

Goodhue County Board of Adjustment Government Center- Board Room 509 West 5th St, Red Wing MN 55066

Virtual Meeting Notice

Virtual Meeting Notice: The Goodhue County Board of Adjustment will be conducting a meeting on October 25, 2021 at 5:00 p.m. Due to concerns surrounding the spread of COVID-19, the meeting and all public hearings will be conducted by telephone or other electronic means.

The public may monitor the meeting from a remote site by logging into https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/641353125 or calling 1-866-899-4679 beginning at 4:50 PM or any time during the meeting. Access Code: 641-353-125

Public Comments: Interested persons must submit comments by phone, in writing, or via email until noon on Monday, October 25, 2021. To submit your comments please email them to samantha.pierret@co.goodhue.mn.us or mail them to the Land Use Management Department at 509 West 5th Street, Red Wing, MN 55066. Comments received by this deadline will be read into the record during the public hearing for that item, including name and address.

Call Meeting To Order

Approval Of Current Agenda

Approval Of Previous Month's Meeting Minutes

1. August 23, 2021 BOA Meeting Minutes

Documents:

#### BOAMEETINGMINUTES\_AUGUST\_DRAFT.PDF

Conflict/Disclosure Of Interests

PUBLIC HEARING: Request For Variance To Minimum Setback Standards Request for Variance, submitted by Kevin and Kim Flueger (Owners), to A-2 Zoning District standards to construct an attached garage addition less than 60 feet from the Flueger Road Right-of-Way. Parcel 34.010.0601. 29880 Flower Valley Road, Red Wing, MN 55066. Part of the NW ¼ of the NE ¼ of Section 10 TWP 112 Range 14 in Hay Creek Township. Documents:

#### BOAPACKET\_FLUEGER\_REDACTED.PDF

Other-Discussion

Adjourn

Anyone interested is invited to attend. Agenda items may be subject to change.

## **Goodhue County Land Use Management**

- \* Goodhue County Government Center \* 509 West Fifth Street \* Red Wing \* Minnesota \* 55066 \*
  - \* Building \* Planning \* Zoning \* Telephone: 651/385-3104 \* Fax: 651/385-3106 \*

The meeting of the Goodhue County Board of Adjustment was called to order at 5:00 PM by Chair Knott in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor Board Room of the Goodhue County Government Center in Red Wing.

## **Roll Call**

Commissioners Present: Daniel Knott, Rich Ellingsberg, Darwin Fox, Denny Tebbe, and Randy Rechtzigel

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Zoning Administrator Samantha Pierret, Zoning Assistant Alexandra Koberoski, and Zoning Administrative Assistant Kathy Bauer

### 1. Approval of Agenda

<sup>1</sup>Motion by Commissioner Fox, and seconded by Commissioner Ellingsberg to approve the meeting agenda.

## Motion carried 5:0

## 2. Approval of Minutes

<sup>2</sup>Motion by Commissioner Ellingsberg and seconded by Commissioner Fox to approve the previous month's meeting minutes.

## Motion carried 4:0 (Commissioner Tebbe abstained)

## 3. Conflict/Disclosure of Interest

There were no conflicts of interest reported

## 4. <u>Public Hearings</u>:

**<u>PUBLIC HEARING</u>**: Request for Variance, submitted by Zachary O'Reilly (owner) to A-1 Zoning District standards to allow parcel line reconfiguration creating property lines closer than 30-feet from existing structures and closer than 100-feet from a livestock building.

Pierret presented the staff report and attachments. Pierret added if there is hesitation from the board to approve this item because of the shed that is bisected on the property line, an easement could be recorded by the applicant for that 13 feet, which would then be removed once the building was demolished or destroyed. Alternatively, a document drawn up by Land Use Management Staff and signed by Zachary and Benjamin O'Reilly could be recorded stating that upon demolition or destruction of the existing hay structure, a new structure must be constructed entirely on one parcel and the building would meet all required setbacks.

