

## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT PUBLIC HEARING

Monday, October 17, 2011

Administrative Center – County Board Room

6:00 p.m. – 7:05 p.m.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Howard Raymer, Jr., Dave Eilertson, Terry Houlihan  
**MEMBERS EXCUSED:** None  
**MEMBERS ABSENT:** None  
**OTHERS PRESENT:** Nathan Sampson, Jonathan Kaatz (minutes)

### CALL TO ORDER

Howard Raymer, Jr., Committee Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. Let the record show that this meeting is called in full compliance with the requirements of Wisconsin Open Meetings Law.

**APPEAL NO. 2011-45** Gary J & Diana J Moe, N7006 County Road W, Holmen, WI 54636-8115. Permit denied to construct two 12-ft X 50-ft lean-to additions to an existing 1,500 sq. ft. detached accessory building that will exceed the 1,500 sq. ft. area limit for such buildings on this 4.0 acre lot. The property is described as Lot 1 of Certified Survey Map No. 180, Volume 7. Property address: N7006 County Road W. Town of Onalaska. Tax Parcel 10-46-1. Town of Onalaska.

**Appearing in favor:** Derek Moe.

REMARK Moe: I'm here on behalf of my father. My father is gone because his father-in-law died. So he had to leave to go to a funeral. I have a letter what he wrote here. I have also pictures of what he wants to do it so you guys can see what it looks like. Some pictures of it there. I'll just read what he says here. (Letter submitted from Gary Moe read)

"I am sorry that I am not here this evening but due to the death of my father-in-law I have had to travel to Sturgis, Saskatchewan, Canada. I have applied for a variance to enlarge my existing pole shed. I have several antique tractors and 2 horses. The horses take up about 1/3 of my shed including hay storage etc. So several of my tractors have had to sit outside. This causes a problem because they have a tendency to leak water in areas they shouldn't, also I have had problems with someone stealing gas, I can only put in what I think I might use for cutting some hay or bailing it otherwise it will be gone next time I want to use the tractor and I always shut off the fuel at the tank. I also had a set of very good tractor tire chains disappear as well as the rear cultivators for a tractor, the draw bar on my compact tractor went missing this summer and who knows how many other things that I haven't discovered missing as of yet. I will be doing the additions to the building itself. I have also sent pictures of what the building will look like when completed. The roof line would continue out as it is. The south side towards the house will be open with one third of this area to be used for my horses and the north side will be enclosed when completed. I was at the Onalaska Planning Commission on Monday night October 10<sup>th</sup> and the Onalaska Town Board on Tuesday night October 11<sup>th</sup> and received a unanimous decision in favor of the addition to my pole shed from both. I hope you too will give me the approval that I need. Thank you for your time.

Gary J. Moe"

QUESTION Eilertson: How is he going to secure, he's talking about a lot of things being taken off this property, how is he going to secure by just having lean-tos?

ANSWER Moe: Well the one side of that is actually enclosed.

QUESTION Raymer: So the open side is more for horses?

ANSWER Moe: Yes, horses and the hail storage underneath there. The other side will be enclosed to stick his tractors and stuff in.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** Email from Melissa Erdman, Town Clerk/Secretary for Town of Onalaska, received on October 17, 2011. Email states the Plan Commission and the Town Board approved the variance unanimously.

**Discussion:** REMARK Raymer: Well, he's almost going to double the size of what he's allowed by doing it.

REMARK Houlihan: Better than having the tractors sitting in the front yard.

REMARK Raymer: More of an agricultural type building on a residential lot.

REMARK Eilertson: He takes good care of his property.

**Motion Houlihan/Eilertson to approve.  
3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPEAL NO. 2011-46** Thomas Neumeister, 2310 Oak St, La Crosse, WI 54603, acting on behalf of Peter J & Krin E Krause, 1910 Nakomis Ave, La Crosse, WI 54603. Permit denied to retain a previously constructed 8-ft X 8-ft covered entry that lies within the required 25-ft setback from the right-of-way of Nakomis Ave. The property is described as Lot 60 of the 4<sup>th</sup> Addn. to Hiawatha Islands Addn. Property address: 1910 Nakomis Ave. Tax parcel 4-1188-0. Town of Campbell.

