

# AGENDA

## City of Winona Board of Adjustment

DATE: Wednesday, March 4, 2020

TIME: 5:00 P.M.

PLACE: City Hall Council Chambers

---

### 1. CALL TO ORDER

Approval of minutes from the February 5<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### 2. NEW BUSINESS

#### A. Mario & Sheryl Einsman

Parcel Address: 360 Grand Street

**Nature of Request:** Applicant requests modifications from code:

- ❖ A front yard setback of 25 feet and side yard setbacks of 10 feet for two-family dwellings 2½ stories in height.  
**Applicant is proposing use of an existing structure, which is approximately 6 feet from the southerly side property line.**
- ❖ A lot frontage of 65 feet and a lot area minimum of 8,000 square feet for two-family dwellings.  
**Applicant is proposing use of a lot, which is to be 60 feet by 100 feet totaling 6,000 square feet with a frontage along Grand Street of 60 feet.**
- ❖ Two automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit.  
**Applicant is proposing use of an existing structure, which currently provides two automobile spaces in total.**

**City Code Sections:** 43.02.24 Table 43-4  
43.02.23 Table 43-3  
43.03.22(A) Table 43-17

#### B. Nick Newman –Kwik Trip

Parcel Address: 262 High Forest Street

**Nature of Request:** Applicant requests modification from code, which is a use specific standard that prohibits standalone parking lots, located within 50 feet of residential districts.

**City Code Section:** 43.03.78(A)(1)

Applicant is proposing a standalone, non-structural parking lot located at 262 High Forest Street to provide employee parking for the existing business located at the adjacent 770 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

**3. OTHER BUSINESS**

**4. ADJOURNMENT**

**PUBLICATION NOTICE: Friday, February 21, 2020**

**CITY OF WINONA  
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
NOTICE OF HEARING**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE:**

The following applications have been made for variations from the requirements of the Winona City Code, as listed below:

Notice is sent to the applicants and to the owners of the property affected by the application.

- a) Mario & Sheryl Einsman – City Code Section 43.02.24 Table 43-4 Site Dimension Standards which requires a front yard setback of 25 feet (25') and side yard setbacks of 10 feet (10') for two-family dwellings two and one-half stories in height. Applicant is proposing use of an existing structure which is approximately six feet (6') from the front property line and three feet (3') from the southerly side property line.

City Code Section 43.02.23 Table 43-3 Lot Dimension Standards which requires a lot frontage of 65 feet (65') and a lot area minimum of 8,000 square feet for two-family dwellings. Applicant is proposing use of a lot which is to be 60 feet by 100 feet (60'x100') totaling 6,000 square feet with a frontage along Grand Street of 60 feet (60').

City Code Section 43.03.22(A) Table 43-17, which requires two automobile parking spaces per dwelling unit. Applicant is proposing use of an existing structure which currently provides two automobile spaces in total. Property is described as R-2 zoning, Sect-22, Twp-107, Range-007, ORIGINAL PLAT, Lot-005, Block-120, ORIGINAL PLAT SLY 60', or at 360 Grand Street.

- b) Nick Newman, Kwik Trip – City Code Section 43.03.78(A)(1) which is a use-specific standard that prohibits standalone parking lots located within 50 feet (50') of residential districts. The applicant is proposing a standalone, non-structural parking lot located at 262 High Forest Street to provide employee parking for the existing business located at the adjacent 770 East 6<sup>th</sup> Street. Property is described as Sect-25 Twp-107 Range-007 HAMILTON ADDITION Block-041 50' ON HIGH FOREST ST BY 62 1/2', or at 262 High Forest Street.

A hearing on these petitions will be given in the Council Chambers, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, City Hall, Winona, Minnesota at **5:00 p.m. on March 4, 2020** at which time interested persons may appear either in person, in writing, or by agent, and present any reasons which they may have to the granting or denying of these

petitions. Any questions regarding the petitioner's request can be directed to the Community Development Department; Inspections Division at 457-8231.

**APPLICANTS ARE REQUESTED TO PREPARE THEIR CASE IN  
DETAIL AND PRESENT ALL EVIDENCE RELATING TO THIS PETITION AT  
THE TIME OF THE SCHEDULED HEARING.**

Chris Sanchez, Chairman  
Board of Adjustment

Gray boxes to be filled in by staff only.

