

**Jo Daviess County Planning Commission/Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes for Meeting
At the Courthouse-7:00 PM
October 23, 2019**

Call to Order: Meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call Present:

Planning Commission:

- ✓ Melvin Gratton
- ✓ Nick Tranel
 Laura Winter
- ✓ Ron Mapes
- ✓ Gary Diedrick
 Jody Carroll, Alternate
- ✓ Peter Huschitt, Alternate

Staff & County Board Members:

- ✓ Steve Keeffer, Highway Engineer
 Sandra Schleicher, JDC Health Dept.
 John Hay, State's Attorney
- ✓ Eric Tison, Planning & Development
- ✓ Robert Heurman, JDC Board Member
- ✓ Melissa Soppe, Planning & Development

Approval of Minutes: A motion was made by Tranel to approve the minutes of September 25, 2019. Seconded by Diedrick. Voice Vote: All Ayes Abstain: Mapes

Mel Gratton swore in all who might want to testify on any request this evening.

New Business

Jamie & Casey Richardson (11621 W Cross Road, Galena, IL 61036) owners have petitioned for a Variance from the required front yard setback, as established in Title 8, Chapter 3, Article B, Section 8-3B-6 A.1.c. Public Streets, of fifty (50) feet to twenty point one zero (20.10) feet, a twenty nine point nine (29.9) foot variation for an accessory structure. Also requested is a Variance from the required side yard setback as established in Title 8, Chapter 3, Article B, Section 8-3B-6 A2 Minimum Interior Side Yards, of twenty (20) feet to eleven point zero three (11.03) feet; an eight point nine seven (8.97) foot variation. Property is located in the R1 Single Family Residential District. Commonly known as 11621 W Cross Road, Galena, IL

Staff

- Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan does not address Variances, but does recognize the importance of the rural character and excellent quality of life existing in the county, stating that it shall be enhanced and protected.
- Wastewater Treatment: A septic system was installed in December 2005 to serve a 3 bedroom house on this property. This system is located to the south of the house as indicated in the application. This request should not have any effect on the septic system.
- Access Considerations: There is an existing entrance onto West Galena Township maintained West Cross Road. The sight distance to the west is 375' which equates to a 30 mph design speed.
- Other Considerations: The property is located in West Galena Township, less than 1 mile west of Galena. The parcel was rezoned as a one lot subdivision in 2005. The existing residence was subsequently permitted. The petitioner came to

the office seeking a permit to place a new accessory structure on a portion of the property. The R1 District requires a side setback of 20' and a front setback to the property line of 50'. All surrounding properties are zoned AG Agricultural.

Jamie Richardson, owner

- I would like to put up a solar array in the northwest corner. I have geothermal lines just south from that, my well is in front of my house. My septic is to the south. There is a natural waterway flowing to the left of my driveway all the way down and continues to go left into a ravine down below the horse shed. This is the only place it can be on the property.

Gratton asks if you could point out the amenities you have such as the well, septic, and etc.

- Jamie Richardson indicates the well to the north of the house, directly to the south of the house is the septic. To the west of the house is the geothermal field, this is kind of the reason for the solar, my electric bills are pretty expensive with those.

Gratton asks what the size of the solar array is.

- Jamie Richardson indicates 10k system, 18 foot wide by 30 foot long. 35 panels

Gratton asks the area the geothermal encompass

- Jamie Richardson indicates 35 foot long by 18 foot wide. Correction it is 45 feet long by 16 feet wide. 720 square feet

Public Testimony

None

Public Testimony Closed

Huschitt asks what the useful life of the solar array is.

- Jamie Richardson indicates 25 year warranty. They will be pillars into the ground and mounted on steel brackets on top of that.

Diedrick indicates appropriate location based on property.