Zachary O'Reilly (applicant) added the 12-13 feet is an overhang on the storage building.

Chair Knott clarified the 12-13 feet is more of an overhang and is open below, more akin to an overhead shelter with the footings of the structure on the property line.

O'Reilly noted it is a 40-year-old building.

Commissioner Ellingsberg questioned if it was a pole building.

O'Reilly answered it was a pole building.

Chair Knott opened the Public Hearing.

No one spoke for or against the request.

<sup>3</sup>After Chair Knott asked three times for comments it was moved by Commissioner Fox

### and seconded by Commissioner Tebbe to close the Public Hearing.

## Motion carried 5:0

Commissioner Ellingsberg added the shed is very old, and it sounds as though the O'Reilly's are willing to comply with the removal of it at some point; he agrees with the option to approve the Variance with a condition upon removal by the Board. He questioned if there was a timeline for the removal.

Chair Knott questioned whether the Board wanted the hay storage structure to be removed now. He questioned how the Board would account for the building once the Variance is approved.

Pierret stated the surveyor could include an easement for the 12-13 feet where the structure is located.

Chair Knott noted the options were to add a condition to approval or have an easement recorded.

Pierret stated another option would be to have staff prepare a document to be signed by both Zachary and Benjamin O'Reilly stating that the storage structure could remain until it is destroyed or demolished. The agreement would state that once this happened, the new building would have to meet setbacks on a single parcel.

Commissioner Rechtzigel noted he agreed with staff drawing up the document for the property owners that once removed, any new potential structure would have to meet setbacks on a single parcel.

Chair Knott asked if a notation can be added to the motion for staff to work with the owners to draw up the said document.

Pierret agreed.

## <sup>4</sup>Motion by Fox, seconded by Ellingsberg, for the Board of Adjustment to:

- adopt the staff report into the record;
- adopt the findings of fact;
- accept the application, testimony, exhibits, and other evidence presented into the record; and

<u>APPROVE</u> the request submitted by Zachary O'Reilly (owner) to A-1 Zoning District standards to allow the east property line of PID 31.032.0600 to be located no closer than 9.7-feet from existing structures and to allow an existing livestock building to be no closer than 37.3 feet from the east property line of proposed Parcel B. An existing Covered Hay Storage structure shall retain 13.0-feet on Parcel 31.032.0600 and the east property line of newly created Parcel A shall be no closer than 17.2-feet from existing structures. All as depicted on the submitted survey dated October 20, 2020. In addition, staff prepare an agreement to be signed by Zachary and Benjamin O'Reilly and recorded with the Variance stating that should the structure that is bisected by the proposed property line of Parcel B be demolished or destroyed, it must be rebuilt on one of the parcels and meet the appropriate setbacks.

## Motion carried 5:0

**<u>PUBLIC HEARING:</u>** Request for Variance, submitted by Zachary O'Reilly (Owner), to Article 13 (Confined Feedlot Regulations) setback standards to allow a feedlot to be established within 1000-feet or 94% odor annoyance-free rating (as determined by the odor OFFSET model) of existing dwellings.

*Pierret presented the staff report and attachments.* 

## Chair Knott opened the Public Hearing.

No one spoke for or against the request.

# <sup>5</sup>After Chair Knott asked three times for comments it was moved by Ellingsberg and seconded by Tebbe to close the public hearing.

## Motion carried 5:0

## <sup>6</sup>Motion by Tebbe, seconded by Fox, for the Board of Adjustment to:

- adopt the staff report into the record;
- adopt the findings of fact;
- accept the application, testimony, exhibits, and other evidence presented into the record; and

<u>APPROVE</u> the request submitted by Zachary O'Reilly (owner) to Article 13 (Confined Feedlot Regulations) setback standards to allow a registered feedlot to be no closer than 149-feet from neighboring dwellings and to allow a feedlot to be located no less than 92% odor annoyance-free rating (as determined by the OFFSET model) to the dwelling on parcel 31.032.0600.

