



Approved

MINUTES CITY OF DUBUQUE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT REGULAR SESSION

5:30 p.m.

Thursday, September 28, 2023
City Council Chambers, Historic Federal Building

Board Members Present: Chairperson Jonathan McCoy, Board Members Keith Ahlvin, Gwen Kosel, Rena Stierman, and Matt Mauss.

Board Members Excused: None.

Board Members Unexcused: None.

Staff Members Present: Wally Wernimont, Travis Schrobilgen, and Jason Duba

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chairperson McCoy at 5:30 p.m.

MINUTES: Motion by Kosel, seconded by Ahlvin, to approve the minutes of the August 24, 2023 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None; Abstain – Mauss.

DOCKET – 28-23: Application of Kevin Muehlenkamp, 2160 Golden Eagle Drive, to allow a pool shed and pool located 6' and 11' from the front property line, respectively, where 20' minimum is required in an R-1 Single Family Residential zoning district.

The applicant submitted a written request to table to a future meeting.

Motion by Ahlvin, seconded by Kosel, to table the request to a future meeting. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None.

DOCKET – 29-23: Application of Kathryn Moran, 1247 Timber Hyrst Court, to construct a 480 sq. ft. pool house and 624 sq. ft. pool where 1000 sq. ft. maximum is allowed in an R-3 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential zoning district.

Kathryn and Joel Moran, 1247 Timber Hyrst Court, spoke in favor of their request. They explained that the area is only slightly over the maximum for detached accessory structures, that they have a large $\frac{3}{4}$ acre lot, that they believe it will do no harm to property values, and that the setbacks are met. They stated that the neighbors have no concerns. They explained that the contractor was not aware that the pool was counted in the square footage for accessory structures.

There was no public input.

Staff Member Schrobilgen detailed the staff report noting the total area of detached accessory structures would be 1,104 square feet. He stated that the pool would be in the rear yard of a large property, and that it would meet all other Unified Development Code requirements. He noted that pools require a 4' fence with self-latching gate per building code. He shared one letter of support from neighbors at 2025 Creek Wood Drive.

Board Member Mauss asked for clarification that a pool counts as a detached accessory structure but not the concrete around it. Schrobilgen replied that Mauss is correct and added that pools 18" or deeper are considered detached accessory structures.

Motion by Mauss, seconded by Kosel, to approve the request as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None.

DOCKET – 30-23: Application of Terry Roussel, 2216 Windsor Avenue, to allow outdoor storage of two vehicles located 0' from side property lines where one vehicle is allowed and a minimum 3' side setback is required in an R-2A Alternate Two-Family Residential zoning district.

Terry Roussel, 2216 Windsor Avenue, spoke in favor of the request. He explained that a couple years ago he had trailers with gravel, and then he had to pour concrete to become code compliant with the Zoning Enforcement Officer. Now he's trying to become compliant for setbacks.

There was no public input.

Staff Member Duba detailed the staff report noting the characteristics of the property and surrounding neighborhood. He displayed imagery of the two vehicle storage areas in question. He expressed that allowing storage here should have a minimal impact on the surrounding area.

Board Member Ahlvin asked if there was a third storage area in the middle, and Duba replied that that area was not being used for storage, and it is not within the side setback. Staff clarified that properties are only allowed one vehicle to be stored outside and that the request included a second stored vehicle and that no additional vehicles could be stored.

Board Member Kosel asked if the applicant was operating a business. Mr. Roussel replied he was not operating a business. Chairperson McCoy asked if Mr. Roussel was okay with the condition that the property cannot be used for commercial purposes, and Mr. Roussel stated yes.

Motion by Mauss, seconded by Stierman, to approve the request with the following condition:

- 1) The existing garages cannot be used for commercial purposes.

Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None.

DOCKET – 31-23: Application of Kenneth Glick, 2505 Pennsylvania to construct a 10' x 12' detached storage shed for a total of 1,250 sq. ft. of detached accessory structures where 1,000 sq. ft. maximum is permitted in an R-1 Single-Family Residential zoning district.

Kenneth Glick, 2505 Pennsylvania, spoke in favor of the request. He noted that he had to change locations for the shed due to a hornet's nest, so he's requesting to put it where the hedge is. (he pointed the location out to staff).