Mapes and Huschitt agree with Diedrick

Standards for variance reviewed 1 –reasonable, ok; 2 – true; 3 – true; 4 – ok; 5 – ok; 6 – true; 7-yes

A motion was made by Huschitt to approve the variance request as presented from the front property line of fifty (50) feet to twenty point one zero (20.10) feet, a twenty nine point nine (29.9) foot variation for an accessory structure. Also from the side property line of twenty (20) feet to eleven point zero three (11.03) feet; an eight point nine seven (8.97) foot variation stating the following:

1. Standards for variance reviewed and met

Seconded by Mapes

Roll Call:	Nick Tranel – Aye	Gary Diedrick – Aye
	Peter Huschitt – Aye	Mel Gratton – Aye
	Ron Mapes – Aye	

Scott & Carrie Temperly (8829 IL Rt 84 N, Galena, IL 61036) owners, have petitioned for a Variance from the required side yard setback as established in Title 8, Chapter 3, Article C, Section 8-3C-6 A2 Minimum Interior Side Yards, of fifteen (15) feet to five (5) feet; a ten (10) foot variation. Property is located in the R2 Two Family Residential District. Commonly known as 8829 Illinois Route 84 North, Galena, IL

Staff

- Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan does not address Variances, but does recognize the importance of the rural character and excellent quality of life existing in the county, stating that it shall be enhanced and protected.
- Wastewater Treatment: The septic system serving this home was installed in 2009 and sized for a 3 bedroom house. The system begins approximately 50 feet north of the house. This request should not have any effect on the septic system. Any plumbing in the new building would require connection to a septic system. The Illinois Private Sewage Code does require a 5 foot separation between a building and a septic tank and a 10 foot separation between a building and drainfield.
- Access Considerations: The property has an existing entrance onto IDOT maintained Illinois Route 84 with adequate sight distance.
- Other Considerations: The property is located in Vinegar Hill Township, more than 4 miles east of the Village of Menominee. The parcel was granted a road frontage variance and was approved/rezoned as a one lot subdivision. The existing residence was subsequently permitted in 2009.
- The petitioner came to the office seeking a permit to place a new accessory structure on a portion of the property. The R2 District requires a side setback of 15'.
- Additionally, a parcel of this size is limited to 1,950 square feet of accessory space, including attached garages. Permit plans indicate 827 square feet for the two car garage accessible off the main level of the house. The plans did not show the lower level door at the time they were submitted so an accurate calculation of the square footage will be necessary. No accessory structures are present on the property. All surrounding properties are zoned AG Agricultural

Eric states we did not have any calls on this request.

Scott Temperly, owner

- With the size of my lot and the layout of the north side with the big ravine in the back, I don't have a lot of spots to put an accessory building. I am trying to stay closer to the fence and use the square footage I have left with the R2 District size. If I go 15 feet off the fence line from that pasture on the east side I would be up on top of my septic system tank. If I can get this variance it would allow me to put some size of accessory building that would not crowd the house or sit on the septic tank.

Gratton asks to have the septic and things pointed out on the map.

- Scott Temperly indicates the septic tank is to the rear of the house, septic field is to the north of the tank lid.

Diedrick asks what size the proposed building will be.

- Scott Temperly states that when I talked to Melissa, that is when I found out about the certain size, which is about 800 square feet; I wanted to do 30x40 which I know is not allowed. I will have to shrink it down to whatever I can get to use the rest of the allowed

meets code requirements for its construction and is not sized properly for a 3 bedroom house. There is very limited space for replacement which would be required before approval for guest accommodations leaving little to no room for expansion or replacement in the future.

- Access Considerations: There is an existing entrance at the western end of Cottonwood Court. The sight distance is adequate since it is at the end of the road.
- Other Considerations: The property is located in Apple Canyon Lake and was constructed in 2001. Per the application and exhibit, this variance request applies to the location of the home itself. Guest Accommodations zoning requires a fifteen (15) foot setback for this three (3) bedroom house. The parcel to the east is zoned RP. The abutting parcel on most of the remaining three sides is also zoned RP and owned by the ACL Property Owners Association.

Eric indicates we did have a couple inquires and may have public here tonight to speak.

Huschitt asks what is owned by ACL.

- Eric indicates the side and toward the lake.

Mapes asks about the septic and was indicated it is only sized for 2 bedrooms.