## Motion carried 5:0

## PUBLIC HEARING: Request for Variance to A2 District Density Standards (Irvin)

Request for Variance, submitted by James Irvin (Owner), to A2 Zoning District density standards to allow construction of a second dwelling in the SW 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of Section 03 TWP 111 Range 14 in Belvidere Township where maximum dwelling density has been met.

Pierret presented the staff report and attachments.

Commissioner Tebbe asked if the applicant didn't own the parcel to the north, would the recommendation from staff be different.

Pierret stated it would not. If an applicant does not own property in another 1/4 1/4, staff would not permit an additional dwelling in the area.

Chair Knott added in regards to the wording on the application, it states the applicants would like to give up their building site on the hill and build one in the wooded area. Chair Knott asked for clarification on the statement that the intent is to retain the existing dwelling site and add another.

The applicant agreed that was the intent.

## Chair Knott opened the Public Hearing.

Henry Thomforde with Belvidere Township Board stated he sees no reason in not granting the Variance. To build a driveway through the valley to where a new dwelling is allowed makes no sense versus constructing a driveway where the applicant would like to build to the south; there would be cropland that would be lost going to the northern ¼ ¼. Further stated the proposed location is a better location than the open ¼ ¼ section. Added this was the consensus of the Belvedere Town Board.

Dan Tipcke (farms neighboring cropland on Bruce Tipcke property) stated the north ¼ ¼ section would be unbuildable due to the location of blufflands; it is very steep on that section of the property. He feels as though the Irvin's did a lot of research to put it in their desired location.

# <sup>7</sup>After Chair Knott asked three times for additional comments it was moved by Tebbe and seconded by Rechtzigel to close the public hearing.

### Motion carried 5:0

Commissioner Tebbe said he understands the statement Tipcke made with the applicants wanting to

put the driveway in the proposed location. Further stated the applicant having the support from Belvidere Town Board also means a lot. Questioned if the Irvin's would be open to giving up density from the other land they own.

*Pierret replied the applicants proposed transferring the density from the northern 1/4 1/4 to the desired location; leaving the northwest 1/4 of the southeast 1/4 unbuildable.* 

Commissioner Tebbe noted the total density wouldn't change much.

Pierret stated the density permitted in the whole section would stay at 12.

Chair Knott questioned what the current density in the section is.



Pierret replied the current density is at 8. She added that before the maximum density definition was added to the Ordinance, transferring development rights was done when someone owned land in an open ¼¼ to permit a dwelling to be constructed in an occupied ¼¼ by claiming the density from the open ¼¼. To avoid having so many density Variances, the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) and Conservation Subdivision uses were created over time.

Commissioner Fox added back in 2000 as a member of the BOA, there were a lot of density transfers. It was difficult for staff at the time to keep track of density trading where a dwelling was permitted and where it was not. At that time, all of the townships were asked about changing the density of the A2 District, and most Townships, including Belvidere Township, responded they preferred to keep the regulations as they were.

Pierret added the Accessory Dwelling Unit and Conservation Subdivision standards were established to avoid variance requests.

Commissioner Fox stated he applauded staff for giving options and recommendations to the applicant, and for following what is in the Comprehensive Plan as he has worked on many subcommittees to come up with the best options for the townships; therefore he supports staffs recommendation to deny this request.

Chair Knott noted in the language of the Maximum Density Ordinance, the use of variances is not supported. It specifically gives other recommendations but does not mention a variance.

Commissioner Tebbe added he understands the density issue but in our Townships and our County, most of the land is not flat; would be nice to interject some common sense into the ordinance. A shorter driveway in a different location makes more sense than running an easement through it just to conform to the density requirement. Stated in an instance where he sees these kinds of situations and concerns, he can support it; also supports densities and trying to preserve them and the farmland. He understands the applicant's request.

