

MINUTES - PLANNING COMMISSION/BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2011, 7:00 P.M., COMMISSIONER ROOMS, LYON COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER, MARSHALL, MINNESOTA

MEMBERS PRESENT: Nassif, Buesing, Vroman, Thooft, Ritter, Anderson, Zimmer and Biren

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ludeman (excused)

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

IDENTIFY ANY CONFLICT OF INTEREST: Thooft – abstain on the Duane Louwagie item if there is a quorum.

AMEND/APPROVE AGENDA – Motion by Buesing, seconded the Thooft to approve agenda. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

CORRECT/APPROVE MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 11, 2011 MEETING – Motion by Thooft, seconded by Buesing to approve minutes as presented. All voted in favor. Motion carried.

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Continued Public Hearing – Conditional Use Permit for Rogge Excavating to establish a gravel/sand processing and washing operation. The property is zoned agricultural and is in the floodplain. Owner of the tract of land is Lawrence Rogge. The property is described as the North Half of the Southwest Quarter (N1/2SW1/4) and the Northwest Quarter (NW1/4) of Section Twenty (20) of Grandview Township. Lawrence Rogge was present. Biren – directed at last meeting to work with Assistant County Attorney Zimmer on conditions from concerns addressed at the last meeting. Copies of the language was sent to concerned parties. Two letters were received. Read letters from Regnier Family Farm and Attorney Stroup. Attached to the minutes are copies of the letters. Copies of easements I won't read. Board questions on proposed language? Understand easement issue? Board – yes. Vroman – know what changes made to CUP? Read stipulations. Buesing – GPS done on easements? Biren – no, that has not been done. Staff conversation has been 1) put road where suppose to be or 2) have 3 parties work together where it is existing and re-record easements. Stroup – abstractor pulled easements, written easement are confused, don't technically give an access all the way across section 19, repeat in description, written easements are wrong. Clearly a road out there, access that has been used. Written easements need to be redone and amended, correct legal recorded easement. Vroman – not straight with world. Agreeable to parties, when crop out surveyed and marked. Thooft – preference to keep road where it is, or to actually put one in there? Stroup – preference for my clients Fischers and VanLeeuwes is to reset it. It is at an angle, doesn't farm well, set wrong, reestablish a new description and reset road and straighten it out. Vroman –road not done according to easement. Stroup – shift it slightly to the south, description was a hit and miss description, no one went out and measured it. Done as a part of a series of land sales. Reset in a better location. Rogge – move it over, at their cost not mine because I am not asking to move road. If this wasn't going on right now, no one would be questioning moving the road or changing it. Leave it where it is at. Not at my cost. Move gravel whole thing not just part of it. Vroman – Tricia whose cost? Zimmer – puts us in a difficult position of dictating an agreement between two private parties. Stroup – current easements are silent on maintenance.