- Eric indicates to meet Guest Accommodations requirement it will need to be enlarged. It is tight on the property for expansion per the Health Department exhibit.

Huschitt asks if the variance is approved the septic will still need to be done

- Eric indicates the Guest Accommodations Zoning requires appropriate septic and will have to be addressed before the Zoning Certificate can be issued.

Gratton asks if we can have contour lines on the map. This is a relatively steep property.

- Eric states that I don't know if I can do that, I have not done that before. In the rear, this is a terraced area; there is a walking path around the side and down to the boat launch. There are walkable areas in the terraced back yard, so the house is significantly elevated from the lake.

Aleks Dabrowski, contract purchaser

- I would like to purchase for vacation purposes for our family. We knew it would come close along the garage line, it is actually 9.9 feet. This would be the garage area, then if you follow the wall all the way to the end there is a sunroom and the closest interior house space is the kitchen and right at the kitchen this is about 14 feet from the side property line, and the sunroom is about 15 feet from the side property line. We are looking to do some Guest Accommodations, more as a personal use, but do need to offset some of the costs. We have gotten quotes on the septic through Sproule, they did come out there and looked at it, we know we have to do the septic if we get through this hurdle first.

Gratton asks if we can indicate where the septic is located.

- Eric shows the septic drawing from the Health Department.

Mapes asks if there are ample parking requirements.

- Eric states there should be enough for the requirements.

Public Testimony

Steve McIntyre, Apple Canyon Lake

- The access to the public boat dock is via end of roadway into the greenspace.

Public Testimony Closed

Gratton indicates we usually see the greenspace on the side of the variance, but this is not, might be a little more problematic.

Diedrick indicates that the encroachment or area of variance is for the garage portion of the house versus the home, this makes it a little easier to review versus a habitable space that would be close to the adjacent property.

Gratton states the activity area is to the rear for both this house and the neighboring.

Eric indicates although I have not received a formal application, subject to this variance request I did not observe any potential additional requirements that would need to be adhered to, only the septic requirements.

Gratton states we see these often and most often trying to see what precedence we have set. This side might be more problematic than if was on the other side. The house seems that it was pushed to the southeast side, not sure it even meets the building setback requirements for construction. The setback should have been at least 10 feet. The other issue with Apple Canyon Lake is that we have small lots and larger houses. The reason for setback is to provide buffer for activities so you do not encroach upon neighbors any more than you have to, the larger number bedrooms the larger of a setback. Fifteen feet seems to be a minimal requirement for a three bedroom home.

Huschitt states that it may not be as easy as others we have seen, but to Gary's point, it is close because half of the home is clear of the setback as we speak, this is public space already to the rear owned by ACL. I am comfortable with the request.

Gratton states that I agree with you, my concern is when we move forward if it is similar, but how do we want to approach that, we are on a fine line on these, GA have been problematic for setbacks from day one, I think our ordinance gives some conservative setbacks.

- Eric indicates that I look at the activity area and I can require additional vegetation to be places as a screening mechanism. With this a solid wall, none of this required additional screening to maintain the GA license requirements. The unique nature of this property is relevant in my opinion.

Gratton asks how the house next door is being utilized.

- Steve McIntyre indicates the home was just sold this year and they use it for their own vacation home.
- Eric indicates this was the home that blew up.

Mapes asks if we have had any this close.

- Gratton indicates we probably have with distance, but thought the distance beyond on the adjacent property was greater.

Huschitt asks the topography of the property on the side.

- Eric indicates the side is fairly level going towards the back, then you terrace down to the lake.

Diedrick states that with having access to the boat dock and public area usage I think you may see activity area there which is beyond our scope and the back yard being tiered, I don't see that being utilized a lot. If we go back to it is the corner of the garage, the bedroom spaces are on the opposite side of the house other than the kitchen area, I see this as being something that could accommodate a Guest Accommodation usage.

Tranel agrees with Gary, I think the activity area will be on the other side of the variance request

side.