Commissioner Rechtzigel agreed with Commissioner Tebbe's statement. Stated if the section was full and was at the maximum density of 12 in the section and the request was to increase to 13 dwellings, he could see denying it; but this section is not full, the ¼¼ section is full. Commissioner Rechtzigel is in favor of the request. Feels the Conservation District is a poor solution for density increases. Questioned whether any townships have accepted a Conservation Subdivision.

Pierret stated Leon Township has accepted one.

Commissioner Tebbe asked if the request is approved, how could the recommendation from LUM staff be worded?

Pierret stated they would change the recommendation from DENY to APPROVE; they would be allowed to establish a second dwelling in the ¼ ¼ section of Belvidere Township. If the Board wanted to approve this they could add a condition that the dwelling density in the northwest ¼ of the southeast ¼ be considered "occupied" by the new dwelling.

Commissioner Fox asked how this would take place; is there a way to track this information for the future.

Pierret stated it would be noted in the county GIS internal mapping, it would show the dwelling site was occupied, the date of when the Variance was approved, the recorded document, etc. It does take some research from staff if a future owner questioned the buildability of the 1/4 1/4 however everything would be recorded and placed into internal files.

## <sup>8</sup>Motion by Tebbe, seconded by Rechtzigel, for the Board of Adjustment to:

- adopt the staff report into the record;
- adopt the findings of fact;
- accept the application, testimony, exhibits, and other evidence presented into the record; and

**APPROVE** the variance request, submitted by James Irvin, to A2 dwelling density standards limiting dwellings to one per original <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> section to allow the establishment of a second dwelling in the SW <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of the SE <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of Section 03 of Belvidere Township, in addition, the dwelling eligibility of the northwest <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of the southeast <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of Section 03 in Belvidere Township shall be considered "occupied" by the new dwelling in the southwest <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of the southeast <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>.

## Motion failed 2:3. (Commissioners Fox, Ellingsberg, and Knott dissenting)

Commissioner Rechtigel asked if it was a family member that is wanting to build on this parcel.

The Applicant stated their daughter wanted to take over the farm and move her children to the country.

Commissioner Rechtzigel questioned if building another dwelling within 100-feet was an option [ADU criteria].

Pierret stated for zoning it is an option. She could not speak to the buildability of the land within 100feet of the existing dwelling. The Irvin's could apply for a building permit for an ADU and staff would administratively approve that request.

Chair Knott asked if rezoning was an option.

Pierret stated that a request to rezone the parcel would need to go to the Planning Advisory Commission. This property is within an A-2 section, surrounded by A-2 and A-1 sections. The Planning Advisory Commission has made it clear that rezoning to R-1 in the middle of an agricultural district surrounded by agricultural uses is not going to be looked on favorably. Pierret noted it would most likely be denied by the Planning Advisory Commission and the County Board.

## 9Motion by Ellingsberg, seconded by Fox, for the Board of Adjustment to:

- adopt the staff report into the record;
- adopt the findings of fact;
- accept the application, testimony, exhibits, and other evidence presented into the record; and

**DENY** the variance request, submitted by James Irvin, to A2 dwelling density standards limiting dwellings to one per original <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> section to allow the establishment of a second dwelling in the SW <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of the SE <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> of Section 03 of Belvidere Township.

## Motion carried 3:2 (Commissioners Tebbe and Rechtzigel dissenting)

## 6. Other-Discussion

Pierret stated there are no items at this time on the September 27<sup>th</sup> BOA agenda. If there is a September meeting, it will be going back to the virtual format.