Staff stated that the new location met the district required setbacks and does not affect the Special Exception request which is for the total area of detached accessory structures. Staff then shared the new proposed location of the shed with the Board Members and Staff identified the location of the shed for the members of the public in the audience.

Julie Bockenstedt, 2475 Cherry Street, noted that the new shed location is where snowplows put snow.

Staff Member Duba detailed the staff report noting the characteristics of the property and surrounding neighborhood. He noted the existing detached accessory structures and stated that the lot is large, 0.87 acres, and the addition of this shed should have minimal impact on neighbors as it meets setbacks.

The Board asked about the snowplow issue, and Planning Services Director Wally Wernimont noted that the Public Works Department handles snow removal, and that they would require an easement in order to place snow on someone's private property. He said he believes the snow is being pushed to the end of Cherry Street, out of the drive lane but within the public right of way and picked up later by snow crews.

Motion by Mauss, seconded by Kosel, to approve the request as submitted. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None.

DOCKET – 32-23: Application of Bryan Ortiz, 2775 Andrew Court to construct a 30' x 36' detached garage for a total of 1,080 sq. ft. of detached accessory structures where 1,000 sq. ft. maximum is permitted in an R-1 Single-Family Residential zoning district.

Bryan Ortiz, 2775 Andrew Court, spoke in favor of the request. He explained that he's looking to build a garage in the back to store a couple of older cars. He noted that it would be just 80 square feet over the limit.

Chairperson McCoy asked if the applicant was okay with the condition to prohibit commercial activity, and Mr. Ortiz confirmed he would be amenable to that condition.

There was no public input.

Staff Member Schrobilgen detailed the staff report noting that the property was large, that the garage would be 80 square feet over the maximum area permitted by code, and that it would meet setback and the height requirements. He noted the applicant has already poured the required hard surface driveway.

The Board had no questions or concerns.

Motion by Mauss, seconded by Stierman, to approve the request with the following condition:

1. The garage cannot be used for commercial purposes.

Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None.

DOCKET – 33-23: Application of Julie Rolling, 3040 Arbor Oaks to construct a 6' high fence in the required front yard where 4' high maximum is allowed in an R-1 Single-Family Residential zoning district.

Julie Rolling and Christopher Lee, 3040 Arbor Oaks Drive, spoke in favor of the request. They explained that they installed a 6' privacy fence in their front yard because they have three front yards, which limits them.

Cary Reish 2990 Arbor Oaks Court, spoke in opposition but acknowledged that it's a unique property. He stated the fence impedes the view down Arbor Oaks Drive. He noted lots of kids like to play in the area, so he feels it's a safety concern.

Chairperson McCoy referred to the letter of opposition submitted from Sandi Welsh, 3035 Arbor Oaks Drive, which cited similar concerns to Mr. Reish.

Staff Member Duba detailed the staff report noting the characteristics of the property and surrounding neighborhood. He stated this case is coming from a code violation and neighborhood complaint. He described the unique feature of this property having frontages on three sides, thereby limiting the height of privacy fencing. He noted the visibility impacts created by the fence and stated that Traffic Engineer Justine Hull observed the fence and determined that it is not a safety issue and has substantial intersection sight distance at the Arbor Oaks Court intersection.

Chairperson McCoy asked the applicants if whether a middle ground could be reached considering the safety and visibility concerns expressed.

Mr. Lee asked if they could erect a retaining wall and put a 4' fence on top of that? The Board asked staff for clarification. Staff Member Schrobilgen replied that the height of a fence is measured from the established grade and that the grade could be modified in this case. He confirmed that the applicant could construct a retaining wall and then place a 4' fence on top, by right.

McCoy stated that it doesn't change the conditions of the safety issue. Ms. Rolling replied that they considered safety when putting the fence up, and they don't believe there's an issue with visibility. She expressed that they've observed a slowdown in traffic speeds. She noted that they're open to considering lowering the fence.

Board Member Ahlvin expressed concerns about traffic and that the fence is not in keeping with the character of other properties in the area.