How do you issue CUP access is in confusion? Rogge – Their office did paperwork, Mark Christiansen lawyer. Thooft – haul road to get to gravel, markers so everyone knows. Easement where it is, mark road by easement that is out there or not part of what we do? Zimmer – I agree with John, two options. It would be better if parties involved agree to one of the options. As indicated, there is a road out there that has been used for years whether that road lines up with the technical legal description of the easement, obviously they don't but you have an established use. Argument that it can continue, also have argument that it should be per the legal description. Assuming that when the easement was granted and drafted by Mr. Stroup's office years ago, I don't know what valid consideration was paid for that. John should go through what the options are again. Biren – language on map was done by GIS department, 30' easement, described as 600' south and an area 30'. Fischer property and VanLeeuwe property, Rogge property. Can see existing road how it goes at an angle. Fair amount of gravel on part of it, other part more dirt. If the 3 parties can get along where this is currently, great. Issues with a curve at the end, if that came straighten on, may be safer. Some space between Rogge/VanLeeuwe to plant corn, separate properties. Condition that Kevin supplied #9, add, no problem with that. Not as a condition but in the minutes. Gladly meet with these 3 parties before the hauling season starts to look at the road. I don't think it is Rogge's intent to be in there for years and years, but who knows. Vroman – problem for us to grant CUP without easement used and in the right place, sooner or later there is going to be a problem. Whose expense? Biren – don't think I am hearing that. Difference of opinion from 3 land owners. Some live with the way it is, some minor modifications and some see it rebuilt all the way. Not make everyone happy. Rogge – leave as is, not my land going through, change it up to them, crop out get it straighten out and I will just use it then. Fischer – regardless, mine will need to be regravled. Renting Lawrence's family land for 5 years, completely taking the road out each year, no gravel on mine for whole ½ mile. I don't care if it is where that easement is existing would work if got a good legal description. Make sure we don't have any problems years down the road by right of adverse possession. Gravel ½ mile, not 30' wide where driving trucks, and maintained. Nassif – how much gravel would it take to leave easement there? Fischer – if moved south to where approach is, gravel on mine, catch ½ of Randy's. Move it where the existing driveway is now, Randy has a separation. Most common sense. Fischer – not a whole lot of extra gravel, straighten safety issue off entrance. Eric VanLeeuwe – easier to make proper marking. Fischer – get it squared with the world. New easement obvious, not a huge expense. Randy VanLeeuwe – okay with that. Zimmer – agree to utilize the existing road for the time, work amongst themselves to correct road as well as the easement issue. Fischer – after crops are out, figure out language. Thooft – parties get that straightened out, still should be marked, everyone knows where it is, documented right. Buesing – 30' easement and marked. Vroman – Rogge concerned about the expense of moving it, think it will be his responsibility. Randy VanLeeuwe – if we move it, ½ will be new dirt trying to compact for a road. Lawrence said 2-3 years before he would go back in there. That gives us grain haulers/farmers to get it halfway in shape. Black dirt gets wet, different type of a road bed. Dirt path, not used when wet, dry conditions. Vroman – fine now. How do we word this that everyone is satisfied? Zimmer – can we word it so that, may use the existing road until such time as the parties redraft the easement. Agree can use the existing road for now until the time comes when it is more appropriate to move it. As far as whose cost it is, sounds to me like, I don't know how we can assess the cost on that, better if the landowners come up with a plan. Sounds like the landowners stand to benefit from it straightened out as well. If they can come up with a plan with John help as far as that. Vroman - #8? Fischer – do when crops out, 6 weeks. Biren – suggest use the wording recorded easement. Nassif – you guys work it out. Who pays for it, attorney's job. You make decisions. We allow CUP. Buesing - addressed Stroup's added stipulation #9. Biren –

no problem adding that. Talking about easement, have that figured out in the minutes. Lawrence should not have to gravel and maintain it when Mark and Randy are hauling loads off it. But when Lawrence is hauling gravel he should. Vroman – maintain satisfaction of who, you? Not intent of it. Nassif – use John as referee. All parties. John says okay, if not done to satisfaction. Biren – play referee a lot. Best in health, safety and welfare I sure will go out there. Meet before hauling season starts to look at road with 3 property owners. See what they think. Reasonable people it works. Buesing – #14? Nassif – goes away if not followed. Gary Crowley – covered for township road he is hauling on also? Oversee that too John? Biren – road authority, township/county. New pit using county road. Thooft – nice to have a third party involved. Dobbins concern with drainage? Biren – got a copy of the DNR permit. Been out there with Lucas Youngsma, DNR, no problem, as far as water pumping. Showed pump location and area being drained, not cropped, flows over land, very rarely if ever gets to ditch, recycling water, weeds/vegetation. DNR permit is for old site, new site would need a new DNR permit, follow DNR policies. Randy VanLeeuwe – concern with wildlife affected? Biren – haven't heard that before. Rogge – pump down for a month, and it rose about 1 ½ feet in a month. No new water coming in there now. Gary Crowley – eventually that water will go into the drainage ditch, Grandview Improvement Drainage Ditch. Our feelings is that we cannot foresee a problem. But I think you have it covered in your language that he has to comply with any environment permits and in the event that we felt he was polluting the ditch, his permit could be pulled. What language do you have in there? Vroman - covered in original 12 & 13. Rogge –water permit we are going to get 10 calls a year, shut down each time. How are we going to control that? Biren – if I get a complaint on that, my first call is to you. See if you are running pump. If you are, I will go out and look at it. Get the same call 10 times, same person will be a cry wolf thing. Board reviewed Findings of Fact. Attached is a copy.