Gratton indicates what this could do to our ordinance going forward, do we need to have setbacks if we continually grant variances or do we throw variances out and forget about them.

Standards for variance reviewed 1 –true, ok; 2 – yes, unique; 3 – true; 4 – true; 5 – true; 6 – ok no issue; 7- true

Mapes is still concerned with the situation and not having greenspace to that side.

Eric states that the adjoining property owner did reach out to me today to get more information; I thought she might be here, but no objection was provided to me on the phone.

A motion was made by Tranel to approve the variance request as presented from the required 15 feet to nine point nine (9.9) feet for the existing home, a five point one (5.1) foot variation, to allow for Guest Accommodations use stating the following:

1. Standards for variance are reviewed and met

Seconded by Diedrick

Roll Call:	Ron Mapes – Nay	Nick Tranel – Aye
	Gary Diedrick – Aye	Peter Huschitt – Aye
	Mel Gratton – Nay	

Larry Aschebrook and Briseis Aschebrook-Kilfoy (269 S Irish Hollow Road, Galena IL 61036) owners, and Allen Trebian (3379 S Girot Road, Hanover, IL 61041) petitioner, has petitioned for a Variance from the proportional value standards as established in Title 8, Chapter 5, Article B, Section 8-5B-48; Lot Configuration. Requesting a variance from the required value of one point four (1.40) to one point four two (1.42); a variation in value of zero point zero two (0.02) to allow for separation of an existing residence in the AG Agricultural District. Commonly known as 269 S Irish Hollow Road, Galena, IL

Staff

- Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan does not address Variances, but does recognize the importance of agriculture as one of greatest assets of the county and farmer. Agriculture relies on the preservation and protection of farmland for a successful future.
- Wastewater Treatment: There is a septic system serving the house on this property that was installed in April 2014 and sized for 3 bedrooms. There is a second system installed to serve a bathroom in a machine shed. This system was installed in December 2017. A new well was drilled on the property in 2013. The variance request should not affect these systems.
- Access Considerations: There are at least 4 different entrances serving the parcel from Rice Township maintained Irish Hollow Road. These entrances have varying degrees of limited sight distance in both directions. Generally speaking, I would consider the design speed of these entrances to be 30 mph.
- Other Considerations: This property consists of two parcels, bisected by S Irish Hollow Road in Rice Township created in July, 2012. No paperwork or survey was submitted to the department for review with compliance for a split of the residence in the AG district. Staff received a permit application for placement of

solar panels on the 16 acre parcel on the east side of Irish Hollow. In reviewing the permit, it was determined that the parcel in question did not meet lot configuration requirements that are necessary to approve an AG split. There was an option, presented to the applicant and owner, to take the entire acreage through the variance process, but each tract on either side of the road has its own legal description. There are only structures on the smaller parcel to the east of Irish Hollow. This is an effort by the property owner and petitioner to bring the parcel in to compliance. All surrounding parcels are zoned AG.

Eric states I did receive a few phone calls for clarification, but no objections were indicated to me.

Allen Trebian, petitioner

- We are trying to get a solar array in to the rear of the house.

Public Testimony

None

Public Testimony Closed

Gratton states that this is just outside the requirements for the lot configuration.

Diedrick indicates standards are met

Gratton asks if this is something that the office could handle.

- Eric indicates this is not specifically listed in the authorizations for administrative variances, could this have qualified, maybe, but it is not specifically listed. I will keep that in mind going forward.

A motion was made by Mapes to approve the variance from the required value of one point four (1.40) to one point four two (1.42); a variation in value of zero point zero two (0.02) to allow for the separation of an existing residence in the AG Agricultural District stating the following:

1. Standards for variance are met

Seconded by Huschitt

Roll Call:	Gary Diedrick – Aye	Peter Huschitt – Aye
	Mel Gratton – Aye	Ron Mapes – Aye
	Nick Tranel – Aye	

