planted trees. They could place the pool in other areas in the yard but feel it would change the character and function of the back yard. The rear of the property is adjacent to an outlot. He is the current president of the association and outlots can be a challenge. They have talked to the neighbors, and they don't have any concerns.

MacMillan asked if the soft sided pool needed a variance.

Mr. McAlpine said it did not because it wasn't considered a permanent structure. They did take their pool down each year. They do last longer if taken down. The hard side pool would have a liner that lasted about 7 years and the pool itself would last about 20 years.

Adams said given the size of the lot he was struggling on why the board would want to grant a variance when there is plenty of room in the back yard. He doesn't feel encumbering someone else's property with the variances overcomes the applicants desire to maintain his backyard.

Mr. McAlpine questioned who he would be encumbering.

Adams said the board doesn't know what would happen with the outlot in the future.

Mr. McAlpine said it was unbuildable.

Adams said the board doesn't know what may happen to the outlot in the future.

Johnson said when he visited the site there were a lot of protrusions coming out of the wall that's going to be by the deck. There are furnace vents, a cleanout, a heater vent and another vent in the upper right corner and a gas line.

Waytashek said those would be questions for the building official before the building permit would be issued.

Johnson asked what the fencing requirements were around the pool in Sherburne County.

Guttormson said he believes every pool needs an automatic pool cover or a fence. Rules might be different if it's an above ground pool.

Demeules said the pool needs to have limited access.

Johnson said the plans do not show a gate on the top or bottom of the stairs.

Mr. McAlpine said he was under the assumption that the access would be limited by the rear yard which is totally fenced.

Johnson said he was concerned about the kids getting on the deck with no supervision around and they fall in the pool. If they approve the variances, he is going to make a condition there is a lockable gate at the foot or the top of the steps.

Demeules said when the applicant applied for the variances, he assumes he was told about the 11 questions that the board went through with the previous applicant.

Mr. McAlpine said he was not told.

Demeules explained there were 11 questions that need to be answered and they all need to be answered “yes”. There are a couple questions that he is struggling with.

Mr. McAlpine said that was unfortunate given the cost of the request.

Demeules said he considers a pool to be a luxury item and it isn't a necessity. It's hard to see the hardship and answer some of the questions.

Waytashek said staff had let the applicant know they had some concerns and, in this case, they do have plenty of alternative area in which to place the pool. They don't have a septic system on the property because it's part of community cluster septic system so they don't need to maintain an additional septic area.

Stimmler asked the applicant if he would consider moving the pool away from the area in the corner then a variance wouldn't be needed at all.

Mr. McAlpine said he would not because he would lose the function of his rear yard. Where they place a volleyball net and throw baseballs to his son. They are trying to make the most of a small lot and make the most of a starter home.

Guttormson said that staff did include the 11 “Findings of Facts” in the review letter sent to the applicant.

Johnson said there is a 6' utility easement around the back corner of the lot. He asked if the deck and the pool would be outside of the utility easement.

Mr. McAlpine said it was 27.38' on the diagonal.

Johnson asked if anyone in the audience had any comments or questions. No one did. Johnson closed the public hearing.

Stimmler asked the applicant if he would be willing to move the pool.

Mr. McAlpine said he would not construct a hard side pool on another location so they will just put up a soft side.

Stimmler motioned and Anderson seconded the motion to deny the 19' variance in setback from the rear property line for a pool with the following "Findings of Fact":

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the comprehensive plan. Yes () No (X)
It will be in conflict with the comprehensive plan because they are asking for a variance that this board will not approve.
2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same district, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since enactment of the relevant Ordinance have had no control. Yes () No (X) There are circumstances which the owners could have control over.
3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance. Yes () No (X) It would not deprive the applicant of rights if he didn't ask for the variance.
4. The exceptional or extraordinary circumstances do not result from the actions of the current or previous owner(s) under the current Ordinance or State Law. Yes () No (X) I have to say no. Extraordinary circumstances would be to not ask for the variance.
5. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty. Yes () No (X) We shouldn't be here asking for a variance.
6. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality and there would be no significant effect on the surrounding properties. Yes () No (X) If we granted a variance it would alter the rear of the building and the dimensions.
7. Adequate sewage treatment systems can be provided if the variance is granted. Yes (X) No ()

8. Granting the variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because the driveway is inadequate length or width. Yes (X) No () It will not affect traffic at all.
9. If a shoreland variance, it will not be a greater height or lesser shoreline setback than what is typical for the area immediately surrounding the development site. Yes () No () N/A
10. The variance will not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy of the neighboring properties of the residence were built according to the applicable regulation and height of structure. Yes (X) No () It would not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy.
11. Economic considerations or circumstances shall not be considered so long as a reasonable use of the property exists under the terms of the Ordinance. Yes (X) No () Economic considerations shall not be considered.

All in favor. Motion to deny variance passed.

