

**BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT/PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF LAKE SHORE
CITY HALL
MINUTES
JULY 14, 2014
9:00 AM**

Chairman John Ingleman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Members of the commission present: John Ingleman, Dick Miles, Earl North Roger Smeby, Tom Diemert and; Council Liaison Susan Amacher; City Zoning Administrator Teri Hastings; City Engineer Dave Reese and City Clerk Patti McDonald. Alternate Kevin Egan was available in the audience. Alternates Pat Hastings and Eric Peterson were absent. There were 10 people in the audience. A quorum was present and the Commission was competent to conduct business.

MOTION BY EARL NORTH TO APPROVE THE MINUTES FOR JUNE 9, 2014 BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT/PLANNING COMMISSION AS PRESENTED. DICK MILES SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING

Variance - Brad Miller requested a variance for the purpose of constructing a 756 square foot two story addition onto the rear of the existing structure. The proposed addition would be 6'6" from the southerly side lot line and 14' 5" feet from the northerly lot line. The property is legally described as Lot 13, Pine Harbor (site address is 9178 Pebble Beach Road) and is zoned medium density residential.

The following documents became part of the record-Notice of mailing, notice of publication, signed application and attachments. There were no written comments received regarding this application.

John Koupal from Start to Finish Construction came before the commission to explain the Miller application. In May, the commission said the project was too big for the lot area and the septic system design wasn't sufficient for the proposed home. The septic design is allowed for the proposed addition.

John Ingleman asked if the existing garage will be taken down. The detached garage will not be taken down.

Earl North asked if there were any concerns from the neighbors. There were no comments with this application.

Teri asked if they knew where the new well will be placed. John K. said they were not sure quite yet, but will make sure they are the proper distance from the septic system and the neighbors mound system. He is working with someone concerning the electrical lines.

Dick Miles asked about the addition in 1988 and what type of foundation was constructed. John said that it is a 3 foot crawl space and the architect said the existing foundation should support the additional story.

There is a concern with the construction easement. James and Kathleen Runyon, 9182 Pebble Beach Road, sent a letter of agreement dated 7/12/14 for a construction easement. John Ingleman

asked if this agreement covered the runoff during construction and once the structure is up what will be done to deal with runoff. John K. said they will gutter the structure and direct the runoff away from the neighbor and lake along with adding rock edging under the overhang.

Earl asked if it is the intention to build a screened in porch on the second floor over the entry on the east side. He went back to the string line test and suggested that the neighbors view will be impeded with the screen porch. He also said they should be respectful with what is already there. Teri had a conversation with the architect and understands the intent of the screen porch, she suggested to him to possibly build a pergola. Earl asked if the sewer line will be insulated under Pebble Beach Road. Teri explained the proposed sewer; she also said that no one should park or drive where the septic tanks are placed; it should be blocked off. Dave Reese asked if the sewer line will be a bored line under Pebble Beach Road. John K. said it will be bored.

Earl said it is a lot of house on an extremely limited site. He said there are still a lot of unresolved concerns with the project. Tom Diemert said he doesn't feel the addition has been reduced in size enough for him to agree to the project. John K. agreed that at the first meeting the structure was too large for this particular site; he did take away the garage to reduce the size. John K. agrees there may be some concerns still with the well and the over head electrical lines. He explained the sentimental value of the property to the family. John said it is a challenge to accommodate the customer as to what is allowed on the property.

Roger is concerned with the runoff from the roof; he said that in his inspections this year he has found a lot of erosion on various projects. John K. said they intend to put rock edging to impede the water runoff by appropriate guttering. Roger also feels the square footage of the proposed structure is too large for the site. Tom Diemert agrees the size of the structure is too large.

Dave Reese asked if the runoff and grading will be directed away from the home; will it be captured on the property. John K. said it will have to be redirected by working with the grade of the property and possibly creating a 'no mow' zone. John K. explained the direction of the runoff from the roof. Dave said he hears that the existing drainage patterns already go to the neighboring property. He asked with the addition, will it put more runoff on the neighbor's property to the north or the south; have you taken into consideration keeping the water on the applicant's property. John K. said they have taken that into consideration and asked if they should do a landscape design. Dave Reese had comments related to the septic said that the septic plan is a limited plan with limited construction conditions; he said if everyone is in the home at once the mound system may get over used, which over time, could cause failure of the system. He also asked if the family understands limited use of water/septic system. John K. said he has spoke with the owners about this. Dave reiterated the need for the construction easement because this project will definitely impact the neighboring property to build this.