Board Member Kosel asked about the visibility triangle and whether this fence blocks it. Staff Member Duba replied that the visibility triangle applies at the intersection of two streets, but this fence is along one street. Planning Services Director Wernimont reiterated that the traffic engineer stated the fence was not a safety issue, but the Board has options and could apply any reasonable conditions to mitigate any concerns.

Board Member Stierman expressed interest in moving the fence but she was not sure where.

Board Member Mauss referred to the visibility triangle, and asked whether the applicant would be open to chopping a corner off the fence at a 45-degree angle. Ms. Rolling stated that she was not opposed to this but didn't see how it would change visibility along the street. Mauss noted that the neighbor, Mr. Reish, expressed approval of this idea. Mauss specified that it could be one post in from the corner in each direction. Stierman agreed with this proposal and said it would allow the applicant to keep the 6' height. Mauss further specified that the fence be moved back one post, about 8', from the corner in each direction. Ms. Rolling stated that they were okay with this proposal.

Motion by McCoy, seconded by Mauss, to approve the request with the following conditions:

1. The fence shall be shortened at the southeast corner by 8' in each direction to create a 45-degree chamfer.

Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None.

DOCKET – 34-23: Application of Roy D. Olds, 2053 Jackson Street to construct a 6' x 12' storage shed 0' from the side property line where 3' is required and to have 8% greenspace where 20% minimum is required in an R-2A Alternate Two-Family Residential zoning district.

Roy D. Olds, 2053 Jackson Street, spoke in favor of the request. He explained that he wrote a statement explaining his proposal. He said he's planning to pave part of the backyard, and he's seeking permission for the 6' x 12' shed to go on the pad about 1' from the north property line. He described the privacy fence he's planning to install, the views of the area, the portions to remain grass covered, his lack of greenspace, and the general size constraints on the property. He expressed that this shed is a need for him to be able to store things, such as gas cans, outside of his home. He stated that he

discussed his plans with his neighbors, and they had no problems with it, and he submitted a petition of support from them.

There was no other public input.

Staff Member Schrobilgen detailed the staff report noting that most of his planned improvements are allowed by right. He noted the shed would be closer to the north property line, at approximately 6", and that the new concrete takes the greenspace down to 8%. He said the greenspace was intended to manage any stormwater and that the site is approximately 1,700 sq. ft.

Chairperson McCoy asked if the applicant would be okay with the condition that runoff be managed on the subject property. Mr. Olds stated that yes, he intended to have the runoff piped into the greenspace.

Motion by Mauss, seconded by Kosel, to approve the request with the following condition:

1. Runoff from the shed shall be managed on the subject property.

Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None.

DOCKET – 35-23: Application of William R. Biver, St. Mary's Inn Maternity Home, 1749 Churchill Drive to allow a Group Home as a conditional use in an R-3c Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential with conditions zoning district.

William Biver, 1320 Oeth Court, spoke in favor of the request. He noted that Director Pasnick was joining by phone. Mr. Biver reviewed the previous steps in the process including the September 6th Zoning Advisory Commission vote 3-2 to recommend approval of the rezoning request and the September 18th City Council vote 7-0 to approve the rezoning request. He noted that by way of courtesy to neighborhood, they held two public meetings, but there's still considerable opposition.

Mr. Biver discussed the classification as a group home is defined by purpose and occupancy. He referred to the letter they submitted, which commented on the eight criteria for a conditional use permit and said that he'd like to highlight some points about each criterion:

- Regarding criteria A, he stated that the staff report supports the fact that the property meets the qualifications for occupancy, and they're a maternity home but group home by definition. They've been in operation for eight years and had no complaints, the residents are vetted, and they are not fleeing domestic violence.
- Regarding criteria B, he stated they have adequate facilities for residential living, serving a maximum of four women with babies. He stated the size of the home is suited to this use, and they will address any building needs. He stated the carriage house will be modified internally for administrative purposes.

- Regarding criteria C, he stated the present home on Balboa Drive has not generated excess traffic, and this home is not anticipated to generate more traffic than a single-family home.
- Regarding criteria D, he stated that Mary's Inn will comply with all laws and building codes and fire codes.
- Regarding criteria E, he stated they have no plans to make lighting changes and can modify any existing lighting that is not conducive.
- Regarding criteria F, he stated the use will have low impact, there are strict house rules, they will not disrupt the neighborhood, and they hope to be positive neighbors.
- Regarding criteria G, he stated that nothing will be developed out of character for a residential home.
- Regarding criteria H, he stated the Balboa property increased in value and is now valued at \$304,900. They plan to make improvements to the property and preserve greenspace.