# CITY OF WINONA

## APPEAL TO BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT FOR MODIFICATION OF CITY CODE

Date 11 Feb 2020 Owner MARIO EINSMAN

Owner Address 307 W 8<sup>th</sup>

Petitioner MARIO EINSMAN Phone No 313-3509

Petitioner Address 307 W 8<sup>th</sup>

As property owner or petitioner, I hereby make application to modify the City Code at the following address:  
360 Grand St.

It is understood that only those points specifically mentioned are affected by action taken on this appeal.

Purpose in seeking Board of Adjustment hearing: lot 5130 requirement  
frontage requirement lot area  
set back

**AND PARKING**  
**- 20 2/14/2020**

See handout for required submittal information and general

The specific ordinance modification desired is \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
new lot 100 x 60

I hereby certify that I am the owner of the above described property or am otherwise legally empowered to make this appeal.

Mario Einsman  
(Applicant's Signature)

Received by:  
JULIE

The Board meets on the first and third Wednesday of every month. Petition must be filed by noon on the Friday 19 days prior to the Wednesday meeting date. The petitioner is required to attend the meeting.

Petition # 6955 Receipt # 57146 Filing Fee 215<sup>00</sup>  
Variance# 20-10-V Invoice # 2069  
Date Received 2-11-20 Hearing Date 3-4-20 Zoning R-2

Pin # 32-000-7640

Grand St

59.68

98.6

6,013 sq ft

100.2

59.93

ENCLOSURE



**Store Engineering**

FAX 608-793-6237

1626 Oak St., P.O. Box 2107  
La Crosse, WI 54602

[www.kwiktrip.com](http://www.kwiktrip.com)

VIA E-MAIL & USPS

January 2, 2020

Carlos Espinosa  
City of Winona – City Planner  
207 Lafayette Street  
PO Box 378  
Winona, MN 55987

Dear Carlos,

This letter is accompanied by a variance request application and the filing fee. Kwik Trip recently purchased property at 262 High Forest St with the intention of building a parking lot. This will be a standalone parking lot with two of the neighboring lots being residential. We are seeking a variance because the city code does not allow for a standalone parking lot within 50' of a residential lot.

The property is on the other side of the alley from our current store, preventing Kwik Trip from combining the lots. Since we cannot combine the lots we are left with a standalone parking lot as the most reasonable option.

The purpose of this project is to create additional employee and guest parking since this store is often congested and parking is sometimes difficult. Our goal is to make this site safer, less congested and easier to navigate. We have reached out to the two adjacent residential lots and received a response from the owners of 755 E 5<sup>th</sup> St expressing interest in a privacy fence, which we find as a reasonable request and are willing to accommodate.

Please let me know if you need any additional information or have any questions.

Thank you,

Nick Newman

---

**OUR MISSION**

*To serve our customers and community more effectively than anyone else by treating our customers, co-workers and suppliers as we, personally, would like to be treated, and to make a difference in someone's life.*

---



# MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

**TO:** Board of Adjustment

**FROM:** Luke Sims

**DATE:** February 21, 2020

**SUBJECT: BOA Application Considerations for 3/4/20 Meeting**

---

**Applicant:** Mario & Sheryl Einsman – 360 Grand Street

**Considerations related to Board of Adjustment Variance Criteria are provided below:**

**1) Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance?**

The intent of the ordinances in question are to provide regulations that ensure spacing of higher-density development in the community from nearby lots and to provide for additional off-street parking to lessen the impact of on-street parking facilities.

**2) Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?**

The variance does not affect the land use as dictated in the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan's future Land Use map designates this property as Traditional Neighborhood, which promotes medium density residential housing (1-4 units) and the associated accessory uses and structures that go along with that.

**3) Does the proposal put property to use in a reasonable manner?**

The R-2 zone allows for medium density dwellings, including two-family dwellings, located in the core of the City. The property in question is a lot that is below the median lot size in the City of Winona's R-2 zoning districts.