Teri's staff report indicated the following: The applicant has resubmitted the variance application with modifications of the house plan decreasing the number of bedrooms from 6 to 4. The addition would be a two story addition and be 6'6" from the southerly side lot line and would be approximately 10 feet from the north side lot line.

A second story will be added to the existing single story part of the dwelling as proposed last time. Given the roof lines and looking at the foundation, a question regarding the suitability of the existing structure to handle a second story should be questioned. Will this portion of the dwelling be removed and rebuilt? The existing home is 3'6" from the side property line. The revised addition will be 6'6" away from the side lot line on the southerly side at the closet point.

The property is a 50' lot. Variances are needed from the side lot lines. The existing structure is less than 75 feet from Gull Lake. It appears the applicant is proposing to construct a screened

porch over the existing lakeside patio. The second submission had actual living space over the patio. The screen porch would be less than 75 feet from the lake.

Elevation drawings have been submitted for the existing dwelling and the proposed addition. Due to the second story over the existing structure, a construction easement may be needed from the adjacent property owner. The roof overhang could potentially be on the lot line. The contractor/applicant should discuss how they anticipate constructing the second story. The current roof slopes to the side lot line for the front part of the existing home; the new addition will also slope toward the neighboring property. It is a large roof area; how will the runoff from the roof be handled?

The elevation drawings depict a full two story building on a 50 foot wide lot. The proposed with is 28 feet. The elevation plans do include some different roof lines to help break up the building along with the covered entry on the north side of the structure. Aesthetically, the dwelling fits better than the previous submission. The cabins on each side of the property are single story cabins. Further, north along Pebble Beach many of the cabins have been rebuilt and are two story homes; however, they are on 100' wide lots.

Floor plans have also been submitted. The floor plans have changed slightly from the second submission with a decrease in the number of bedrooms but not overall home size. However, reviewing the floor plans, an additional bedroom could be added easily. The proposed addition will impact the existing septic system. A septic system design has been provided for a mound system across Pebble Beach Road. There are several systems along Pebble Beach Road that have their systems located across the road. In addition, the well serving the property is in the area of the proposed addition. A new well will also need to be drilled.

The survey shows three overhead power lines crossing the property. One overhead line will interfere with the proposed addition. The applicant's representative is working on addressing this issue. The issue should be adequately addressed prior to approving the variance.

The survey shows the existing impervious surface at 21.20 % and the revised site plans shows the impervious surface at 20%. The city engineer can verify these numbers for accuracy.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Planning Commission has dealt with 50' lots and the need to upgrade the existing cabins on those lots. The Planning Commission has to be conscious of the impact of the improvements on the adjacent properties. There are a number of newer homes that have been designed and constructed to fit within the neighborhood. The revised variance application is an improvement from the first submission. The addition has been downsized some, but is still a lot of bulk for a narrow lot. The design has more aesthetic appeal than the first submission which helps with the bulk of the home. The lot has limitations; the lot was created when people were building small seasonal cabins. This property is further restricted with low elevation and saturated soils (septic system). The applicant has decreased the number of bedrooms in order to have a compliant septic system but the overall size of the home has not changed. It should also be demonstrated how the addition can be constructed without trespassing on the adjacent property or with a construction easement from the adjacent property owner.

MOTION BY EARL NORTH TO DENY THE REQUEST FOR VARIANCE ON THE BRAD MILLER APPLICATION BECAUSE IT DOESN'T MEET THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTER OF THE NEIGHBORHOOD; IT IS AN OVERBUILD ON A MINIMUM SIZE LOT. THE COMMISSION WOULD CONSIDER A REDISIGN CHANGING THE SCALE AND THE SCOPE OF THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT OF A FUTURE APPLICATION. DICK MILES SECONDED THE MOTION. John K. asked if the application is denied could they give him an