Nassif moved, seconded by Buesing to recommend to the Lyon County Board of Commissioners to grant a Conditional Use Permit to Rogge Excavating to establish a gravel/sand processing and washing operation. The property is zoned agricultural and is in the floodplain. Owner of the tract of land is Lawrence Rogge. The property is described as the North Half of the Southwest Quarter (N1/2 SW1/4) and the Northwest Quarter (NW1/4) of Section Twenty (20), Grandview Township.

With the following stipulations:

1. Conditional Use Permit will be reviewed at least annually or at such time the Zoning Administrator deems appropriate.
2. Conditional Use Permit is granted for 40 acres or the life of the operation whichever is less.
3. Top soil will be stockpiled and used for reclaiming and leveling.
4. Reclaiming and leveling of land is to be done as work progresses.
5. Grade site after extraction is completed so as to render it usable, seeding required avoiding erosion and an unsightly mar of the landscape.
6. Must maintain a backslope of 4:1 or flatter.
7. Permit holder is required to work with road authorities to address damage resulting from hauling if any. The road authority may notify the planning and zoning administrator if road damage is not addressed timely and adequately.
8. Location of recorded easements used for access must be verified by a Global Positioning System (GPS) and marked adequately. Marked adequately means placing a visible object such as a post or stake on the property lines and in areas where the line of sight is interrupted by an obstruction such as a hill.

9. Permit holder shall gravel and maintain to the satisfaction of the Zoning Administrator all easement roads used as ingress and egress for the property covered by this Conditional Use Permit.
10. Responsible for dust control on haul roads.
11. Haul roads designated as: 300th Street to County Road 5 or County Road 15. Responsible for maintenance on roads trucks will be hauling on.
12. Owner must notify the Lyon County Zoning Office when work is complete.
13. Must obtain permits from appropriate agencies. Permits may include but are not limited to water appropriation permits, public waters permits, and storm water permits.
14. Must comply with the Soil and Water Conservation District and DNR regulations.
15. A violation of any condition set forth in this conditional use permit may terminate the permit. If terminated the permit holder must reapply for a new conditional use permit before work in the gravel pit is to resume.
16. Adopt Findings of Fact as part of this motion.
17. A copy of the Lyon County Board of Commissioner's Motion shall be filed with the County Recorder's Office along with the legal description of the property. Additional fees to be paid by the applicant for the actual costs incurred by the county for the recording fees.

VOTING FOR: Nassif, Vroman, Buesing, Thooft

OPPOSED: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Ludeman

Motion carried.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS:

Public Hearing – Road Right-of-Way Variance request for Emil T. and Louise J. Goossens Revocable Living Trusts to construct a hayshed (50'x70') forty-two (42) feet from the road right-of-way of a township road. This is a fifty-eight (58) foot variance request. (Existing hayshed was damaged in a storm; met setback requirements; and was 50'x75'). The area representing the request is zoned agricultural. The property is described as the West half of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 NW1/4) of Section Twenty-six (26), Grandview Township. Vince Laleman and Gary Crowley were present. Biren – decisions made here final, findings of fact agree with all or deny. Showed maps of building site. Letter sent to City of Marshall, no response. Talked with Glenn Olsen, no concern. Existing hay shed damaged severely in July 1st storm. Emil Goossens would like to have it placed 75' from center line of road. 50'x70' hay shed. Building site close to township road. Sent a letter to Grandview Township. Sent it back agreed with no comments. No other phone calls on this. In line with existing shed. Let Gary talk on the logistics. Crowley – since 1979 lived there, past years have always had trouble with shed, sits out in open, west nothing to stop wind, 3rd time a lot of damage on shed. One of the reasons is the west doors, wind from west catches doors and blows them in. Come out of my yard there, going towards the old shed, drop in ground level, all the water drains there. Get wet, water flows in front of shed. By putting the shed the other way, can come out of there on high ground, and stay on the high ground and put an east door on shed, so facing east. Another problem is the snow. Having shed there help hold snow from west blowing in. I have silage piles stored from where the new shed will be erected and to the east. Good drainage from silage piles. Close access for electricity for the shed, come off of power from grain bins. Advantage get rid of west doors. Move shed towards the east, drops off quite a bit where it would take quite a bit of fill, where at right now take no fill, and it will drain away from shed, and lines up with other buildings. Nassif – tell me again why it won't work if it meet setback? Crowley – ground drops off

so much, a lot of fill, 4'-5'. Vince Laleman – tracks from the yard fall right to shed, bring water into shed. This way going up the hill and tracks are not feeding into shed.