**Appearing in favor:** Krin E Krause, 1910 Nakomis Ave, La Crosse, WI 54603.

QUESTION Raymer: So this was previously constructed and you want to retain it?

REMARK Krause: Well Peter and I have lived in the home since 1993. The house was built in the seventies. And the roof line is not what you see there right now. I have some pictures I'd like to present to the committee. It might give you a little better explanation of the situation at hand. When we started this project we were looking to make a kitchen remodeling into the back of the house. We were very much in tune with the Shoreland Zoning and that's where my focus was at the time obviously. During the course of that construction we went ahead and checked the roofing in other areas of the house and there were some issues from ice damming and rotting as a result of that ice damming. So one of those issues was right near the front door. During the course of that discussion to remedy the situation, we looked to the advice of an architect and our builder and it was determined that if we slightly change the roofline to a gable end we could take some steps to further alleviate any future ice damming. This is the second roof we put on the house in the 18 years we've lived there and both times we discovered the same problem in the same area. So we're really working to resolve the problem. (*Referring to pictures submitted by the appellant at the public hearing.*) I want to direct your attention to photo number one, for instance, that shows our house in the foreground and our neighbor's directly to the south in the background there. It's the red brick. During the course of the discussion as to how to deal with this issue was one of those line of sight things, so we just looked and obviously we're not any closer to the street than our neighbors necessarily as far as it appears. So we made the adjustments in that light and what you see in the picture is the result. I've appeared before the Campbell Town Zoning and Planning Commission and they have approved my request for the appeal. I've also included with your photographs a statement from our neighbors and none of them that I went by had found any objections to the changes that were made. So I guess at this point I'll yield to the committee for any questions.

REMARK Eilertson: You knew that you were supposed to get a building permit.

REMARK Krause: Well frankly I didn't realize it was going to make such a change and I should have, yes. I should have. I take that responsibility. I should have done that. I was one of those things.

QUESTION Raymer: So when was it done?

ANSWER Krause: It was actually done July.

QUESTION Raymer: Just this summer?

ANSWER Krause: Yeah. The whole process. Actually we just moved back into the house last week.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** 1) Fax dated and received on October 13, 2011, from the Town of Campbell. Fax states that the Campbell Town Board had no objections to this variance.

2) Letter and pictures submitted by appellant during the public hearing portion of this appeal. Letter contains signatures of five neighbors stating they have no objections and they support their application for this variance.

**Discussion:** REMARK Raymer: Pretty straight forward I guess.

REMARK Eilertson: I have no problem with this. The whole street has got encroachments.

REMARK Raymer: We could put it in it could never be enclosed.

REMARK Eilertson: It looks nice.

REMARK Houlihan: It's an improvement.

**Motion Eilertson/Houlihan to approve with the condition the covered entry shall remain open.  
3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPEAL NO. 2011-47** Bill Hammes, 2331 Market St, La Crosse, WI 54601, acting on behalf of Jacob C Gosh, 1317 La Crescent St, La Crosse, WI 54603. Permit denied to construct a 26-ft X 32-ft detached accessory garage that will lie within the required 60-ft setback from the centerline of La Crescent Pl and will exceed the 500 sq. ft. area limit for such buildings on this 0.16 acres lot. The property is described as Lot 8, Block 1 of Beaudette's Addn. Property address: 1317 La Crescent St. Tax parcel 4-967-0. Town of Campbell.

**Appearing in favor:** Bill Hammes, 2331 Market St, La Crosse, WI 54601.

REMARK Hammes: I also own property behind that property which is 1317 La Crescent Place. Mr. Gosh and I are in the process of negotiating to buy his property. And so one of the things I was looking at is if I could put on a bigger garage to give a little more access for parking for the neighbors. The garage there now is kind of small. My neighbor directly south of that... Let me back up. I wouldn't be going as far to the road as my neighbor directly south. Her garage is quite a bit closer to the 60 foot line. The neighbor south of Al's Marina has a fairly big, nice looking pole barn that's almost on the road. I don't think the garage would be out of character for the neighborhood. It would increase traffic because right now there's just Mr. Gosh living there. And it would still be far enough off the center of the road that people driving off the road would have good access to pull off and out of traffic. So that's my request.