idea as to what scope and design reduction the commission would accept. Tom said they probably can't tell them what to do; they can tell them what not to do. He also said that as a group they need to limit what is built on a 50 foot lot. John respects that every decision sets the precedence for future requests. Teri said that there have been a couple projects done on 50 foot lots that were done well; she will share the addresses with John K. John Ingleman said they have the flexibility to reduce the size of the second floor. John K. asked if it would help to have a landscape plan upon resubmission. Dave Reese said it would. Earl suggested telling the client the challenges of the size of the lot, the runoff going to the neighboring property and the current design doesn't fit the essential character of the neighborhood. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Conditional Use Permit - John Allen made application for a conditional use permit to construct a 15,664 square foot building for the purpose of displaying, warehousing, and maintenance of antique cars and boats. The building will contain a small office space as well. The property is legally described as Lots 25-29, Block 12 Tingdale Brothers Sherwood Forest on Gull Lake. The property is zoned Neighborhood Commercial and is located at 8521 Interlachen Road.

The following documents became part of the record-Notice of mailing, notice of publication, signed application and attachments. There were two letters of concern read into the record, one from Eileen Thom and one from Theresa Thom; the letters are filed in the property file.

John Allen came before the commission to explain his application. John said this building is going to be a soft touch to the property and facility. He said it will have an Adirondack look to it; this building will not have any maintenance or repair work done on site. The neighboring building is where the maintenance will take place. He said that the fire that the Thom's spoke of was allowed by the DNR and in hindsight probably should not have been burned on a holiday weekend.

Tom Diemert asked about maintenance on boats and cars. John Allen said there will be not maintenance or restoration in the new facility; it will be for display of his 25 antique boats. He is not asking for anything over what city code already allows. Any finish work would be in the neighboring building. Teri said that in 2003 the commission approved boat restoration in the building on neighboring property with no concerns after issuing the CUP.

Dick Miles asked if the museum will be open to the public. John said that there are no defined plans for public display. Possibly limited use for non-profits to hold a fundraiser.

Earl North noted the concern of the neighbors and asked about capturing solvents or volatiles during any boat restoration. John said that if they do any restoration they would follow the rules of the EPA. Earl said with the land use he would expect the same as with past projects John has done in Lake Shore; however, he was concerned with the early clearing of the land. John said they did everything consistent with the ordinance. He said they took down what they needed to make the project work and they will replant. Dave Rasinski was at the P&Z site visit the week before and explained the grading and sewer plan on the property. John said they have purposely situated the building toward the neighboring property he owns to allow for more green space on the Balsam Lane side.

Dave Reese said the grading plan would be a condition of the project and approved by the city. John said they were anticipating any approval would be contingent on an acceptable drainage plan. Dave said the certificate of survey indicates the use of pervious pavers. Teri said that there is a 50% credit for the use of pervious materials possibly allowing a 50% credit towards impervious surface. John is using pervious material rather than asphalt. Dave asked if John will provide the city with the design for the fire suppression system. He said that Teri's staff report

indicated submitting a landscape plan. John said that landscaping shouldn't be a challenge. Teri said that at the site visit they saw on the backside of the property it shows sufficient screening. Dave Rasinski is working closely to the project regarding the potential drainage issues between the two properties.

Virginia Dingle, 8532 Interlachen Road, asked what will be in location of the former structure. The parking will be off to the side of the structure. Mr. Dingle asked if John would be using the public access road across the street. John will not use that access for launching boats. The Dingle's asked for reassurance of the ponding area won't just be for mosquito collection. Teri said it depends on the soils and she explained the use of existing ponding areas for drainage. The daughter said to the commission that the letter from the Thom's probably came because of the same concerns as theirs, thinking that there was going to be a metal structure rather than what is proposed; she suggested providing more information to neighboring properties. She said the timing of the burn was a concern. Teri said that she sent the plans to the Thom's when they requested them. John said some things may have been done wrong, but he assured the neighbors they will love the look of the property.

Terry Frovik, 8558 Nottingham Road, a new resident to the community said the visual impact of removing all the trees on the site was shocking. He asked if County 77 is all zoned commercial and what's the future impact of something like this for this residential community. Teri said there is very little property left that is zoned neighborhood commercial; she said 25 years ago there was a considerable amount more zoned neighborhood commercial and there was an initiative to down zone to residential. Terry Frovik said he was questioning the attractiveness and character of the woods in Lake Shore. He also commented on burning on a Holiday weekend. Teri said they were issued a DNR construction burning permit. She also commented that the city's comprehensive plan speaks to that the City of Lake Shore is prominently a residential area and is a big proponent to keep that character.

