

## MINUTES

### **Members Present**

Mr. Olthoff, Mr. Washington, Mr. Tripp, Mr. James, Mr. Vickery, Mr. Liehr, Mr. Mulcahy, and Ms. Evans

### **Members Absent**

Mr. Einfeldt, Ms. Polk, Mr. Reid and Mr. Tholen

### **In Attendance**

- **Board Members**

Mr. Bossert, Mr. Byrne, and Mr. Stauffenberg

- **Department Heads**

Delbert Skimerhorn

- **Media**

None

### **1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by the Committee Chairman, Mr. Olthoff, at 9:00 a.m. Quorum present.

### **2. Roll Call**

### **3. Public Comment**

Julie Kokos commented on the GLB Railroad.

Paul Gaspar commented on the GLB Railroad.

Dana Meyer commented on ZBA Case #16-04.

### **4. Approval of Minutes: February 17, 2016, April 20, 2016, & May 18, 2016**

The minutes were not ready.

### **5. Building**

- **Building Report - May 2016**

Mr. Skimerhorn reviewed and discussed the report with the committee.

**Mr. James made a motion to approve the building report, and Mr. Tripp seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.**

### **6. Zoning**

- **ZBA Case #16-03; request for Rezoning R1-Single Family Residential District to C2-General Commercial District on a parcel generally situated in Section 5 of Aroma Township. The petitioners are Dale Stang & Dennis Stang, property owners, and James Williams, applicant.**

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that the purpose of the rezoning is to allow Mr. Williams to re-open and reuse the property for a tavern and restaurant as it has been used for well over the last 40 years. The property has been zoned R1-Single Family since the County adopted zoning in 1967, and there is no record of why or how it was missed. The property has been in commercial use prior to that date. The Zoning Board of Appeals voted 5 to 0 to approve the rezoning.

Mr. Bossert stated that, back when the County had first adopted the zoning, they didn't have the same accuracy of mapping then like they do now and that large areas were zoned based off of the amount of uses in the area. The area was mostly residential, so it was all zoned as residential.

**Mr. James made a motion to approve the rezoning of the property, and Mr. Vickery seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.**

- **ZBA Case #16-04; request for Variances (2) to section to Section 121-286.c.1 (Distance between Driveways and Number of Driveways) on a parcel generally situated in Section 34 of Salina Township. The petitioners are Mike & Tammy Focken, property owners and applicants.**

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that originally the applicants asked for two variances, one for distance between driveways because they wanted to build a driveway that's 98 ft. instead of 100 ft. That one was withdrawn at the request of their attorney at the public hearing. The second variance was for the number of driveways in a 330 ft. interval. Based on the diagram, the applicant isn't allowed a second driveway due to the ordinance. Not only would the applicant like to build another driveway on the property, they would like to build a 24 X 24 garage at the end of that driveway. The purpose of the driveway is to back up a goose neck trailer and vehicles into the garage and driveway. Due to public comments, neighbors believe that the applicants want the driveway to park a semi-truck that could possibly contain hazardous materials. The applicant stated that her husband is a truck driver but has arrangements to park the truck elsewhere. The Zoning Board of Appeals voted 5 to 0 to deny. They voted against all four findings of fact and didn't believe the applicant was able to prove a hardship stating there were plenty of locations on the property where they could build a garage and still access it using the existing driveway; therefore, a second driveway wasn't warranted.

Mr. Tripp referenced the PowerPoint presentation and stated that, in the second measurement, there are two driveways there based off the diagram being shown.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that the second driveway was put in under a different set of rules in 1998. The next driveway, they have no record of it being put there. He also stated that, yes, the extra driveway met the rules back in 1998, but does not meet the rules of today.

Ms. Evans asked if the reason why the applicant cannot build the new driveway and garage on the property is due to the fact the owners went from a 10 acre home to a 5 acre home.

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals felt they can still have their building for storage and still use the existing driveway, and, therefore, didn't warrant the issuance of a variance. If the zoning ordinance is met, then a variance shouldn't be an issue and the ordinance allows a driveway for every 330 ft. of frontage.

Mr. James stated that he was involved in this driveway issue, and that his position is that if you buy 5 acres, you get one driveway. He cited safety concerns as the reason that the rules were put in place.

**Mr. Vickery made a motion to agree with the Zoning Boards of Appeals to deny the application, and Mr. James seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.**

## **7. Transportation**

- **Transportation Update**

Geoff Olson stated that we are getting another bus next week from our calendar year 2015 CVP application.

**8. Old Business**

Mr. Skimerhorn stated that they have received some additional information since the last time they spoke about the Great Lakes Basin Railroad. He referenced information that was presented at an earlier meeting, and discussed new statistics about the proposed railroad, and potential impacts to the County.

**9. New Business**

None

**10. Adjournment**

**Mr. James made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 10:07 a.m., and Mr. Tripp seconded it. Motion carried with a voice vote.**

Bill Olthoff, Committee Chairman  
Diane Owens, Executive Coordinator