**4) Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality?**

The surrounding properties are also located in R-2 zones and feature a mix of owner-occupied, single-family rental, and multi-family rental. The properties surrounding the property in question are often smaller than the required lot area minimum and lot frontage requirements for their corresponding occupancy loads and are frequently closer than the required setbacks.

*Attached to this memo is an overhead mock up from City Staff of the proposed lot changes from the applicant as understood in the application process. This reference map is a preliminary approximation only.*

---

**Applicant:** Nick Newman – Kwik Trip – 262 Highforest

**Considerations related to Board of Adjustment Variance Criteria are provided below:**

**1) Is the variance in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance?**

The intent of the restriction on standalone parking near residential districts is to ensure that parking lots do not create an undue impact on residential neighborhoods.

**2) Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan?**

The 2007 Comprehensive Plan's Future Land Use Map designates this area as Traditional Neighborhood, which "may include small-scale commercial, office, [and] civic uses." And may be appropriate with mixed residential portions of urban expansion areas, such as in relation to the mixed use designation along Mankato Avenue and the Mixed Use-

Neighborhood re-zoning of the property in question. The Traditional Neighborhood designation's characteristic grid, connected street pattern, and neighborhood commercial opportunities will be enhanced through the proposed alley-loaded parking at 262 High Forest Street.

**3) Does the proposal put property to use in a reasonable manner?**

The Mixed Use-Neighborhood zoning district allows standalone, non-structural parking as a conditional use to be approved by the Planning Commission. The variance in question is related to one of the use-specific standards that accompany that use.

**4) Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality?**

The surrounding properties are located in a mix of R-2 and Mixed Use-Neighborhood zones which includes a mix of adaptive reuse of former commercial and residential properties for residential and commercial uses, respectively, as well as ongoing neighborhood-oriented commercial businesses, including the applicant's business directly to the south of the property in question.

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT  
Regular Meeting**

**DATE:** February 5, 2020

**TIME:** 5:00 p.m.

**PLACE:** City Council Chambers, City Hall

**PRESENT:** Sanchez, Murphy, Conway, Buege, Kouba, Breza

**ABSENT:** Krofchalk

---

Chairman Sanchez called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

Corrections were made to the January 15, 2020 minutes. Chairman Sanchez called the meeting to order, not Chairman Kouba. All members present voted aye to approve the minutes after the correction was made.

**Petition No. 20-8-V, Stephanie McDaniel-Vision 2020 Education Foundation**

Stephanie McDaniel - City Code Section. 43.02.24 Table 43-4 and 43.03.73 E) which limit structures in R-2 zoning districts to a maximum height of 35 feet and require schools to have a minimum 40 foot setback from property lines. Applicant wishes to construct an addition onto an existing school at a height of 46.5 feet and a minimum 14 feet to the nearest property line. Property is described as R-2 zoning, Sect-21, Twp-107, Range-007, CUMMINGS VILA/GOULDS ADD, Block-004, (ROGER BACON HALL), or at 1165 West Broadway.

Stephanie McDaniel, 380 St. Peter St, St. Paul, MN, addressed the Board Ms. McDaniel said the height that is being proposed is based on two buildings adjacent to the one that is being requested that are actually higher than the maximum allowed, so the impact of this building would be minimal and architecturally pleasing according to Ms. McDaniel. Ms. McDaniel said the building addition will be in context and similar to other adjacent buildings for both height and setback applications.

Tom Conway asked what the criteria and reason was for the overall size of the footprint of the building and Ms. McDaniel mentioned there is some design criteria that is required for the use of the building which will be a student dormitory and also they will try to conserve some green space and line the building up with the other buildings for aesthetics.

## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

February 5, 2020

PAGE 2

---

Dave Kouba asked about occupant density of the dormitory and Ms. McDaniel said that essentially there will be two students for each dorm room and there will be a couple of rooms for outside residence supervisors.

There being no others who desired to speak, Chairman Sanchez closed the public hearing and opened it up for discussion.

Dave Kouba mentioned that the building is not uncommon for student activity and educational purposes within the area.

Tom Conway mentioned that the addition is more towards the center of the campus and not on the outskirts of it and will not cast shadows or obstruct vision for any of the neighbors.

Staff verified that the proposed use is within the zoning district as a permitted use.