REMARK Eilertson: The garage that's sitting there now looks pretty good. The only reason you're asking to do this is to increase the size.

REMARK Hammes: This is correct. And I would tear that garage down and build a new garage. Correct.

REMARK Eilertson: And the boats and things that are sitting outside...

REMARK Hammes: There would be none. Obviously I don't own that now, but there would be no outside stuff of that nature.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** 1) Fax dated and received on October 13, 2011, from the Town of Campbell. Fax states the appellant did not apply to appear before the Campbell Planning and Zoning Commission.  
2) Letter dated September 15, 2011, submitted by the appellant at the time the application was made for the variance. Letter states the current owner, Josh Gosh, has authorized Bill Hammes to speak on his behalf. Letter also describes the detached accessory garage proposal.  
3) Phone call from Pat Post, Town of Campbell Supervisor, received by Chad Vandenlangenberg on October 17, 2011. Supervisor Post indicated that the appellant did not approach the Town of Campbell and that the Town of Campbell would like to hear these requests and make a recommendation. Supervisor Post indicated she also has concerns with possible drainage and stormwater issues.

**Discussion:** REMARK Raymer: Well the drainage issues would be held through Land Conservation and Soil Erosion, Zoning, and the building inspector, so I don't think that's an issue.

QUESTION Eilertson: Mr. Hammes, I have a question for you. What do you intend to do with the property after you buy it?

ANSWER Hammes: It will probably be a rental property.

QUESTION Eilertson: You're not going to flip it?

ANSWER Hammes: No, because I'm the neighbor, I'd really like to control the property and so that's why I'm not going to flip it.

QUESTION Eilertson: You're going to keep it for a number of years?

ANSWER Hammes: I'd like to keep it as long as I can. Quite frankly I guess I wasn't aware I was supposed to appear before Campbell. So that's why I didn't go over there.

REMARK Raymer: Normally you would have got it in your packet, from the Zoning Office, and it would have told you you should go there.

REMARK Hammes: I have my packet. I thought my responsibility was just to here.

REMARK Sampson: This would be that signed sheet.

REMARK Raymer: Those instructions were in that packet. But we're not going to hold this up because the Town of Campbell hasn't made their decision.

REMARK Eilertson: I'm not concerned at all about the drainage. I looked at it. The garage that's sitting there is draining. I think it's fine. This will just be larger.

REMARK Raymer: They'll put gutters on it.

REMARK Houlihan: It's really more alley than it is street.

**Motion Eilertson/Houlihan to approve.**

**3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPEAL NO. 2011-48** Steven K & Peggy L Lechnir, W4524 County Road T, Mindoro, WI 54644. Permit denied to construct a 32-ft X 25-ft addition to an existing 15-ft X 25-ft detached accessory building that together with an existing detached accessory building will exceed the 1,000 sq. ft. area limit for such buildings on this 2.89 acre lot. The property is described as Lot 1 of Certified Survey Map No. 34, Volume 15, except part taken for road. Property address: W4524 County Road T. Tax parcel 5-836-2. Town of Farmington.

**Appearing in favor:** Steven K Lechnir, W4524 County Road T, Mindoro, WI 54644.

REMARK Lechnir: My wife and I own this property and we have horses that we need to get a shelter for. The existing building that I want to add on to is the old farmstead's milk house, entryway to the barn, which the foundation is to the east of that. Right now it's a 14 foot by 14 foot area for horses to get into. And even if they were buddy buddy...they just don't get along that well. So we'd like to build on to it for some hay storage and for shelter for them to get out of the snow and the wind. I spoke with the neighbors. I talked to Tim Goodenough to the east of us and he said go for it they need a shelter. I spoke with Mike Hauser, who owns property on the south and the west, and he said I don't care. And Steve and Kay Timm, who own the property to the north and west of us, said it makes no difference to us. Rocky Lockington is going to do the construction for us. That's all I got. We bought another 8.84 acres this spring from Steve and Kay Timm that is across the highway but it's on a different tax thing.

