

c) *Interested Property Owners:*

Secretary Passmore confirmed for the Board there were no calls and no letters received regarding this application.

Rebecca Elsamiller, property owner of 1700 E. Bremer Ave., stated she is in favor of the request as she and her husband own a 4.5 acre property to the west and are interested in the same variance process as it pertains to larger than allowed for accessory buildings for storage of commercial equipment in addition to personal items.

d) *Discussion:*

Dan Streicher, property owner, said his farm operation needs more storage and this shed would accommodate those needs. One of the existing buildings will be removed and be replaced by the proposed building, if approved for a variance. Mr. Streicher outlined the buildings are on the same property where his residence is and he owns land around his property with the residence which he farms.

Secretary Passmore clarified for Member Brown the City Code is silent on agriculturally zoned property as it pertains to size of accessory buildings allowed. Mr. Passmore stated the Code addresses accessory buildings as it pertains to single or two family dwellings regardless of zoning district and because of the residence located on the same property as the proposed accessory building, the interpretation by Staff is to consider the proposal towards the maximum square footage allowed for accessory buildings. Mr. Passmore stated in conversations with the property owner, there are multiple storage uses out of the existing accessory use buildings that include agricultural, commercial and personal storage and staff is counting the existing buildings used for various agricultural storage and other storage towards the total maximum allowed. Mr. Streicher stated his equipment to be stored includes a tractor, a dump truck and two company trucks for his construction business along with farm equipment and personal items.

Member Charlson stated he has a hard time to object to the proposal, being that the nature of the proposal incorporates storage of agricultural and other items. Mr. Charlson outlined the applicant may be able to apply to have the property re-zoned to M-1, Light Industrial, the adjacent zoning district, which does not have a size restriction for storage of contractor's equipment. Mr. Charlson stated he thinks the contractor equipment could be utilized by a farmer and therefore could be allowed to be viewed as agricultural storage, and the proposal appears to be the same appearance as that of agricultural building storage units placed elsewhere.

Member Brown stated a similar case was turned down for a detached building and a building permit was later resubmitted to be attached to the residence and was approved in that manner, although the amount of land was less than the size of this property.

Mr. Passmore clarified for Ms. Shea the literal enforcement of definition of accessory building is being discussed and not a hardship in this case.

**Board of Adjustment Minutes
June 14, 2010**

Member Shea stated she is not comfortable with allowing for storage of the outlined items of bobcats, company trucks, and dirt moving equipment for agricultural purposes in lieu of for commercial purposes as she thinks the Board should focus on the size of the building, not necessarily what will be stored within the structure.

Mr. Passmore stated the application is for part of the building to be used for agricultural storage and being that the Land Use Map shows this area as residential, and it is zoned A-1, Agricultural, there may be similar requests proposed and staff will have to bring forward requests for agricultural storage requests due to farmers wishing to place large buildings to house large agricultural equipment. Ms. Shea stated she thinks that since hearing the arguments presented a of need to store large equipment used in farming, and the Land Use Map shows this area as residential, staff has no choice but to bring this forward not for a hardship review, but for an interpretation on a case-by-case basis and thinks this case for variance should be approved based upon the facts presented.

e) Motion by the Board:

Motion By: Shea

Seconded By: Charlson

Move that a variance to allow 1718 E. Bremer Ave. to exceed the size and height regulations for single family dwelling accessory structures for the current plan of a 60'x120' machine shed be approved.

Yes: 4

No: 0

Absent: 1

E. Old Business: None

F. New Business: None

G. Adjournment:

Motion By: Charlson

Seconded By: Shea

That the Board of Adjustment meeting be adjourned.

Yes: 4

No: 0

Absent: 1