Vroman – some way to make this variance less, place it needs to be. Nassif – any place else you could place shed? Crowley - look at my farm yard can say it is pretty full. Drains to the east, quite a bit of fall, best spot for it, east door. Vroman – snow concern, coming from the west. Laleman – entrance will be where the yard entrance is, other way clear 200' to get to shed. Buesing – variance for grain bin. Crowley – and machine shed, in line with machine shed, 75' center of road. Nassif – when did you build the other one? Crowley – 1988, other one built after that. Bin is closer to road than the buildings. Vroman – to replace a building to close to road still need a variance. Biren – that is a correct statement. Nassif – where the hayshed is now, if you just replaced it where it is now and maybe a little larger and put your doors on the east end? Laleman – shortest distance to yard to building, least amount of snow removal, no dirt haul in, water doesn't run into building. Crowley – behind the hay shed it slopes, where the old hayshed was. Thooft – township concern with snow? Oakland – no concerns. Vroman – board comments? None. Audience comments? None. Board reviewed Findings of Fact. Attached is a copy.

Vroman moved, seconded by Buesing to grant the following variance to Emil T. and Louise J. Goossens Revocable Living Trusts to construct a hayshed (50'x70') forty-two (42) feet from the road right-of-way of a township road. This is a fifty-eight (58) foot variance request. (Existing hayshed was damaged in a storm; met setback requirements; and was 50'x75'). The area representing the request is zoned agricultural. The property is described as the West half of the Northwest Quarter (W1/2 NW1/4) of Section Twenty-six (26), Grandview Township. With the following stipulations:

1. That if any of the work performed as allowed by the granting of this variance is ever impacted or required to be removed, the cost of such impact shall be borne by the landowner, including removal and/or relocation of property and facilities.
2. Must obtain a building permit prior to construction.
3. The purpose of which the variance was granted shall be undertaken by the applicant within 18 months of the granting of the variance. For good cause, the Zoning Administrator may grant an administrative extension of up to 12 months. Said extension shall be in writing. If the applicant fails to establish use of the variance within said time limits, the variance shall expire.
4. Adopt Findings of Fact as part of Motion.
5. A copy of this Motion shall be filed with the County Recorder's Office along with the legal description of the property. Additional fees to be paid by the applicant for the actual costs incurred by the county for the recording fees.

VOTING FOR: Vroman, Buesing, Thooft, Nassif

OPPOSED: None

ABSTAINED: None

ABSENT: Ludeman

Motion carried.

Public Hearing – Road Right-of-Way Variance request for Duane Louwagie to construct a machine shed (40'x100') twenty-five (25) feet from the road right-of-way of a township road. This is a seventy-five foot (75') variance request. The area representing the request is zoned agricultural. The property is described as the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter (SW1/4SW1/4) of Section Fourteen (14), Fairview Township. Duane Louwagie was present. Biren – showed photo of