The Board went through the variance finding questions and question number one asked if the variance was in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance? Yes, the property is used as an educational facility and will continue with the same kind of use.

Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, the zoning is correct for educational use.

Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, it is educational use and also the demolition of part of the building is appropriate and will be the same use.

Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, it's based on the lot size; which is 300' by 300' and relatively a small space for high school educational use.

Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality? Yes, it is still within the constraints of an educational building which is similar to its surroundings.

With no further comments, Tom Conway made a motion to approve the variance as proposed and it was seconded by Jim Murphy. All were in favor of approving the variance request.

Petitioner was informed that there was a 10-day appeal period during which time no action could be taken on the petition.

### **Petition No. 20-4-V, Lucas Malay**

Chairman Sanchez opened the public hearing and read the petition:

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES**

**February 5, 2020**

**PAGE 3**

---

Lucas Malay – City Code Section 43.02.32 8)a)vii which requires a hydrogeological study completed by a qualified professional and 43.02.32 8)a)vi which requires a Phase 1 Archaeological Survey for land disturbance in a Ridgeline Transition Overlay District. Applicant proposes to construct a new single family home within the Ridgeline Transition Overlay District without a hydrogeological study or Archaeological Survey. Property is described as R-R zoning, Sect-05 Twp-106 Range-007 WILSON ANNEXED TO WINONA 45.61 AC S 1/2 SE 1/4 NW 1/4; S 1/2 S 1/2 NE 1/4 LYING W'LY CSAH 44; PART N 1/2 SE 1/4 & PART NE 1/4 SW 1/4 COM NE CORNER N 1/2 SE 1/4, S 1 DEG E ALONG E LINE N 1/2 SE 1/4 156', N 87 DEG W 1265.41' TO PT OF BEG: N 87 DEG W 2725.32' TO W LINE NE 1/4 SW 1/4, N 1 DEG W 4.8' TO NW CORNER NE 1/4 SW 1/4, S 89 DEG E ALONG N LINE NE 1/4 SW 1/4 & N LINE N 1/2 SE 1/4 2736.88', S 7 DEG W 108.82' TO PT OF BEG EX: PART N 1/2 SE 1/4 & PART S 1/2 S 1/2 NE 1/4 COM NE CORNER N 1/2 SE 1/4, S 1 DEG E ALONG E LINE N 1/2 SE 1/4 156' N 87 DEG W 1265.41' TO PT OF BEG: N 87 DEG W 486', N 7 DEG E 200', S 87 DEG E 486', S 7 DEG W 200' TO PT OF BEG, or at 22401 Garvin Heights Road.

Lucas Malay, 25997 Blackberry Rd, Winona, MN, addressed the Board. Mr. Malay stated that the land has been in production for a number of years. He has located a spot that is conducive to the type of house he will like to build and also farther back on the lot in a private spot.

Jim Murphy asked the approximate height of the structure and Mr. Malay said is essentially a slab on grade with possibly a split level on one part. Mr. Malay didn't say specifically how tall, but he did say it was not multi-story or anything of that nature.

Dave Kouba asked if there was an alternate side on the land where he could build and there wouldn't be a problem with water and Mr. Malay responded he would like to put the home on his own property and keep the land in farming production.

Tom Conway mentioned that the part of the land that he is intending on building on has the least amount of slope and is one of the flattest areas and it would have the least impact of putting a house on the land. Mr. Conway asked what the cost would be for the studies and Mr. Malay said he was quoted anywhere between \$30,000 and \$50,000.

Chairman Sanchez posed a question to Staff and asked if the City has encountered anything like this before and Staff commented that this ordinance came into play in 2009 and those changes have been addressed before within the Planning Department, and it was not unique to the City.

## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

February 5, 2020

PAGE 4

---

There being no others who desired to speak, Chairman Sanchez closed the public hearing and opened it up for discussion.

Dave Kouba commented that if the studies were done, they may not find anything different than what has been there for many years because the land has always been disturbed with agricultural purposes.

Travis Buege commented that the impact on the land with one dwelling would be fairly incidental and the only issue for down water contamination would maybe be a septic system and in which case are controlled and inspected by Winona County, so there are safeguards in place to protect the land and the impact would be minimal with a single dwelling on the land.