He concluded by stating that in 2015 they ZBA granted a Conditional Use Permit for 2750 Balboa, and this request is similar, just in a new location. He expressed that they would satisfy the Conditional Use Permit criteria.

Chairperson McCoy opened the public input portion and reminded attendees to discuss the Conditional Use Permit only, to state concurrence with previous speakers if you agree, and to follow the 3-minute time limit.

Christy Weisler, 505 Chestnut Trail, Mary's Inn Program Supervisor, expressed support for the applicant and stated that all staff are trained in CPR, trauma, mental health, and first aid. She noted that their residents are vetted.

Mary Kay Mueller, Mary's Inn House Supervisor, expressed support for the applicant and stated that they are neighborly and shared a story of how they helped a neighbor who had fallen. She expressed an interest in sharing mutual blessings with the neighborhood.

Carol Letcher, 1040 Carmel Drive, expressed support for the applicant and stated that she'd lived at 1749 Churchill when it was the first home in neighborhood. She expressed that this would be a perfect home for these young women and would help them return to a normal life. She noted that there is a nearby group home, and no one complained.

Coral Ayers, 2354 1/2 White Street, expressed support for the applicant and stated that she lived at Mary's Inn. She described aspects of living at the house including the curfew, light traffic, most residents don't have cars or visitors, 5:00 p.m. dinners, the need to obtain a job, children at daycare, doing chores and yard work, and celebrating holidays

like Christmas and Halloween.

Marlene Habel, 1285 Cortez Drive, expressed support for the applicant and stated that she lives near the Balboa house. She said that her house is noisier than Mary's Inn. She stated that she volunteers there, it has been a positive experience, the house is run well, and there are not many cars.

Matt Selby, 1815 Eden Lane, with his wife, expressed support for the applicant and stated that concerns are inapplicable or have been addressed. He expressed that property values, safety, and traffic are not a concern. He stated his children play here and these women would provide motherly eyes. He expressed favor for their vetting process, curfew, and trustworthy leaders. He noted that the City Council echoed this sentiment. He said he toured the current residence and found nothing to oppose.

Marty McNamer, 1800 Manson Road, expressed support for the applicant and stated that he has 40 years as a developer and believes that Mary's Inn has caused no depreciation of property values near their Balboa house. He stated that his developments have single-family and multi-family housing together. He expressed that Mary's Inn is capable of doing this, and he's familiar with this neighborhood.

Travis Kirby, 16703 Forest Gate Road, expressed support for the applicant and stated that he's been a realtor for 20 years. He stated that he's heard concern about property values, so he ran a list of comparable sales in the city of Dubuque and on Balboa. He concluded that homes sold on Balboa have received slightly more compared to their asking price and spent fewer days on the market. He stated there is no statistical proof of adverse effect on values.

Brian Kane, Attorney, 2100 Asbury, Suite 2, representing John & Ann Riley, 1733 Eden Lane, expressed opposition to the application, referred to his letter, and stated that this proceeding is about the Conditional Use Permit, not about the mission of the organization; it's about law, and the Supreme Court says to look at incompatible uses. He stated that granting a CUP has to meet all criteria in the Unified Development Code (UDC), and they have issue with C, F, H, and G, and he mentioned traffic and narrow streets.

Steven Juergens, 1805 Eden Lane, expressed opposition to the rezoning and Conditional Use Permit, stating the focus should be on other neighbors. He noted there is R-1 zoning and single-family residences all around. He referred to covenants that required single-family use. He expressed that zoning and uses shouldn't change unless there's a change in the area, but the only change is the applicant wants to relocate his business. He noted a 2010 application for an accessory dwelling unit was denied.