building site. Commodity shed had a concrete foundation. Shed gone, foundation still there, fence gone. Louwagie – shed was gone, used for commodities, feeder wagon and loader, stored stuff. Keep wall there, 5' tall still use it as a commodity shed but not as a machine shed. Wind break fence damaged too, was an open lot. Wind cleaned area out. Was an open lot, water would run out. Do away with that part of it. Put a fence, utilize lot. Work cattle need place to go with them, keep lot. Cement on bottom would like to make machine shed on part of concrete. Vroman – leave space between the 5' wall and new shed. Louwagie – would like to be able to drive through area, to get out around to the east. Vroman – looked at it, understand why is doing what he is doing. Thooft – conflict of interest will abstain. Louwagie – don't know where else I would build, bins site off to the west, east of that is my silage pile. Upper part between two shed, bedding for cattle. Limited area. Building site was like this when we moved on there, congested. Vroman – cattle yard was almost to the road. Louwagie – yard close to where variance will be. Shed will be inside the feedlot. Biren – size of shed is 40'x100'. Vroman – questions from the Board? None. Biren - Read letter from Marlys Deutz. Attached to minutes is a copy of the letter. Vroman – township comments? Oakland- agreed with request, no comments. Nassif - other place to put shed? Louwagie – utilize concrete. Thomas Deutz – problem putting building that close, laws are in place to be followed. Asking for a little consistency. 2007 another meeting similar to this, denied a bin 54' from road. Right-of-way for planting crops is 33'. This building is going to be closer than what you can plant crops. There was no existing building where he is putting this on. Look to east of building site, plenty of room, need consistency of Board. To be in compliance with feedlot, I followed the rules, I built else where. Rules are for safety reasons, I understood that. Vroman – denied because of cattle yard. Biren - reciprocal setback for new houses from feedlots, ¼ mile, house same setback. Wasn't the case, house was going to be closer. Had to follow ordinance. Thomas Deutz – agree with other farmers, didn't go that step, made your point. June 12, 2007 meeting, want to see consistency of board. Nassif – had to deny it, had to be ¼ mile from feedlot setback, doesn't make any difference. Forced to put that in our ordinance by the State of Minnesota. Could not do it. Thomas Deutz – I have a copy of 6/12/07 meeting, public hearing for Vince Lanoue 46' right-of-way variance for a grain bin, denied. Nassif – is that a house? No. Thomas Deutz – is this a house? No. Nassif – so why are we talking about it? It seems to me that this is a case of you being angry because it was denied. It was not Louwagie's decision to deny it. It was ours. Joe Deutz – if they would not have come in here, he would have been able to build it. Neighbors stopped it. Vroman – stopped because it was too close to the feedlot. Joe Deutz – if they would have agreed to it, could have built. Biren – Board of Adjustments made decision, piece of information would have used in the decision making process. Don't know how that would have ended up. Louwagie – if there is a concern with distance, could but not ideally put at 60'. Vroman – then you wouldn't have that space. Louwagie – not exactly what I would want. Less space, an option. Thomas Deutz – why are these laws in place if we have to get a variance, move it closer? A lot of traffic on that gravel road. Snow comes from northwest. Example is when you go to Hanley Falls, storage system is close to Hwy 23 problem wind crossing, this setting same way. Township road east/west, don't see how the township cannot have a problem, more expense for them, 9 houses to east, more plowing. Vroman – they supported it. Vroman – other audience comments? Laleman – state influence of building house because state had rules on building feedlots, anything now about existing feedlot? Denied because had to be ¼ mile from feedlot. This is an existing feedlot, does that change anything? Biren – this is a machine shed. Laleman – feedlot there. Biren - he owns it, same owner. If Tom Deutz would have owned feedlot, he could have built wherever he wanted to, one home per 80 acres. Vroman – ordinance state statute ¼ mile. Thomas Deutz – state law and you have to go by that. Inconsistency, grain bin 46' from right-of-way of road, was denied and that was on a dead end road.

Building that is bigger than a grain bin and closer to the road. I don't understand why bin denied and machine shed approved, consistency. Nassif, Vroman and Buesing were on the board. Zimmer - I want to point out something. It is going to be changing again but our criteria with granting a variance has changed over the years based on court decisions. I wanted to point that difference out. In fact, by the time that we have our next meeting, because our ordinance is changing that was approved by the County Board and the effective date is two days from now. Our variance criteria are going to be slightly different again. Change that we had to make this time was due to state legislature. Previously we had changed it because of the Stadsvold case. Buesing – more in favor of the landowner. Zimmer – the magic words change, wording changed, practical difficulties/hardship, standards have changed a little bit too. Nassif – how are they changing? Zimmer – for next time, we have to go by this right now, ordinance that isn't effective yet. Vroman – part of reasons, we could not do what we want. Nassif – I would have loved to grant a variance for your house. We could not do it. Thomas Deutz – would like to get off that subject, it is done. This is not an existing building, snow problems, setbacks there for a reason. Board reviewed Findings of Fact. Attached is a copy. Comments: Biren – option to make it further away, Duane offered that. Vroman – show why he requested 75', get between other building and new shed. Nassif – had cattle a lot closer to road. Vroman – nothing in ordinance for that, cement any where you want. Biren – not in the shoreland. Farm site concrete any where on property, off right-of-way.