No further discussion forthcoming, the Board considered the findings.

Question number one asked if the variance was in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance? Yes, there is minimal on the land for such a large piece of property with only one dwelling on it.

Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, the parcel is for low density residential which is what the applicant is intending to do.

Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, it is residential and when the property was annexed in 2005, the property was envisioned as a location for low density residential subdivision.

Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, there is an approximate 3 acre portion of land on the property adjacent to County Road 44 where a house could be built without a variance.

Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality? Yes, it is consistent with the area and there are homes studded throughout the neighborhood.

Travis Buege moved to approve the variance as requested and Jim Murphy seconded the motion. Dave Kouba opposed the motion and the remaining members approved the variance.

Petitioner was informed that there was a 10-day appeal period during which time no action could be taken on the petition.

### **Petition No. 20-5-V, Johnson & Scofield – Joseph & Gloria Bronk**

Chairman Sanchez opened the public hearing and read the petition:

Johnson & Scofield, Inc. - City Code Section 43.02.23 Table 43-3 and 43.02.24 Table 43-4 which requires a minimum lot size of 8,000 square

## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

February 5, 2020

PAGE 5

---

feet, a minimum frontage of 65 feet, and a side yard setback of 10 feet for a single family two story home in an R-1 zoning district. Applicant proposes to split an existing lot into two and thus create a new lot with an existing home on it. The new lot is proposed to be 5,690 square feet with 53 feet of frontage and a side yard setback of 8.5'. Property is described as R-1 zoning, Sect-29, Twp-107, Range-007, LIMITS E 53' OF W 304' OF N 275' OF NW ¼ NE ¼ or at 1927 Gilmore Avenue.

Brian Wodele, Johnson & Scofield, addressed the Board. Mr. Wodele expressed the idea behind the variance request was to absorb an existing lot and combine with another existing lot to make one parcel. The resulting parcel with the house on it does not meet the 8,000 square feet and the other perimeters and that is the reason for the variance request. The criteria for measurement for the 8,000 square feet doesn't include a portion of the right-of-way. The lot in question used to be part of Highway 14 with a state right-of-way of a minimum of 100 feet. There is one particular lot in the same situation and has a 66 foot right-of-way with 33 feet from the center line of the road, which is more of a normal application.

Jim Murphy mentioned that the lot looks like it is over 8,000 square feet by including the frontage, so it looks like a typical lot in Winona.

Chairman asked what their intentions were for the new lot and the reply was that they just want to incorporate it into their existing lot. There are not concrete plans for the parcel or a willingness to sell it for future development.

A question was drawn about accessing the new lot and if it would be from an existing driveway and it there was a reply that there would be more than one access to get to the lot.

There being no others who desired to speak, Chairman Sanchez closed the public hearing and opened it up for discussion.

Two letters were read by Chairman Sanchez from the neighbors and both letters were a request to deny the variance request for various reasons.

No further discussion forthcoming, the Board considered the findings

Question number one asked if the variance was in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance? Yes, it is consistent with the existing lots and zoned R-1.

Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, it is residential and the continued proposed use.

Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, it is adjacent to single family dwellings and neighbors are not certified as rentals.

## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

February 5, 2020

PAGE 6

---

Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner?  
Yes, the right-of-way is existing.

Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality? Yes,  
the locality is basically residential single family home.

Staff clarified that this variance request is just for combining the lots and not being proposed to do any construction on it. If that were the case, the owners would have to come back to the Board of Adjustment.

Jim Murphy moved to approve the variance request as requested and it was seconded by Dave Kouba. All members present voted aye.

Petitioner was informed that there was a 10-day appeal period during which time no action could be taken on the petition.

### **Petition No. 20-6-V, Marie Schueler**

Chairman Sanchez opened the public hearing and read the petition:

Marie Schueler – City Code Section 43.02.24 Table 43-4 which requires a front yard setback of 25 feet (25'), a side-yard setback of eight feet (8'), and a rear yard setback of 30 feet (30') for two-family dwellings which are two story's in height. Applicant is proposing to utilize the existing two story structure as a duplex, which is currently sited with only a 20 foot (20') front yard setback, a side-yard setback of three feet (3') on the westerly side, and a rear yard setback of five feet (5'). Property is described as B-3 zoning Sect-21, Twp-107, Range -007, BRONK'S ADDITION, Lot-001, Block-001, AUD'S PLAT #2, or at 254 Orrin Street.