## ADJOURN

## <sup>10</sup>Motion by Tebbe, seconded by Fox to adjourn the BOA meeting at 6:17 p.m.

#### Motion carried 5:0

Respectfully submitted:

Kathy Bauer, Zoning Administrative Assistant

### **MOTIONS**

<sup>1</sup> APPROVE the meeting agenda. Motion carried 5:0 <sup>2</sup> APPROVE the previous meeting's minutes. Motion carried 4:0, Tebbe abstained <sup>3</sup>Close the Public Hearing. Motion carried 5:0 <sup>4</sup>APPROVE for O'Reilly Variance Request to Minimum Setback Standards Motion carried 5:0 5Close Public Hearing. Motion carried 5:0 6APPROVE for O'Reilly Variance request for Feedlot Setback Standards Motion carried 5:0 <sup>7</sup>Close Public Hearing. Motion 5:0 <sup>8</sup>APPROVE Irvin Variance request A-2 District Density Standards. Motion failed 2:3 (Fox, Ellingsberg, and Knott dissenting) <sup>9</sup>DENY Irvin Variance request A-2 District Density Standards. Motion approved 3:2 (Tebbe and Rechtzigel dissenting) <sup>10</sup>ADJOURN. Motion carried 5:0

## **Goodhue County Land Use Management**

Goodhue County Government Center | 509 West Fifth Street | Red Wing, Minnesota 55066

Lisa M. Hanni, L.S. Director

Building | Planning | Zoning Telephone: 651.385.3104 Fax: 651.385.3106



County Surveyor / Recorder

Environmental Health | Land Surveying | GIS Telephone: 651.385.3223 Fax: 651.385.3098

To: Board of Adjustment From: Land Use Management Meeting Date: October 25, 2021 Report date: October 8, 2021

**<u>PUBLIC HEARING</u>**: Request for Variance, submitted by Kim and Kevin Flueger (Owners) to A-2 Zoning District standards to allow a garage addition to be constructed less than 60 feet from Flueger RD Right-of-Way.

## Application Information:

Applicant(s): Kim and Kevin Flueger (Owners) Address of zoning request: 29880 Flower Valley Rd. Parcel: 34.010.0601 Abbreviated Legal Description: Part of the NW ¼ of the NE ¼ of Section 10 TWP 112 Range 14 in Hay Creek Township. Township Information: Hay Creek Township approved a variance for the project at their September 16<sup>th</sup>, 2021 meeting. Zoning District: A-2 (Agricultural District)

## Attachments and Links:

Application and submitted project summary Survey/Site Plan Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance: http://www.co.goodhue.mn.us/DocumentCenter/View/2428

## **Background:**

Kim and Kevin Flueger (Owners) have applied for a variance to A-2 minimum setback standards to construct a proposed 16-foot by 34.7-foot garage addition on the west side of the existing dwelling. The proposed addition would be 36.9-feet from the Flueger RD Right-of-Way line at its closest point where 60 feet is required.

### Variance Standards:

Variances shall only be permitted when they are in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Goodhue County Zoning Ordinance and when consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan. Variances may be granted when the applicant establishes "practical difficulties" exist in complying with the existing official controls. Practical difficulties mean the applicant proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by an official control, the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner, and the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality. Economic considerations alone do not constitute practical difficulties.

## **Draft Findings of Fact:**

- 1) Harmony with the general purposes and intent of the official control:
  - Property line and Right-of-Way setbacks are intended to create separation among adjacent structures and roads to allow for adequate access and accommodate future road expansion.
  - The existing home is located 52.9 feet from the Flueger RD Right-of-Way and is an existing non-conforming structure. Locating the addition 36.9-feet from the Right-of-Way is not

anticipated to further impede future road expansion or on-going maintenance. This request appears in harmony with the purpose and intent of the official control.

## 2) The variance request is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan:

• The Goodhue County Comprehensive Plan supports the use of existing rural residences to provide rural living opportunities in the unincorporated areas of Goodhue County.

The proposed garage addition appears consistent with the Goodhue County Comprehensive Plan.