Richard & Bridget Zurcher (3027 W Veta Grande Road, Scales Mound IL 61075) owners, have petitioned for a Special Use Permit to allow for a retail greenhouse; also requested is a Variance from required nonagricultural accessory square footage allowance of 3,600 sq. ft. as established in Section 8-3A-4 B 2, Intensity of Use, to 7,700 sq. ft., a variance of 4,100 sq. ft., to allow for existing and future accessory structures. Also requested is a Variance from the hard surface parking requirement as established in Title 8, Chapter 4, Article D, Section 8-4D-6 B Off Street Parking Design and Maintenance to allow for a gravel parking surface. Property is located in the AG Agricultural District. Common Address: 3027 W Veta Grande Road, Scales Mound, IL

Staff

- Comprehensive Plan: In the Comprehensive Plan it is stated that the County is strongly supportive of commercial and industrial growth. It recognizes existing businesses for the contribution they have made to the local economy and the tax base over the years. Existing business and industry have the greatest likelihood of new job creation. The County is eager to support existing business and industry in their efforts to expand. The County will also work to retain businesses and industries as well as the jobs they provide. Additionally, the Comp Plan would indicate this area of use as containing approximately 19.7% as not prime farmland, and 80.2% as farmland of statewide importance.
- Wastewater Treatment: There is no permit on file for a septic system on this property. Any new structures with plumbing would require a soil investigation and installation of a new septic system. Any existing system would need to be located and inspected before it would be approved for use. Yearly water sampling is recommended for any facility served by a well that is accessed by the public.
- Access Considerations: There is an existing entrance onto Scales Mound Township maintained Veta Grande Road with adequate sight distance.
- Other Considerations: This property is located south of W Veta Grand Road and west of N Elizabeth Scales Mound Road, approximately 1.6 miles northwest of Scales Mound. The property was acquired by the owner/applicant in 2009 following zoning action to separate the existing residence from a larger lot and create a one lot subdivision. A variance was granted for road frontage. The applicant applied for and received a permit for an agricultural accessory structure at the end of March, 2019. In early April, the department was informed that work was being conducted to add plumbing for a restroom to support visitors to the commercial greenhouse which was not included on the plans reviewed for issuing the initial permit. A stop work order was issued to allow for corrective zoning action.
- A greenhouse, nursery is defined as: An establishment where flowers, trees, seeds, plants, plant stock and other products that are commonly used for landscaping and gardening are grown and sold (8-7-2).
- There is no record of a Special Use for the Greenhouse on file. A greenhouse/nursery, as defined, is allowable in the AG district subject to Special Use approval and the follow standards (8-5B-14):
 - A. Within the agricultural district, a minimum of sixty percent (60%) of the plant materials and garden crops that are for sale shall be grown on the property.
 - B. Greenhouses and nurseries shall not be located within one hundred fifty feet (150') of an existing residentially zoned district boundary line, or residential dwelling.
 - C. Within the conservation district, retail sales are not permitted. (Ord. 2009-3, 5-12-2009)
- The retail business operation is seasonal from approximately April through June. All surrounding parcels are zoned AG.
- LESA: The Land Evaluation score on this property is 59.24 (below the County average), with an overall LESA score of 194.24. Some of the Site Assessment factors contributing to the overall score were the percent of AG land adjacent (max pts, 25), the commitment to AG adjacent (5/25 pts) and the size of the parent parcel (0/15 pts). Additionally contributing factors were distance from community services (max 15 pts), availability of water/sewer utilities (both max 10 pts) and consistency with the Comp Plan (10/20 pts).

Eric indicates no additional comments were received.

Bridget Zurcher, owner

- This piece of property is in the center of my parent's property, it is just a mile from their farm where I grew up and they continue to farm. I want to very much be a part of that. In 2015, Janie Stadel had a greenhouse in Schapville and she wanted to retire, she reached out to me to see if I wanted to take over the business and so that is where it all started. We tore down the greenhouse and moved it to our place. We have been operating for the last 5 years. I was unaware of the special use permit necessary to do so. I have the retail greenhouse, it is one building that I allow customers in to purchase the plants, I grow everything there myself. I am really only open April, May and June. Occasionally I have people come out during the summer, but only by appointment only. I also have produce and cut flowers and along with that I have a produce subscription, for the last 2 years I have served 50 Jo Daviess County residents produce for 16 weeks during the summer. To do that I have to have a wide range of produce so I have high tunnel buildings, they are basically structures that are plastic framed metal buildings I grow the produce in the ground, no electricity, so I can extend the season by starting earlier and I can go later into the season providing local people with produce. Small greenhouse on the property as well.