Marie Schueler, 104 Main Street, Winona, MN, addressed the Board. Ms. Schueler told the Board that her mother originally owned the house and she had given the house over to her. Ms. Schueler said she added an addition to the second floor and was renting the house as a duplex.

It was clarified that the original license was for owner-occupied, with the owner's unit not being certified. The license had lapsed because Ms. Schueler was going to try and sell the house and didn't think she would have to worry about recertifying. The sale did not work out so Ms. Schueler said she was requesting a variance to be able to convert the home into a duplex with the owner's unit certified as well so the request is for a full duplex and not owner-occupied.

Jim Murphy asked if there was ever a business at this property and it was verified that a number of years ago Christmas trees were sold at this property.

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES**

**February 5, 2020**

**PAGE 7**

---

There being no others who desired to speak, Chairman Sanchez closed the public hearing and opened it up for discussion.

No further discussion forthcoming, the Board considered the findings

Question number one asked if the variance was in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance? Yes, it is in line with the ordinance.

Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, the zoning is appropriate.

Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, there is no change in how the property was being used before.

Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, the lot is an odd size and very unique.

Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality? Yes, nothing will change in how it is being used.

Dave Kouba moved to approve the variance as requested. Jim Murphy seconded the motion. All members present voted aye.

Petitioner was informed that there was a 10-day appeal period during which time no action could be taken on the petition.

**Petition No. 20-7-V, Tom Hoseck**

Chairman Sanchez opened the public hearing and read the petition:

Tom Hoseck – City Code Section 43.03.72 F) which requires two family dwellings in R-1 districts to be located on a corner lot with access to an arterial or Collector Street. Applicant wishes to establish a duplex on a non-corner lot that does not have access to an arterial or Collector Street. Property is described as R-1 zoning, Sect-27 Twp-107 Range-007 LIMITS PART GOV'T LOT 1 SEC 27 & PART NE 1/4 NE 1/4 SEC 34 T107 R7 COM ON N LINE SEC 34 AT PT 125.40' W OF NE CORNER SEC 34, S 0 DEG E 51.48', N 90 DEG W 666.89' TO PT OF BEG, N 0 DEG W 51.48', N 23 DEG E 184.15', N 77 DEG W 8', N 13 DEG E 40', N 65 DEG E 22.39', N 23 DEG E 74.28', S 78 DEG E 100', S 22 DEG W 289.57', S 0 DEG E 51.48', N 90 DEG W 110' TO PT OF BEG, or at 161 East Lake Blvd.

Tom Hoseck, 278 Mankato Avenue, addressed the Board. Mr. Hoseck said currently the home has an efficiency apartment in the basement and a single family residence above.

## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES

February 5, 2020

PAGE 8

---

The Board requested some dictation on the code requirements specifically for the duplex in the center and not on a corner lot and also arterial and collectors streets. Staff provided some guidance by answering the Board specifically. There being no others who desired to speak, Chairman Sanchez closed the public hearing and opened it up for discussion.

Chairman Sanchez read a letter from one of the neighbors about an easement for the driveway between two neighbors and letting them know that the easement was still in place.

No further discussion forthcoming, the Board considered the findings

Question number one asked if the variance was in harmony with the purpose and intent of the ordinance? Yes, it has minimal impact on traffic and will continue residential use which is in harmony with the ordinance.

Is the variance consistent with the Comprehensive Plan? Yes, it is residential use.

Does the proposal put the property to use in a reasonable manner? Yes, it is consistent with the other lots.

Are there unique circumstances to the property not created by the landowner? Yes, there are no corners to put a duplex on.

Will the variance, if granted, retain the essential character of the locality? Yes, it essentially remains the same.

Jim Murphy made a motion to approve the variance as requested and it was seconded by Dave Kouba. All members present voted aye.

### **Adjournment**

Tim Breza made a motion to adjourn with a second by Travis Buege. The vote of the Board was unanimous.

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 6:25p.m.

  
Greg Karow  
Secretary