Earl said there are two kinds of error, the error of hand and error of the heart and in this particular instance he felt this was an error of the hand. He suggested that if John Allen had known that they were going to burn that weekend (July 4th) to keep ahead of it things may have been done differently. As far as what the Planning Commission does as a group, they have a prescribed and necessary procedure that they have to follow and if they don't follow that and start doing things uniquely different for each request we end up with no rules to follow and a lot of people being unhappy because they don't follow the rules. He said that on occasion errors may happen. He said that the City's Comprehensive plan really prescribes how property is treated.

Tom Diemert asked if there will be anything stored outside. John Allen said that there may be a few trailers outside and to the rear of the structure.

Peter Schmidt said that as he understood someone had an over the counter permit; then the property was clear cut and the house was removed; then the Schmidt's received the letter for the project. He asked if the property is zoned commercial. It is neighborhood commercial. John said he was taking the structures down whether a new structure was built or not. He explained the project again as Mr. Schmidt just arrived to the meeting. Peter was concerned with runoff. The plan is designed for a 100 year rain.

Johann Massmann (visiting Terry Frovik) stated he is a former chair from a planning and zoning commission and said that there is a public safety concern with the zoning of this property along County 77. He is concerned that this could become a sales showroom or an event center and it would be appropriate to note the concerns of future owner's of the commercial property in relation to the road concerns. Earl said that with the planning of reconstruction of County 77 the issue of sight lines, curbs, speed and density have been subjects of great conversation in every

planning meeting they have had. He said you have to be thoughtful and considerate anytime you are driving. He said with the reconstruction a lot of the concerns will be mitigated. He said there is already an event center at Sherwood Forest and the land issues were thoroughly addresses upon approval of their CUP. Johann suggested putting something in the motion now that would address the public safety for future owners. He speculated that if there were new owners of the commercial property and if the road wasn't being reconstructed, the major traffic concerns should be addressed. Teri said that if there was a change of use to a 'showroom' that would trigger a re-application for the Conditional Use Permit and traffic would be an issue to address further. Dave Reese said that this is a county highway and if there were proposed entrances added this would be sent to the county for their review and approval. Earl suggested that John Allen visit with the county before completing his project as the grade of the road may change with the reconstruction and may affect his entrance.

Dick Miles wanted to confirm the parking space size on the lot. The city standard is 10 x 20 and he has indicated 10 x 18 and with the American's with Disabilities act he may need to adjust his plan. John said the spaces will not be striped and his plan reflects their proposed use.

Tom Diemert asked about the lighting that is indicated on the plan. John said there will not be any lighting in the parking area. Tom asked where the sewer system will be located. Teri said it will be on the undisturbed southwest corner of the property.

Teri's staff report indicated the following: The applicant has submitted a conditional use permit request for the construction of a 14,080 square foot building for the purposes of displaying, warehousing and maintenance of antique cars and boats. The building will also have office space. The property currently has an existing dwelling and three pole barns. The home and two pole barns are proposed to be removed from the site.

The property is zoned Neighborhood Commercial. The lot size for the Neighborhood Commercial District is 40,000 square feet with 20,000 square feet being buildable.

In permitting new conditional use permits; the Planning Commission may impose, in addition; to the standards and requirements expressly specified by the ordinance, additional conditions that the Planning Commission considers necessary to protect the best interest of the surrounding area or the city as a whole. This may include the following:

- Increasing the required lot size or yard dimension.
- Limiting the height, size or location of buildings.
- Controlling the location and number of vehicle access points.
- Increasing the street width.
- Increasing or decreasing the number of required off-street parking spaces.
- Limiting the number, size, location or lighting of signs.
- Requiring berming, fencing screening, landscaping or other facilities to protect adjacent or nearby property.