Huschitt asks for the produce portion do those customers come to the property to pick it up or is it delivery.

- Bridget indicates it is actually both. I deliver to neighboring towns where they meet me and a few people come to the property.

Gratton states that will all the structures you need a variance of 4,100 square feet.

- Bridget indicates that I also included a packing shed that I was going to do for my produce and also have proper space to wash and store my produce. The 900 square feet was to be off the front of the existing greenhouse building, right now I just have a small corner in the greenhouse for cash register, in there it is humid, sunny and a struggle, I would like to build an area off the front for placement of the cash register area to have under shade cover.
- Eric indicates the numbers on the paper were from me figuring the area.
- Bridget indicates that because of the retail square footage requirement for parking, I would need 12 parking spaces that are paved. I know two were out to see the place you will notice it is a farm, allowing for paved parking probably would take away from part of that, it is not a level farm, it is on a hill, that is part of the charm, and when customers come out they love it is unique country farm. They see cattle, chickens and ask farming in Jo Daviess County.

Gratton states that the retail aspect is what triggers the special use. The growing is all Ag, but the retail is what triggers.

Diedrick asks about the trailer on the property was located, is that the location of future building.

- Bridget states that if we move forward with building it that was the plan.

Huschitt asks if there were any calls on this request.

- Eric indicates no. Technically mom and dad are the surrounding neighbors.
- Bridget states yes they are technically my only neighbors and I think my biggest supporters.

Public Testimony

Elizabeth Walters, neighbor

- We think this is a good thing. They have been good neighbors, they help, she does have a long lane and helps maintain the lane. Put 19 loads of gravel on the road. They both enjoy maintaining. As far as it being and staying agriculture it teaches a lot of people, but still has the retail aspect.

Public Testimony Closed

Mapes indicates no issues with the special use.

Gratton states that this can be more than retail sales; this is a unique setting for people. The volume of business being done here is not creating a ton of issues, it kind of borders with agri-tourism.

Standards for special use reviewed 1 –true; 2 – not an issue; 3 – will not; 4 – yes; 5 – true; 6 – yes

A motion was made by Diedrick to approve the Special Use Permit to allow for a retail greenhouse stating the following:

1. Standards for Special Use reviewed and are met

Seconded by Huschitt

Roll Call:	Mel Gratton – Aye	Ron Mapes – Aye
	Nick Tranel – Aye	Gary Diedrick – Aye
	Peter Huschitt – Aye	

Accessory area square footage

Huschitt indicates if this was at a different location I may have more questions, but in this situation it is a mile off the road and it is part of an existing family farm. Location, occupancy, and intended use I don't see an issue.

Everyone agrees

Standards for variance have been discussed and met

A motion was made by Huschitt to approve the variance from required nonagricultural accessory square footage allowance of 3,600 sq. ft. as established in Section 8-3A-4 B 2, Intensity of Use, to 7,700 sq. ft., a variance of 4,100 sq. ft., to allow for existing and future accessory structures stating the following:

1. Standards for variance are met

Seconded by Mapes

Roll Call:	Peter Huschitt – Aye	Mel Gratton – Aye
	Ron Mapes – Aye	Nick Tranel – Aye
	Gary Diedrick – Aye	

Parking surface

availability of water/sewer utilities (both 8/10 pts) and the parcel is within the 1.5 mile planning area of the Village of Stockton (10/20 pts). There is a pond of approximately 2.3 acres that encompasses 11.1% of the parcel. This score is based on most of the former golf course being designated as non-agricultural. Because the sale occurred during this calendar year it has not been in agricultural production long enough to be reclassified. If recalculated using an agricultural designation for the former golf course, the score rises to 178.6 because the percent of agricultural land adjacent is higher.