REMARK Raymer: Can't use that acreage because it's not attached to this one.

REMARK Lechnir: Right. Is it the highway the deal? I don't know how that works. We had it surveyed before we bought it. So it's like two different parcels or something.

QUESTION Eilertson: Who's your contractor that's going to do this for you Steve?

ANSWER Lechnir: Nick Lockington. He's out of Mindoro.

QUESTION Eilertson: Is the building that you're going to attach this addition to, has he looked at that to see how sound it is? It looked like it was in pretty bad shape.

ANSWER Lechnir: Yeah, the front of it looks terrible. That's why I'd rather get... When we put this on the front it will take care of that. The roof I put up there and hammered all the stuff on the roof down. And the sides are sound. It's a cement block on two sides, wood on one side and the backside is part of the limestone, old barn. The wall is at least that thick on the backside of it. I don't know how attached it's going to be. The roofs are going to butt to each other but I don't know exactly how he's going to connect it per se.

QUESTION Eilertson: And this attachment is going to have a concrete foundation?

ANSWER Lechnir: No, not the new one. The new part is just going to be like a pole building. So we can blade out the horse stuff.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** None.

REMARK Sampson: I have no correspondence Mr. Chairman but I believe the Town of Farmington Plan Commission may be meeting this evening.

REMARK Lechnir: Tomorrow. I went last month to their meeting but I didn't get the stuff going fast enough to get on their agenda. But I was there and talked to them about it and they know that I'm going to be there tomorrow night at their meeting.

**Discussion:** REMARK Houlihan: According to what Nate and I discussed on the tour he can combine these two properties and then he can do this.

REMARK Raymer: Even though the road separates.

QUESTION Houlihan: Isn't that correct?

ANSWER Sampson: That would be a possibility. The other possibility is a building of this size could be constructed on the 8.84 acre parcel that's south of the county road but my understanding is that his intent was to keep everything on the north side.

REMARK Houlihan: Well yeah, moving his horses on the other side of the road, I can understand that.

REMARK Raymer: I thought to combine lots they had to be contiguous.

REMARK Sampson: No, you can have a road that separates a tax parcel.

REMARK Eilertson: The horses need shelter.

**Motion Houlihan/Eilertson to approve.**  
**3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPEAL NO. 2011-49** Monte McIntyre, Plant Manager, acting on behalf of Swiss Valley Farms, W3959 County Road D, Mindoro, WI 54644. Permit denied to construct an approximate 52-ft X 54-ft addition to an existing non-conforming commercial building that will lie partially within the required 50-ft setback from the right-of-way of County Road D and partially within the required 75-ft setback from the ordinary high-water mark of Creamery Creek, but outside the required 45-ft vegetative buffer required as a condition of approval of Appeal No. 2000-50. The property is described as part of the E½-SW, Section 21, T18N, R6W. Property address: W3959 County Road D. Tax parcel 5-906-0. Town of Farmington.

**Appearing in favor:** Monte McIntyre, 323 Hamilton St, West Salem, WI 54669.

REMARK McIntyre: Our property that is in question is W3959 County Road D, Mindoro. We are a manufacturer of bleu cheese and because of the Global Food Initiatives that are taking place now days and the FDA, we need to expand our laboratory, almost double it. We have no room to train our employees in, which is a requirement for the Global Food Initiative. We are actually using a lunch room to train people. It becomes a little difficult when people are taking breaks and having lunch and we're trying to train someone. We also have a problem with our doors opening directly to the outside and we want to establish air locks because of the Global Food Initiative we need to do this along with the FDA regulations. Another thing, and it's strictly our ego, is that two of our largest customers are base out of Europe and we have to entertain them in our lunch room while employers are taking lunch or breaks. And that's unfair to the employees, but they are customers. Right now we'd be approximately 76 feet with the addition going on and the duplex at W3935 is setback at 57 feet from centerline. And all of the other houses east of W3935 are even closer. I only measured one of them. I didn't want to get shot by a whole row of people being out there with a tape measure. But for us to expand in the future we need to do this. We have no offices. We're going to be receiving people from Sparta. We're closing our procurement office in Sparta and we'll be having people coming from there to be based out of Mindoro. Any future expansion we will need to have this.