The following should be met for the conditional use to be approved: the use must be appropriate for the zoning district (neighborhood commercial). The use with conditions would be compatible with the city's Comprehensive Plan. The use with conditions would be compatible to

neighborhood. The use would not be injurious to the public health, safety, welfare, decency, order and comfort, convenience, appearance or prosperity of the city. *The proposed building will have a rural feel and fit in with the community. The proposed use will not be intrusive to the adjacent residential properties to the rear.*

The proposed use would be consistent with the Comprehensive plan as this building would promote businesses and promote the attractiveness of Lake Shore.

In addition the Planning Commission should consider the following:

- The Conditional use should not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity for the purpose permitted on that property, nor substantially diminish or impair values in the immediate vicinity.
- The Conditional use will not impede the normal and orderly development and improvement of surrounding vacant property for uses predominant in the area.
- The Conditional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.
- The Conditional use will have vehicular approaches to the property which are so designed as not to create traffic congestion or indifference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares.
- Adequate measures have been taken to provide sufficient off-street parking and loading space to serve the proposed use.
- Adequate measures have been taken or will be taken to prevent or control offensive odor, fumes, dust, noise, and vibration, so none of these will constitute a nuisance and to control lights and signs in such a manner, that no disturbance to neighboring properties will result.
- The Conditional use will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of a natural, scenic or historical feature of major significance.
- The Conditional use will promote the prevention and control of pollution of the ground and surface waters including sedimentation and control of nutrients.

The Neighborhood Commercial standards do not specify a number of parking spaces for this type of use (the Planning Commission will need to determine the number of spaces) In addition, the applicant will need to meet ADA (American with Disabilities Act) standards and provide handicapped parking. The applicant is proposing 15 spaces; the ordinance requires the parking space to be 10'x20'. The site plan shows parking spaces at 10x18'. The size of the spaces will need to be adjusted.

The applicant is proposing overhead doors on the west and east ends of the building. The ordinance states overhead doors shall be placed primarily in the rear and secondarily in the side yard. Based off the elevation drawings, the doors will have a rustic appearance and fit within the neighborhood. The overhead doors should not interfere with parking or use of the adjacent property.

The applicant is combining Lots 23-29, previously the property was divided as Lots 23-26 and Lots 27-29. When the pole barn on Lots 23 and 24 was constructed the impervious coverage limit was 50% for the commercial district. Currently the Neighborhood Commercial District allows 40% impervious surface. The amount of proposed impervious surface for this site plan is 39.96%, which does not include the pervious paving area.

The applicant has not submitted a landscape plan for the site. A buffer of trees has been left in the rear portion of the property and along the setback area off of Balsam Lane. The NC district requires 10% of the land to be seeded or sodded and landscaped with approved ground cover, shrubbery and trees.

Trash handling equipment: The applicant should address how he will handle trash equipment.

Mechanical Equipment: Teri believes there shouldn't be out of the ordinary mechanical equipment for the building located outside. This should be verified and if necessary a condition on type and location may be needed.

Exterior Lighting: The applicant should be prepared to discuss lighting for the exterior of the building. Due to the residential properties across the street, the lighting should be downcast and prevent glare. Lighting levels will need to meet the ordinance requirement.

Signage: The applicant has not submitted a plan for signage. Two signs are allowed for the business.

Architectural Appearance: The applicant has provided elevation drawings of the building. The applicant is proposing an Adirondack style building that will fit into the character of the area. The front of the proposed building will have porte-cochere that will impact the setback from County 77.

A septic system site evaluation and design is required. At the time of this report this information was not available.

Outdoor Storage: The applicant should address if any outdoor storage is planned. While outdoor storage may be necessary from time to time, it should be limited.

Drainage. A drainage plan has not been submitted. The applicant has requested that upon approval; a plan adequate to the city engineer would be prepared.

Access. The applicant is proposing two access points off of County 77 and one off of Balsam Road. Currently there are three access points off of County 77 so one would be eliminated. I do not anticipate the sight to have a high volume of traffic. The proposed access points on 77 are at the existing location points so sight lines should be adequate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend approval of the conditional use permit provided the following are adequately addressed:

- Landscaping plan to be submitted and to be completed one year from the issuance of the permit and according to the plan submitted (or any modifications requested by the Planning Commission)
- X number of parking spaces as required by the Planning Commission.
- Lighting for the building should not create glare or generate beyond the property lines including the adjacent roadways.
- Signs shall adhere to the ordinance requirement.