Steve Keeffer states the entrance has been there for 50 years, I don't believe there has been an issue, but site distance is dicey to the north. They want a garage attached to the house and the entrance should be up there at the knob in the road. This would be safer.

Eric indicates no inquiries from the public have been received.

Lyle Eaton, petitioner

- Eric stated everything very well. The remainder of the golf course is all turned into agricultural which I think is a plus, preserve farmland. This corner of the former golf course would be a good purpose for a home because I don't know what it would be used for. The potential buyers would like to keep the buildings that are the old golf cart buildings, I don't think it is a make it or break it thing, but they are already there for use. The site distance issue, they are willing to move the driveway entrance. Rebecca Cahill indicates that we are already planning for that.

Mapes indicates that they have proposed moving the entrance, but never was moved.

Gratton states that the use before was probably at a more intensity than what it will now be used for.

Public Testimony

Neill & Rebecca Cahill, potential buyers

- We want to make this our primary residence, add a garage to the northwest corner. The driveway will be up top. Really no plans for the buildings, but one is halfway heated and would like to use that as a storage shop. The rest we just don't want to tear them down, I would like to live another 50 years and collect stuff.

Public Testimony Closed

Gratton states that we have 20 acres here.

Eric indicates from the discussion and comments I would recommend considering adding a condition of the special use to relocate the driveway to a more accessible location.

- Neill Cahill asks if there would be a problem with keeping the existing entrance to access those buildings.
- Eric asks what the intent of the parking lot area is.
- Neill Cahill indicates eventually we would like to rip it up, but would be nice to have the lower end to enter instead of coming up top and having to go around the house.
- Eric indicates that is us to you with the change in use here, if that would be appropriate.
- Huschitt states that I view this as repurposing it as is, it has been a golf course for so many years, I would leave it up to the new owners to put the driveway up top if they so choose to. I am concerned that we make the motion that we say they have to do that and

then the township has a concern or it doesn't come to be. If we say the lower driveway has to be removed, knowing that property and it being there for so long, I would not be in favor of stating the lower driveway needs to be removed. If this was a new business with more traffic, I would feel differently, we are repurposing this to a single family home.

- Gratton states that if I owned that property I would want to keep the lower entrance to access those building, it is existing and see no issue with leaving it.
- Mapes states that I don't think to include with motion, it is up to the road commissioner and owner.
- Diedrick states they will need to go to township road commissioner if they want to install a new driveway anyways.

Mapes asks about the proposed garage area if that was included in the numbers

- Eric indicates it was included in the numbers

Standards for special use reviewed and met

A motion was made by Huschitt to recommend approval of the Special Use request for a non-ag home on a lot less than 40 acres stating the following:

1. Standards for Special Use are met

Seconded by Mapes

Roll Call:	Ron Mapes – Aye	Nick Tranel – Aye
	Gary Diedrick – Aye	Peter Huschitt – Aye
	Mel Gratton – Aye	

Accessory area square footage

Gratton states that we have existing building and in reasonably good condition and enhance the property, I don't think it makes sense to tear them down. This is a large parcel.

Mapes asks if they want to do a storage business

- Eric indicates it would be a different zoning request

Standards for variance have been discussed and met

A motion was made by Diedrick to approve the variance from the required nonagricultural accessory square footage allowance of 3,600 sq. ft. as established in Section 8-3A-4 B 2, Intensity of Use, to 11,484 sq. ft., a variance of 7,884 sq. ft., to allow for multiple existing accessory structures, as well as the addition of an attached garage stating the following:

1. Standards for variance reviewed and are met

Seconded by Tranel

Roll Call:	Gary Diedrick – Aye	Peter Huschitt – Aye
	Mel Gratton – Aye	Ron Mapes – Aye
	Nick Tranel – Aye	

Reports and Comments:

Tranel made a motion to adjourn at 8:50 PM. Diedrick seconded. Voice Vote: All Ayes