Patty Lassance, 1732 Churchill Road, read an opposition letter from Julie Fuller, 1780 Eden Lane. She expressed favor for the quiet residential, single-family neighborhood, and referred to a covenant for single-family use that should be preserved. She expressed that this is spot zoning, and this doesn't appear to be a group home such as the ARC nearby. She opposed the turnover this house could have with 4 women at a time, staying

about 3 months, so Mary's Inn could have 12 women per year.

Alicia Rasmussen, 911 West Locust Street, expressed support for the applicant and stated that she lived in Mary's Inn for 3 months and it was just her at that time. She expressed that all the roads in Dubuque are narrow. She stated that the house is not loud, that a baby crying is the loudest thing. She expressed that Mary's Inn would be a good neighbor.

Susan Hughes, 2700 Arbor Hills Drive, expressed support for the applicant and stated that she and her husband are both volunteers with Mary's Inn, he mows the lawn, and she babysits and gives rides. She has observed little traffic. She expressed that she understands that people are concerned with what they don't know, but Mary's Inn is not a corporation, it's the only maternity home in eastern Iowa, it's a loving place that teaches family and parenthood at critical time in the women's lives. She expressed that Dubuque is a welcoming community.

John Robbins, 1741 Eden Lane, expressed support for the applicant and stated he lives across the street from the home. He expressed that Mary's Inn should be welcomed in this inclusive All-America City, and that it would be mutually enriching for the neighborhood and the women in the home. He expressed trust in Mary's Inn's leaders and stated that he visited the Balboa house, and Mary's Inn has listened to neighbors' concerns and provided responses.

Melissa Claussen, 2979 Pennsylvania Avenue, expressed opposition, and stated we're not monsters. She expressed that a maternity home is not a group home, and they're not a licensed group home, and state law says a non-ambulatory person, such as a baby, can't be on the second floor of a group home. She expressed that the 2015 Conditional Use Permit should not be cited as reason to grant this as a group home. She stated that a home with transient residents doesn't need inspection.

Chris Motto, 1765 Eden Lane, expressed opposition and noted that many opinions are from people who don't live in the area. She opposed the rezoning and expressed that it sets a precedent for additional rezoning. She expressed a desire to keep this area strictly residential.

Chairperson McCoy noted that several concerns were brought up and asked the applicant's rebuttal to address the criteria for granting a conditional use permit.

Arthur Gilloon, attorney, provided the applicant's rebuttal. He expressed that the neighbors in this area have an eight-year resume from Mary's Inn's tenure on Balboa. He noted that most neighbors are fine with the proposal, and the majority of those within 200' had no objections. He stated no one from Balboa has raised objections during their time there. Chairperson McCoy asked him not to make conjectures about who's here.

Mr. Gilloon continued by responding to the criteria and the opposition arguments in Mr. Kane's letter. He stated this area doesn't have narrower streets, and this use would not

create excess traffic, and there are six parking spaces on the property. He also stated that Mary's Inn has shown itself to be good neighbors on Balboa, and they can be good neighbors here. He expressed that the fear displayed by the opposition is not based in fact. He noted that Mr. McNamer and Mr. Kirby stated that Mary's Inn did not harm property values on Balboa. Mr. Gilloon discussed the spot zoning concerns which have been addressed and covenants which have expired. He stated that the city has clarified and approved that this use is categorized as a group home. He further discussed that harmony doesn't mean everybody agrees, Mary's Inn has lived in harmony on Balboa for eight years. He stated that the 1749 Churchill yard needs care, and they will provide that.

Chairperson McCoy asked about improvements that were made to the Balboa property to clarify the sale price. Ms. Pasnick stated they installed a new roof, driveway, sidewalk, graded the back yard, removed an ash tree, planted trees, replaced the furnace, air conditioner, and sewage pump, and did minor repairs.

Planning Services Director Wernimont detailed the staff report noting that he wouldn't go into great detail since many of the points have already been addressed. He displayed maps and photos of the property and surrounding area. He stated that there are six off-street parking spaces on the property and 13 on-street parking spaces along the street frontage. He displayed a map showing the proximity to the ARC group home located just south of the subject property on Pennsylvania Avenue. He showed the notification map of all properties within 200' who received notification. He described the previous Conditional Use Permit and the property Mary's Inn currently occupies on Balboa. He described what a Conditional Use Permit is and the eight general criteria for approving them, as well as the two additional criteria for a group home. He concluded by listing the communications received on this matter.