- The proposed building should be constructed out of the materials proposed.
- Outdoor storage of on any permanent basis is prohibited or unless modified by the Planning Commission.
- Drainage plan submitted and approved by the city engineer.

Rationale for the conditional use permit:

The use with the above conditions should not be injurious to the use and enjoyment of other property in the immediate vicinity. The use will not require public cost for public facilities and services. The property will have proper vehicle approaches which should not cause traffic congestion or hazardous conditions. The business will not result in the destruction of a natural or historical feature of the area but will enhance the rural character of the area.

MOTION BY EARL NORTH TO APPROVE THE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION OF JOHN ALLEN AT 8521 INTERLACHEN ROAD AS PROPOSED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS: THAT A LANDSCAPE AND PLANTING PLAN BE SUBMITTED TO THE CITY FOR REVIEW AND APPROVAL; A GRADING AND ON SITE DRAINAGE PLAN ALSO BE SUBMITTED TO THE CITY FOR REIVEW AND APPROVAL. TOM DIEMERT SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ordinance Amendment - Sale & Display of vehicles and equipment - The Lake Shore Planning Commission considered an ordinance amendment that proposes to regulate the sale or display of vehicles or equipment. Earl said the city from time to time does sell forfeited vehicles and old police cars. Teri said that it is unlikely that the city would have more than three vehicles in one year. Earl asked if vehicles on property need to be currently licensed. Yes, it should be licensed. Earl suggested adding the 'date for sale' to the sign so it is easily identified as a reasonable amount of time allowed.

MOTION BY TOM DIEMERT TO RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL TO ADOPT THE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT FOR THE SALE AND DISPLAY OF VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT. ROGER SMEBY SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW BUSINESS – Ms. Dingle recently overheard a real estate agent tell a prospective client that the city is attempting to add benches at some of the local public accesses and make them a walkway to the trail as the city moves forward with the planning of the bike trail. Teri said she spoke with that real estate agent as she asked about the future plans of that access and told her that it has been discussed that someday when there is a trail there may be benches placed at some of the accesses. Ms. Dingle asked if there will there be an assessment to property owners when the bike trail is constructed or will there be an easement request. Teri said if there is any property acquired with the County Road 77 project there may be some easements needed; as for the bike trail project there won't be.

OLD BUSINESS –

Final Plat - Lake Shore Villages LLC - Lake Shore Village Properties has submitted the Final Plat for the additional garage units.

The final plat is in substantial compliance with the preliminary plat that was approved by the City. The settlement papers have all been signed and a deed for the encroachment has been recorded. A drainage plan has been submitted which includes a berm.

The association documents for the plat were reviewed by the city attorney and were acceptable.

An independent plat check of the final plat is being completed. The final plat should not be signed until a letter documenting the plat check is on file.

The professional costs (city attorney & city engineer) have not been totaled yet, the association is responsible for these costs.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Recommend approval of the Final Plat to the City Council as the final plat complies with the conditions on the Preliminary Plat approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council in February.

Don Johnson came before the commission to represent the Lake Shore Village LLC.

Earl said in the packet there were two plats and only one is signed. The seconded plat isn't signed until there is final approval from the city.

MOTION BY DICK MILES TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE FINAL PLAT OF LAKE SHORE VILLAGES LLC. EARL NORTH SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

REPORTS

City Engineer – Dave Reese said that they are still working on city road projects.

Chairman – John Ingleman had nothing to report.

Council Liaison – Susan Amacher had nothing to report.

Zoning Administrator – Teri Hastings said there will be a meeting in August.

PUBLIC FORUM – Tom Diemert asked if the city has anything to do with docks. Teri said the first section of dock (at the water and land) has to be 10 feet from the property line. There is a restriction of size. The DNR has jurisdiction of docks; however, if a dock is longer than 200 feet it requires a CUP.

Carol Beebe, Lake Shore Association, asked if the boat on the side of the dock is also supposed to be 10 feet from the lot line. The city doesn't regulate that.

MOTION BY EARL NORTH TO ADJOURN THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT/PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF JULY 14, 2014 @ 11:13 AM. DICK MILES SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Transcribed by Patti McDonald
Lake Shore City Clerk