- 3) There are "practical difficulties" in complying with the official control (the applicant proposes to use the property in a reasonable manner not permitted by an official control, the plight of the landowner is due to circumstances unique to the property not created by the landowner, and the variance, if granted, will not alter the essential character of the locality):
  - The Applicant's request to construct a garage addition is a reasonable use of property in the A-2 District. The addition, as proposed, would meet all other required setbacks.
  - The parcel is a non-conforming size at 1.5-acres (2-acre minimum in A-2 District).
  - The Applicants stated that there are no alternative locations for the garage addition due to the size of the parcel, existing dwelling configuration, and the existing topography, which consists of steep slopes classified as Blufflands and Shoreland.
  - The Applicants considered a lesser variance that would result in a 14-foot by 34.7-foot garage addition, however this size would not accommodate the needed size for storage.
  - The property is surrounded by A-2 zoned properties on all sides owned by Edward Flueger to the east and south, Eric Sloan to the west across Flueger RD, and Matthew Hardyman to the north across Flower Valley RD.
  - The request appears unlikely to alter the essential character of the locality.

# 4) No variance may be granted that would allow any use that is not allowed in the zoning district in which the subject property is located.

• Attached garage additions are a permitted use in the A-2 Zoning District. The request does not constitute a use variance.

# The draft Findings of Fact shall be amended to reflect concerns conveyed at the Board of Adjustment meeting and public hearing.

The Board should specify the facts and reasons that are the basis of the Board's determination. In granting a variance, the Board of Adjustment may impose conditions directly related to, and bearing a rough proportionality with, the impact(s) created by the variance.

### **Staff Recommendation:**

- adopt the staff report into the record;
- adopt the findings of fact;
- accept the application, testimony, exhibits, and other evidence presented into the record; and

**APPROVE** the request for a variance, submitted by Kim and Kevin Flueger (Owners) to A-2 Zoning District standards to allow construction of a garage addition 36.9-feet from the Flueger RD Right-of-Way.

	R ⊨CEIVED	
APPLICATION FOR	OCT 7 2021	For Staff Use only
L	and Use Managem	VARIANCE NUMBER:         Z21-0049           \$350 RECEIPT#         179910           DATE         10/7
LEGALDESCRIPTION: 34010.0601	1	ZIP CODE: S506 Attack
PID#: ZONING DIS	TRICT LOT AREA (SF/ACRES): LOT D	DIMENSIONS: STRUCTURE DIMENSIONS (if applicable): 16 × 34.7
APPLICANTOR AUTHORIZED AGENTSNAME KIML+KEVINCFlus APPLICANTS ADDRESS 29880 - Hower Vall Red Wing Mrs	lin Kd	
PROPERTY OWNER'S NAME Same as Above Samuel PROPERTY OWNER'S ADDRESS:		
Same		EMAIL: Same
CONTACT FOR PROJECT INFORMATION:		
ADUKESS: ADUKESS: Same		EMAIL:
Property Line Setbacks	hat apply) ot Coverage ff Setbacks BUILDING APP	R PREVIOUSUSE: Welling & attached garage USE: NO DODED addition garage PPLICATION PERMIT NO: (Iffiled) DATE FILED: DATE FILED:
Ĵ	oreland Setbacks	
TOWNSHIP SIGNATURE: By signing this form, the Township acknowledg In no way does signing this application indicat TOWNSHIP OFFICAL'S SIGNATURE	te the Township's position on the var	
By signing below, the applicant acknowled 1. The undersigned is the owner or autho 2. The information presented is true and 3. If I am unable to be present at the hear 4. Additional information or applications	orized agent of the owner of this correct to the best of myknowle ing where my request is acted up	

Applicant's Signature:_	Kim Shuger	_
Print name:	Kim Flueger	

38

Date: 10/7/21

\_\_\_ (owner or authorized agent)

#### REQUEST SUMMARY

Please cite the Ordinance Article(s) and Section(s) you are requesting a variance from:

 Article:\_\_\_\_\_
 Section:\_\_\_\_\_
 Name:\_\_\_\_\_

 Article:\_\_\_\_\_
 Section:\_\_\_\_\_\_
 Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_

#### SUPPORTING INFORMATION & JUSTIFICATION

You, or your agent, bear the burden of providing information to convince the Board to rule in your favor. Please provide answers to the following questions in the spaces below or in an attached document. You may also attach any additional supporting documentation you desire the board to review.