Chairperson McCoy asked what the condition of approval placed on the Balboa home for Mary's Inn was. Mr. Wernimont read the notice of decision from that case, which listed the condition that a maximum of four women and infants and one house mother could live at the house.

Mr. Wernimont showed what conditional zoning was approved for 1749 Churchill, noting that the property functions as an R-1 with a group home as a condition. He stated that tourist homes are preempted from regulation.

Chairperson McCoy asked if other conditional uses would have to get a new Conditional Use Permit, and Wernimont stated yes.

Chairperson McCoy asked the applicant if they were okay with a limit of four residents again this time, and Mr. Biver stated yes. Board Member Stierman asked if the "house mother" term could be updated, and the applicant stated that position is called "coordinator" now.

Board Member Ahlvin asked if the definition of group home is residential and whether staff offices be allowed. Mr. Wernimont stated that offices are considered accessory to

the principal use and would be allowed. He also stated that the Board may wish to discuss how frequently the proposed boardroom would bring people to the home that are not directly involved in care.

Chairperson McCoy noted that he was the one dissenting vote in 2015 to the approval of the Conditional Use Permit for Mary's Inn on Balboa.

Board Member Kosel asked the applicant about the offices, and what alterations they plan to make to the home. Mr. Biver stated they have no intention to modify the main dwelling, just do maintenance, and the rear of residence would be an office for the director and a part-time assistant.

Board Member Stierman asked for clarification about the proposed boardroom use. Mr. Biver replied there are six members on the board, they meet one night per month for two hours, and most vehicles could be parked on the property.

Board Member Stierman discussed traffic, noting that residents typically don't have vehicles, and questioned whether they are allowed to. Ms. Pasnick estimated that about five of the previous 60 residents have had vehicles.

Board Member Stierman asked about transportation for the women and how they get to jobs and doctor's appointments. Ms. Pasnick replied that most are on Medicaid, which provides medical transportation, that there are volunteer drivers, the house is two blocks from a city bus stop, and some carpool with co-workers.

Board Member Stierman asked about home values and whether there is a requirement to disclose a group home in the area during home sales. Mr. Wernimont stated that would be best addressed by a realtor. Board Member Kosel, who is a realtor, stated that a group home is not on a seller's disclosure statement.

Board Member Mauss stated that after reviewing the UDC he felt that criteria are met and historically supported by the Balboa address. He noted that a group home moved next door to his home, and it has had zero impact. He expressed that the fears won't become reality.

Chairperson McCoy asked the applicant if they are amenable to a condition limiting the number of residents and staff on the property, and Mr. Biver requested to add an executive director position.

Motion by McCoy, seconded by Ahlvin, to approve the request with the following condition:

1. Occupancy shall be limited one coordinator, one executive director, and four women and their dependents.

Motion denied by the following vote: Aye –Mauss; Nay – Ahlvin (citing Criteria A), Kosel (citing Criteria A, F, and H), Stierman (citing Criteria A and F) and McCoy (citing Criteria A, F, and H).

Conditional Use Permit Criteria

A. The proposed conditional use will comply with all applicable regulations of this title, including lot requirements, bulk regulations, use limitations, and all other standards or conditions contained in the provisions authorizing such use.

F. The location and size of the conditional use, the nature and intensity of the activities to be involved or conducted in connection with it, the size of the site in relation thereto, and the location of the site with respect to streets giving access to the conditional use, shall be such that it will be in harmony with the appropriate and orderly development of the district and neighborhood in which it is located.

H. The proposed conditional use will not cause substantial injury to the value of other property in the neighborhood in which it is located and will contribute to and promote the convenience and welfare of the public.

ITEMS FROM PUBLIC: None.

ITEMS FROM BOARD: None.

ITEMS FROM STAFF: None.

ADJOURNMENT: Motion by McCoy, seconded by Ahlvin, to adjourn the September 28, 2023 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. Motion carried by the following vote: Aye – Ahlvin, Kosel, Mauss, Stierman and McCoy; Nay – None

The meeting adjourned at 8:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Shena Moon, Associate Planner

November 2, 2023

Adopted