QUESTION Eilertson: How many people do you employ there?

ANSWER McIntyre: Forty-four. And we're almost at capacity right now so we're looking in the next couple years of possibly expanding.

QUESTION Houlihan: This addition is going to take out part of your parking lot. Do you have area for those cars to go?

ANSWER McIntyre: Yes we do. We had torn down a building that was just adjacent, we own the property, and it was just adjacent to the east. We tore that down two years ago I believe, and that is now parking area. The property is quite long but we don't have a lot of width to it. But there is adequate property to put a parking lot in. Right now we require all of our employees to park on the property. There's no parking on the street.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** 1) Email from Michael Wenholz, Department of Natural Resources – Bureau of Watershed Management, received on October 14, 2011. Email recommends the addition to be built on the east side of the building outside of the required setback from the ordinary high-water mark if possible. If not possible, the department recommends the addition not be any closer to Creamery Creek this is shown on the plan and that the required 45-foot vegetative buffer from Appeal No. 2000-50 not be disturbed and be continued into the future.

2) Email from Betty Sacia, Town Clerk for Town of Farmington, received on October 14, 2011. Email states the Farmington Town Board approved the variance request at their October meeting.

**Discussion:** REMARK Raymer: Interesting comment from the DNR.

QUESTION Eilertson: Monte, did you hear that reading? The DNR asked the question why this addition can't be flip-flopped over to this side and it's probably because it a functional...

ANSWER McIntyre: Right. On the other side, the east side, we have our shipping. We also have our milk intake area. This would be adjacent to what we have as present offices, present laboratory. Eventually we're going to have to acquire property to the east of us for future expansion. I'd love to be able to do it; we just don't have the option to put the offices there. Thank you.

REMARK Eilertson: I knew that was the case.

REMARK Raymer: Did the DNR look at it, or did he just go by drawings? If he'd went and looked at it would have seen what that was.

REMARK Eilertson: As far as the setback, that's not an issue.

REMARK Houlihan: That's not an issue.

QUESTION Sampson: The only question that I would have is that if the board would want to entertain just making mention of that condition of maintaining that vegetative buffer strip that was required?

**Motion Houlihan/Eilertson to approve with the condition that the 45-ft vegetative buffer strip required as a condition of approval of Appeal No. 2000-50 shall be maintained.**

**3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPEAL NO. 2011-50** Thomas E & Agnes M Neumeister, 3033 Edgewater Ln, La Crosse, WI 54603. Permit denied to construct a 20-ft X 34-ft addition to an existing 40-ft X 34-ft detached accessory garage that will lie within or encroach on the 4-ft required sideyard and together with an existing 1,232 sq. ft. detached accessory building, will further exceed the 750 sq. ft. area limit for such buildings on these 0.22 and 0.04 acre parcels. The property is described as Outlot 87 and part of the Un-Numbered Parcel, Assessors Plat of the NE¼ of Section 12, T16N, R8W. Tax parcels 4-1714-0 & 4-1511-16. Town of Campbell.

**Appearing in favor:** Thomas E Neumeister, 3033 Edgewater Ln, La Crosse, WI 54603.

REMARK Neumeister: Gentlemen, the reason I'm asking for this addition is for the past years, probably almost eight, nine years now, I've had a couple boats. Now I have three boats. And the past couple years I've doubled covered them and I've had two or three litters of kittens in the spring. We don't need any more cats. I don't know how they get in there, but they've been getting in there. And if you viewed my property, you see what type of homeowner I am. I like things neat. I've got plenty of space there. NB Partners, I'm half owner of that property to the south of me. The Schnick property to the north of me, I have a letter from her that says she doesn't have a problem with it. I'll let you look at that. And then also, there was a mix up at the Town of Campbell as far as meeting with them. So anyways, I talked to Pat Post. I talked to Jeff Bluske. And I went and met them on Thursday night at their meeting and they didn't have a problem with it. They were going to send a letter to you guys so it didn't hold up this meeting here. I don't know if you received that or not.