Vroman moved, seconded by Nassif to grant the following variance to Duane Louwagie to construct a machine shed (40'x100') twenty-five (25) feet from the road right-of-way of a township road. This is a seventy-five foot (75') variance request. The area representing the request is zoned agricultural. The property is described as the Southwest quarter of the Southwest quarter (SW1/4SW1/4) of Section Fourteen (14), Fairview Township. With the following stipulations:

1. That if any of the work performed as allowed by the granting of this variance is ever impacted or required to be removed, the cost of such impact shall be borne by the landowner, including removal and/or relocation of property and facilities.
2. Must obtain a building permit prior to construction.
3. The purpose of which the variance was granted shall be undertaken by the applicant within 18 months of the granting of the variance. For good cause, the Zoning Administrator may grant an administrative extension of up to 12 months. Said extension shall be in writing. If the applicant fails to establish use of the variance within said time limits, the variance shall expire.
4. Adopt Findings of Fact as part of Motion.
5. A copy of this Motion shall be filed with the County Recorder's Office along with the legal description of the property. Additional fees to be paid by the applicant for the actual costs incurred by the county for the recording fees.

VOTING FOR: Vroman, Nassif, Buesing

OPPOSED: None

ABSTAINED: Thooft

ABSENT: Ludeman

Motion carried.

PLANNING COMMISSION: None

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT/PUBLIC HEARING – MINNESOTA SESSION LAW 2000 – MINN. STAT. §116.07, SUBD. 7(I), FEEDLOT: None

RENEWAL - CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS – AUGUST 2010:

Philip Regnier – Daniel Stevens, Mobile Home, N1/2NE1/4, Section 20, Grandview Township. Issued August 1994 (3 years), renewed every 3 years. 2003 estate, extended yearly since then to have mobile home removed from property. July start enforcement, status. Biren – mobile home is gone. Recycled, demo site and some buried. Done.

RENEWAL/REVIEW – CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS – AUGUST:

Jody and Aurora Heard, Mobile Home, N1/2N1/2, Section 9, Vallers Township. Issued: August 2009, 2 years. Inspect. Move by October 1, 2011 (may request an extension if remodeling is not complete). Recorded. Biren – building site north on 59, mobile home moved out there but nothing ever got done, didn't remodel. Plans changed house on market. I don't have a time line, mobile home will be moved before house is sold.

RENEWAL/REVIEW – CONDITIONAL USE PERMITS – SEPTEMBER:

Mike and Rosann Schmitt, Business (Lawn Service), NE1/4SE1/4, Section 7, Lake Marshall Township. Issued: September 2001 (5 years, renewed in 2006). Recorded. Biren – south of Lanners private driveway off County Road 7, lawn mowing service, wouldn't know it is there. All equipment inside. Never had an issue with place. Motion by Nassif, seconded by Buesing to renew. All voted in favor. Absent – Ludeman. Motion carried.

DISCUSSION: Replacement of trees. Biren – with storm back in July, a lot of people replacing groves/partial groves, wind breaks. Having some troubles, we have a vegetative setback 60' from right-of-way. Don't issue building permit for trees, consider it a non-conforming use, existing grove too close to the road, as long as use doesn't change, we don't force them to change until there is road construction. Shoreland standards 50% of structure is destroyed, make them apply for a new permit, same in ag district. Struggling what to do with trees, some replacing a row, some one side. Not giving out building permits. Never liked setbacks for trees. Like the road authorities to have the power to trim them. Have to buy right-of-way, trees aren't worth a million dollars. My plans are if they are going to replace what was there, and not within the road right-of-way and branches aren't in the road right-of-way, not going to have an issue with it. Planting new windbreak, wildlife planting that will need to meet the setback. Around an existing building site, non-conforming use you are allowing to exist. Consensus of board okay. Crowley – township board can make people take trees out if causing a hazard, if in ditch or close to ditch area. Biren – wondering what your opinions are, few planted this fall, majority next spring, 20 or better. Some may be replacing 10-12 trees, or a couple rows others whole thing. Buesing – give them your best advice, common sense. Biren – treat them as a non-conforming use.

8:50 p.m. meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard Vroman, Chairman
Planning and Zoning/Board of Adjustments

Carol Oakland, Secretary
Planning and Zoning/Board of Adjustment