Discuss your current use of the property and the reason for your variance request:

durell. atta T. neger RA

Describe the effects on the property if the variance is not granted:

none

imable to do garage ad

Describe any unique physical limitations that exist on your property, not generally found on others, which prevent you from complying with the provisions of the current ordinance:

our lot less alla un - Changed KC When bles

NO

Discuss alternatives you considered that comply with existing standards. If compliant alternatives exist, provide your reasoning for rejecting them:

Discuss alternatives you considered that would require a lesser variance. If you rejected such alternatives, provide your reasoning:

lesser width don

In your opinion, do you think the granting of your variance request would alter the "essential character" of the neighborhood/area?:

## MAP 01: PROPERTY OVERVIEW



## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Public Hearing October 25, 2021

Kim and Kevin Flueger (Owners) A-2 District

Part of the NW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 10 TWP 112 Range 14 in Hay Creek Township

Variance request to construct a garage addition 36.9-feet from the Right-Of-Way where 60-feet is required.



2020 Aerial Imagery Map Created October, 2021 by LUM

## MAP 02: VICINITY MAP



## BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Public Hearing October 25, 2021

Kim and Kevin Flueger (Owners) A-2 District

Part of the NW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 10 TWP 112 Range 14 in Hay Creek Township

Variance request to construct a garage addition 36.9-feet from the Right-Of-Way where 60-feet is required.



2020 Aerial Imagery Map Created October, 2021 by LUM



## MAP 03: ELEVATIONS



## **BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

Public Hearing October 25, 2021

Kim and Kevin Flueger (Owners) A-2 District

Part of the NW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of Section 10 TWP 112 Range 14 in Hay Creek Township

Variance request to construct a garage addition 36.9-feet from the Right-Of-Way where 60-feet is required.



DATA DISCLAIMER: Goodhue County assumes NO liability for the accuracy or completeness of this map OR responsibility for any associated direct, indirect, or consequential damages that may result from its use or misuse. Goodhue County Copyright 2021.  $\ N$ 

2020Aerial Imagery Map Created October, 2021 by LUM



former County Road Number 45, (now a Township Road), also being an angle point in the southeasterly line of said parcel A, described below; thence southeasterly and

southerly along said centerline to the intersection with a line bearing North 89 degrees 55 minutes 46 seconds West from the point of beginning; thence South 89 degrees 55 minutes 46 seconds East to the point of beginning.

Subject to a roadway easement over, under and across that part of the westerly side thereof, taken by former County Road Number 45, (now a Township Road) and subject to all other easements and restrictions of record.

Parcel A (Parcel A is included herein for reference only and is not being conveyed by this deed.)

That part of the Northwest Quarter of the Northeast Quarter of said Section 10, described as follows:

Beginning at the northwest corner of the Northeast Quarter of said Section, running thence east 19 chains and 94 links, thence south 5 chains, thence south 62 degrees 30' west 9 chains and 87 links, thence south 27 degrees west 11 chains and 75 links to the south line of the Northwest Quarter (NW 1/4) of said Northeast Quarter (NE 1/4), thence west 5 chains and 90 links to the west line of said quarter section, thence north 20 chains to the place of beginning. EXCEPT that part lying southerly of the centerline of Goodhue County Road No. 45.

PATH: S/SHARE/STR/CERTS/112-14/10/KC FLUEGER/KC FLUEGER 2021.DWG

CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY FOR: K.C. & KIM FLUEGER	I hereby certify that this survey, plan or report was prepared by me or under my direct supervision and that I am a duly Licensed Land Surveyor under the laws of the State of Minnesota.
JOHNSON & SCOFIELD INC. SURVEYING AND ENGINEERING	Marcus S. Johnson Minnesota License No. 47460 Date: September 30, 2021
1203 MAIN STREET, RED WING, MN 55066 (651) 388-1558	BK. NA PG. NA W.O.# DRAWING NUMBER SHEET 1 OF 1 SHEETS 21-986 S-9780