REMARK Sampson: No we haven't. Just an email from Pat Post this morning.

QUESTION Neumeister: Okay and what did that say?

ANSWER Sampson: I'll get to that.

REMARK Neumeister: Okay I'm sorry. So I guess that's all I have.

QUESTION Eilertson: The reason for the addition Tom is because you have three boats?

ANSWER Neumeister: Yes and I'd like to keep them inside.

QUESTION Eilertson: Where are you keeping them now?

ANSWER Neumeister: Actually I have two different warehouses, other parts of the area, but its just not convenient. My son is renting one of the buildings now so I'm kind of getting kicked out of that one. And I also have three trucks too.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** 1) Letter submitted by appellant during the public hearing portion of this appeal. Letter is from Rosalie and Ronald Schnick and is dated October 17, 2011. The letter states they do not have any objections to the 24-ft x 36-ft addition to the existing garage.  
2) Fax dated and received on October 13, 2011, from the Town of Campbell. Fax states the appellant did not apply to appear before the Campbell Planning and Zoning Commission.  
3) Phone call from Pat Post, Town of Campbell Supervisor, received by Chad Vandenlangenberg on October 17, 2011. Supervisor Post indicated that the appellant did not approach the Town of Campbell and that the Town of Campbell would like to hear these requests and make a recommendation.

**Discussion:** REMARK Raymer: He's significantly over.

REMARK Eilertson: Yeah. I don't think there's a demonstration of a hardship here.

REMARK Houlihan: We don't have a hardship here at all.

REMARK Eilertson: None what so ever.

REMARK Houlihan: There are so many buildings so close together in that whole area. If they ever have a fire it's going to be a...

REMARK Raymer: When you look at the total of what's allowed and what he's already got, and then you add to that, it doesn't look like we're doing our job.

**Motion Eilertson/Raymer to deny.  
3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**APPEAL NO. 2011-51** Troy C Strittmater, W2161 County Road I, Bangor, WI 54614. Permit denied to alter an existing 28-ft X 36-ft detached accessory building by constructing a 12-ft X 36-ft addition and increasing the building height to 21-ft 4 inches, exceeding the 15-ft height and 1,000 sq. ft. area limits for such buildings on this 2.80 acre lot. The property is described as part of the NW-NE & NE-NE, Section 36, T16N, R6W. Property address: W2589 County Road I. Tax parcel 2-520-2. Town of Barre.

**Appearing in favor:** Troy C Strittmater, W2161 County Road I, Bangor, WI 54614.

REMARK Strittmater: The property that I own is located at W2589 County Road I.

QUESTION Raymer: So you're at 1,008 now? Right?

ANSWER Strittmater: Correct. I believe that's what it is.

QUESTION Raymer: Then you want to add this and what is it?

ANSWER Strittmater: The 36 by 40 with the proposed 12 by 36 addition would bring the square footage up to 1,440 square foot. My lot size is approximately 2.88 acres. I know the new proposal... The 3.01 to five acres is going to allow 1,500 square foot for a detached accessory building. So the 1,440 square feet is, you know, just kind of shy. It's 60 square foot shy of the 1,500 square foot but my acreage is just shy of the 3.01 acres.

REMARK Raymer: If you had the 3.01 you could have 1,500 and you're two tenths of an acre short of that or 21 hundredths.

REMARK Strittmater: Correct.

QUESTION Raymer: Anybody got any land for sale out there? What's the addition for?

ANSWER Strittmater: The addition onto the existing 28 by 36 garage would allow me to utilize that garage for storing ag equipment, which is taller in height. Right now the garage currently has, it's like ten foot four side walls with an eight foot door. The garage cannot accommodate any of my equipment that I currently have.

QUESTION Raymer: Is this for agricultural use?

ANSWER Strittmater: Correct.

QUESTION Raymer: There's nothing else in it?

QUESTION Strittmater: Currently now?

ANSWER Raymer: Yeah.