Stimmler motioned and Adams seconded the motion to deny the 7' variance in setback from the rear property line for a deck on existing garage with the following "Findings of Fact":

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the comprehensive plan. Yes () No (X) It will be in conflict with the comprehensive plan because they are asking for a variance that this board will not approve.
2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same district, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since enactment of the relevant Ordinance have had no control. Yes () No (X) There are circumstances which the owners could have control over.
3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance. Yes () No (X) It would not deprive the applicant of rights if he didn't ask for a variance.
4. The exceptional or extraordinary circumstances do not result from the actions of the current or previous owner(s) under the current Ordinance or State Law. Yes () No (X) I have to say no. Extraordinary circumstances would be to not ask for the variance.
5. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty. Yes () No (X) We shouldn't be here asking for a variance.
6. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality and there would be no significant effect on the surrounding properties. Yes () No (X) If we granted a variance it would alter the rear of the building and dimensions.

7. Adequate sewage treatment systems can be provided if the variance is granted. Yes (X) No ()
8. Granting the variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because the driveway is inadequate length or width. Yes (X) No () It will not affect traffic at all.
9. If a shoreland variance, it will not be a greater height or lesser shoreline setback than what is typical for the area immediately surrounding the development site. Yes () No () N/A
10. The variance will not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy of the neighboring properties of the residence were built according to the applicable regulation and height of structure. Yes (X) No () It would not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy.
11. Economic considerations or circumstances shall not be considered so long as a reasonable use of the property exists under the terms of the Ordinance. Yes (X) No () Economic considerations shall not be considered.

All in favor. Motion to deny variance passed.

6:35 P.M. LISA PETERSON (NOBERG HOMES): (Property Owner: Matthew & Elizabeth Baufield) Requesting a 14' variance in setback from the right of way of 234th Ave NW for a detached garage. Required setback from the right of way is 67'. Address: 18810 234th Ave NW, Big Lake, Mn Legal: Eagle Point S ½ of Lot 1, Block 2 and the SLY 100' of the ELY 72' of Lot 3, Block 2 Sec 31, Twp 34, Rge 27 .51 Acres Orrock Township General Rural District and within the General Development Lakeshore District of Eagle Lake.

LISA PETERSON (NOBERG HOMES): (Property Owner: Matthew & Elizabeth Baufield) Requesting a 13' variance in setback from the rear property line for a detached garage. Required setback from the rear property line is 25'. Address: 18810 234th Ave NW, Big Lake, Mn Legal: Eagle Point S ½ of Lot 1, Block 2 and the SLY 100' of the ELY 72' of Lot 3, Block 2 Sec 31, Twp 34, Rge 27 .51 Acres Orrock Township General Rural District and within the General Development Lakeshore District of Eagle Lake.

Johnson read the variance requests.

Guttormson said Orrock Township recommended approval of the variance requests. The proposed accessory building is 24'x27.9' in size. The applicant currently has a 585 sq ft garage that will be removed. The applicant could build the same size garage in the same location, but they have chosen to build the maximum size building of 666 sq ft. The septic passed inspection in June 2023. The proposed impervious surface is 25% and they will not be allowed additional impervious surface in the future.

Matt Baufield, 18810 234th Ave NW, Big Lake, Mn was present.

Mr. Baufield said they are requesting the variances for a few reasons. The existing garage looks like trash. They have lived at the property for 21 ½ years and the garage has a single 8' door on it and it's very tight to get anything but a small car in. They want to get the new building away from the wooded area to the west of the garage because it is heavily wooded and they have had a tree fall on the garage in the past. There are dead trees in that area.

MacMillan asked about setbacks for the garage.

Guttormson explained the setbacks for the lot.

Demeules asked which line was considered the back.

Guttormson said the north property line was considered the back.

MacMillan asked if there was currently an attached garage.

Mr. Baufield said there was not an attached garage.

Anderson asked if there would be plumbing in the loft area of the garage.

Mr. Baufield said there would not be plumbing in the loft and that area would be used for storage.

Johnson asked if the power pole near the garage was the power source for the garage.

Mr. Baufield said the power pole will be in use until Connexus can take the poles down. They are looking into when and if they can do it. If they do take the pole down, they will underground trench the service to the garage.

Johnson asked about the location of the small shed that is close to the existing garage.

Mr. Baufield said that was his shed that is on the neighbor's property. The neighbors informed the applicants a few years ago that the shed was over the property line. The neighbors are fine with the shed staying there for now. The applicants plan to remove the shed when they remove the existing garage.

Guttormson recommended making it a condition of the variance that the shed be removed.

MacMillan asked what the setback was for a well from the garage.

Guttormson said the well setback is 3’.

Demeules said he thinks everyone deserves a garage in Minnesota and he doesn’t think there is another location for the garage to be built.

Adams said the new garage will actually be further away from the property line.

Johnson asked if anyone in the audience had any comments or questions.