REMARK Strittmater: Currently now there's some ag equipment in it.

QUESTION Raymer: There's no cars?

ANSWER Strittmater: There's no cars in the garage.

QUESTION Raymer: Boats?

ANSWER Strittmater: No. The only thing you're going to find in there now is an old tractor that was my grandfather's and a seeder and some semi tires.

QUESTION Eilertson: And after the renovation takes place, what are you going to store in it? You're saying agricultural equipment. What specifically is that going to be?

ANSWER Strittmater: Anything from tractors to combines. Whatever I can utilize it for.

QUESTION Houlihan: Are you farming this?

ANSWER Strittmater: No.

QUESTION Houlihan: Where's the ag?

ANSWER Strittmater: The property I farm is located approximately a mile up the road.

REMARK Houlihan: When we were on tour there, there was a dump truck setting there.

REMARK Strittmater: Correct.

QUESTION Houlihan: Are you going to have construction equipment there?

ANSWER Strittmater: That dump truck is used for farm use. I have a bulldozer which I also use on the farm.

QUESTION Houlihan: You're not doing construction work off the farm?

ANSWER Strittmater: No. My intentions when I bought that property back in 2005, with that garage, have always been to try and utilize that garage to my advantage. And after purchasing the property, there was a property line issue that took several years to get resolved. That's finally been resolved with the neighbor to the east of that building. *(Referring to survey map submitted by appellant at public*

hearing.) As you can see from this drawing here from Chris Fechner, I've been working with him on the required setbacks and the side yard setback.

QUESTION Raymer: So that drawing that you submitted actually doesn't show that jog then? Was that what the dispute was? The drawing we have shows that jog on that lot.

ANSWER Strittmater: Correct. The map that you have isn't current. There was actually two property disputes. One with the Wills property and one with the Hemker property, and both of those property issues have been resolved.

QUESTION Raymer: When they resurveyed it and made the straight line like that, did that not add a little bit of acreage to this parcel or not?

ANSWER Strittmater: Yes it did. I believe the map you have says 2.80. And now I believe it's like 2.88.

QUESTION Raymer: I don't see it on here. Did he put it one here or not?

ANSWER Strittmater: On this large map? No, the acreage isn't on there. I don't know why. Somehow it got missed.

QUESTION Eliertson: The farm that you have down the road, how many acres do you have there that you farm?

ANSWER Strittmater: That acreage is 400 acres. But it isn't my property.

QUESTION Eliertson: You lease it?

ANSWER Strittmater: Correct, I rent it. It's my mother's property. This property that I currently own down here, my plan is to either construct a single family home or bring in a modular home on that site. My wife and I currently live in the house on the farm. We have a nine month old and are expecting again in March. Old farm house is not very warm in the winter. And trying to keep heat in that is like trying to keep water out of a screen door submarine.

QUESTION Eliertson: With this you plan to build a residence there?

ANSWER Strittmater: Correct.

QUESTION Eliertson: You're not planning to subdivide this or split it?

ANSWER Strittmater: No.

**Appearing in opposition:** None.

**Correspondence:** 1) Letter submitted by appellant during the public hearing portion of this appeal. Letter is dated October 17, 2011 and is signed by Kenneth P. Manke. The letter states Manke Farms, Inc. has no objection to the appellant putting on an addition to the existing garage.

2) Letter dated October 13, 2011 and received on October 14, 2011 from the Town of Barre. Letter states the Town of Barre met for its regular board meeting on October 11, 2011 and the board members approved the request for a variance.

**Discussion:** REMARK Raymer: He's going to use it for farm storage. It isn't a farm property, but that's what he said.

REMARK Eliertson: If he builds a home on here, he'll probably use it for his cars and stuff like that. I don't have any problems as long as this isn't being done for speculation and profits.

QUESTION Raymer: If you build a house out there, are you going to have an attached garage?

ANSWER Strittmater: Possibly. Yeah.

**Motion Eliertson/Houlihan to approve.**

**3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**

**Motion Eliertson/Houlihan to adjourn at 7:05.**

**3 Aye, 0 No. Motion carried unanimously.**