Mark Nicholson, 18849 234th Ave NW, Big Lake, Mn said he lives directly across from the applicants. He is in support of the board granting the variances. He drove around the area recently and there are at least 26 other residences that do not meet the standard setbacks that are currently in place. Many have structures closer to the road than the applicant’s garage will be. He said it will be a nice improvement. He feels sorry for them in the winter.

Johnson closed the public hearing.

Adams motioned and Demeules seconded the motion to approve the 14’ variance in setback from the right of way 234th Ave for a detached garage with the following conditions and “Findings of Fact”:

Conditions:

1. Prior to construction, a building permit must be obtained from the County.
2. The variance is only valid if acted upon by the applicant within one (1) year of approval.
3. The applicant needs to obtain a razing permit for both the shed and the existing garage prior to removing the structures. They must be removed prior to a building permit being issued.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the comprehensive plan. Yes (X) No ()
That’s correct it will not be in conflict.
2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same district, and result from lot size or shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since enactment of the relevant Ordinance have had no control. Yes (X) No () That’s correct due to the unique shape of the lot creates an issue also he’s moving the structure farther away from the lot lines that benefit the required variances.

3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance. Yes (X) No () That's correct. He's moving the shed farther away from the property lines.
4. The exceptional or extraordinary circumstances do not result from the actions of the current or previous owner(s) under the current Ordinance or State Law. Yes (X) No () That's correct. This was probably built before the setback ordinances were enacted.
5. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty. Yes (X) No () That's correct. This is the minimum variance.
6. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality and there would be no significant effect on the surrounding properties. Yes (X) No () It will actually improve the character of the area.
7. Adequate sewage treatment systems can be provided if the variance is granted. Yes (X) No () That is correct. I am assuming this is a tank and is pumped and a drainfield.
8. Granting the variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because the driveway is inadequate length or width. Yes (X) No () It will have no impact on parking or vehicle traffic.
9. If a shoreland variance, it will not be a greater height or lesser shoreline setback than what is typical for the area immediately surrounding the development site. Yes (X) No () That is correct.
10. The variance will not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy of the neighboring properties of the residence were built according to the applicable regulation and height of structure. Yes (X) No () That is also correct. It will not affect the sunlight or view of other neighbors.
11. Economic considerations or circumstances shall not be considered so long as a reasonable use of the property exists under the terms of the Ordinance. Yes (X) No () Financial considerations were not considered. That is correct.

All in favor. Motion to approve passed.

Adams motioned and Anderson seconded the motion to approve the 13' variance in setback from the rear property line for a detached garage with the following conditions and "Findings of Fact":

Conditions:

1. Prior to construction, a building permit must be obtained from the County.
2. The variance is only valid if acted upon by the applicant within one (1) year of approval.
3. The applicant needs to obtain a razing permit for both the shed and the existing garage prior to removing the structures. They must be removed prior to a building permit being issued.

Findings of Fact:

1. Granting the variance will not be in conflict with the comprehensive plan. Yes (X) No ()
That's correct it will not be in conflict.
2. Exceptional or extraordinary circumstances apply to the property which do not apply generally to other properties in the same district, and result from lot size of shape, topography, or other circumstances over which the owners of property since enactment of the relevant Ordinance have had no control. Yes (X) No () That's correct due to the unique shape of the lot creates an issue also he's moving the structure farther away from the lot lines that benefit the required variances.
3. The literal interpretation of the provisions of this Ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of this Ordinance. Yes (X) No () That's correct. He's moving the shed farther away from the property lines.
4. The exceptional or extraordinary circumstances do not result from the actions of the current or previous owner(s) under the current Ordinance or State Law. Yes (X) No () That's correct. This was probably built before the setback ordinances were enacted.
5. The variance requested is the minimum variance which would alleviate the practical difficulty. Yes (X) No () That's correct. This is the minimum variance.
6. The variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality and there would be no significant effect on the surrounding properties. Yes (X) No () It will actually improve the character of the area.
7. Adequate sewage treatment systems can be provided if the variance is granted. Yes (X) No () That is correct. I am assuming this is a tank and is pumped and a drainfield.
8. Granting the variance will not result in the parking or loading of vehicles on public streets in such a manner as to interfere with the free flow of traffic of the streets because the driveway is inadequate length or width. Yes (X) No () It will have no impact on parking or vehicle traffic.
9. If a shoreland variance, it will not be a greater height or lesser shoreline setback than what is typical for the area immediately surrounding the development site. Yes (X) No () That is correct.
10. The variance will not increase loss of sunlight, views or privacy of the neighboring properties of the residence were built according to the applicable regulation and height of structure. Yes (X) No () That is also correct. It will not affect the sunlight or view of other neighbors.
11. Economic considerations or circumstances shall not be considered so long as a reasonable use of the property exists under the terms of the Ordinance. Yes (X) No () Financial considerations were not considered. That is correct.

All in favor. Motion to approve passed.

6:55 P.M. Adams motioned and MacMillan seconded the motion to adjourn. Motion carried. Meeting Adjourned.

Submitted by:
Kelly Mittelstaedt