

The Muscatine County Board of Adjustment held a virtual GoToMeeting on Friday, December 4, 2020, with Chairperson Carol Schlueter and members Emily Geertz, Janelle Spies and Tom Harper present, Charles Clark was absent. Eric S. Furnas, Planning, Zoning & Environmental Administrator and Dixie Seitz, Office Administrator also attended.

Present for this hearing: Diane Bouchard.

Carol Schlueter: I will open this virtual meeting and read the opening statement. The Zoning Board of Adjustment is a quasi-judicial board appointed by the Muscatine County Board of Supervisors. The Board's purpose is to interpret the Zoning Ordinance and to allow certain limited exceptions and variances where special conditions or hardships exist. We are an independent volunteer board of citizens and not part of the county administration. There are five members on the Board. State law requires three affirmative votes to approve any appeal under consideration, no matter how many members are present. If fewer than five members are present, the appellant has the opportunity to have the appeal delayed until the next meeting. This request must be made prior to Board deliberation of that case. As a Board of the County, we welcome all testimony. We make our decision based on the facts and evidence under county code, presented in open meeting. We ask that if you wish to speak, please give your name and address. Okay, we need to approve the minutes as written from the last meeting, you all received them through email. If there are no changes, is there a motion to approve them as written?

Emily Geertz: I will make a motion to approve the minutes as written.

Carol Schlueter: Is there a second?

Janelle Spies: I will second the motion.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, there has been to approve the minutes and it has been seconded. All in favor please say Aye (4) Opposed (0) Absent (Clark). It has passed. Eric, would you please read the first request?

Eric Furnas: Case #20-12-01. An application has been filed by Francis S. and Diane M. Bouchard, Record Owners. This property is located in Montpelier Township, in the SE¼ of Sec. 22-T77N-R1E, Tract Between the Railroad and River, Government Lot #1, 3776 Midway Beach Road, containing approximately 0.36 acres and is zoned R-2 Residential District. This request, if approved, would allow the Zoning Administrator to issue a Variance in order to replace the existing detached garage with a new 1,250 sq. ft. detached garage in the front yard space, located only 25 feet from the front lot line instead of the required 35 foot setback, and with a waiver of the elevation requirements for detached accessory structures over 600 sq. ft. This request was tabled from the November, 2020, hearing.

Carol Schlueter: Thank you Eric. Was there any correspondence in regards to this request?

Eric Furnas: No ma'am.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, would the applicant please state your name and tell us what you are wanting today?

Diane Bouchard: Yes, this is Diane Bouchard. I am requesting that you issue a Variance so that we don't have to have the elevation that is required by FEMA. It would be almost three foot in the air. We need to replace the existing garage, it is not in good shape. We'd like to have a 1,250 sq. ft. garage.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you. This is Carol again. I forgot to tell you, since we only have four members present today a tie vote would be a no vote. You have the option of continuing with the four members or having us table this until the next month when we may have five members, but we're not sure. It's up to you. You need to ask us to table your request before we vote on it. Do you wish to continue?

Diane Bouchard: Yes, I'm fine.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, board members... do you have any questions or concerns?

Tom Harper: So if I read this correctly, your request is to ... the first one is a Variance from the front lot line setback but then the other Variance is for a waiver from the elevation requirements. How much below the flood plain requirement are you planning on building this?

Diane Bouchard: Well everyone on Midway Beach has an existing garage and ours is bad, it's not even insured, that's how bad it is. In order to drive into it the way it is now, you would have to have four-wheel drive. We are planning on putting up four concrete walls with those flood vents in them, the way they are in our house right now.

Eric Furnas: Madam Chairperson, would you like me to kind of go into a little more detail, since this one is a little different and involves the flood plain?

Carol Schlueter: Yes, please do so.

Eric Furnas: Okay, so as the applicant explained and in the introduction that I read, there is one part of the Variance that they requesting to be allowed to replace an existing garage and place the new one only 25 feet from the front lot line. That doesn't change, that is the approximate distance that the current garage already is. If you look at the map, that is the layout in most of the neighborhood, with the dwellings being closer to the river and the garages right off of Midway Beach Road. So that really would not change. There wouldn't be anything closer to Midway Beach Road than there already is. The garage would be enlarged considerably, however, the enlargement would extend towards the river, not any closer to the road. And then secondly, the flood plain elevation thing is not something that the Board of Adjustment typically sees, however, it is one of the powers that the Board of Adjustment ... since it's a Variance from the flood plain restrictions, the Board of Adjustment can approve. Normally any detached structure like a garage that is over 600 sq. ft., according to newer FEMA guidelines, would be required to have the floor height at least one foot above the base flood elevation. You don't see too many garages out in this area that have that... they were all constructed prior to those FEMA regulations or are smaller than 600 sq. ft. In order to achieve that in this case, it would require that the site be elevated between three and four feet and the garage floor would be three to four feet above the existing grade. As you can see with the narrow lot width, to construct and to pour an approach to the garage at an appropriate slope, the approach of the garage would have to go way into the neighbor's or it would be very very steep. I've talked extensively with the DNR, because they are required to approve any Variance that you would choose to grant as well. They advised that so long as the portion of the garage that is down in the flood plain, the first few feet of it is constructed with flood resistant materials. In this case, the Bouchard's plan on pouring a concrete knee wall up at least to the flood plain height and then start their wood framing from there. The garage floor itself would be down in the flood plain. This is an acceptable construction method. There would have to be a flood vent installed that could allow water to flow through so that damage does not occur to the structure from hydraulic pressure and any light switches or electrical could be up out of the flood plain as well. That's kind of the breakdown on this. I know it's a little different. But just keep

in mind, if you grant the Variance, if that is your desire, that then it should also indicate that it would be conditional upon DNR concurrence as well.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you Eric. Board members, do you have any other questions on comments on this request?

Janelle Spies: Yeah, this is Janelle. Eric, they won't have any problems insuring this?

Eric Furnas: They may... that's up to the lender. Because of the floor elevation, there will not be an elevation certificate issued like there is a house that is normally elevated above the flood plain. Because the lowest enclosed floor space will be down in the flood plain, however, it has to be constructed to resist floatation and hydraulic pressure and damage from water. So you can't put any lumber down in there, that's why they are putting it up on a three foot stem wall. But yeah, there may be insurance issues, which are only required by a lender. So if there is no mortgage or borrowed money, flood insurance isn't required on a detached structure. But there could be issues or cost increases, yes.

Emily Geertz: This is Emily. I was just going to say, Eric, you clarified the questions that I had about the elevation and the base flood. Then I can also see that the setback is consistent with all of the garages in the area. It seems like there really isn't an alternative to this and this is a hardship. I don't have any problem with it as long as, like you said, in the motion that we say that it is concurrent with the DNR approval.

Tom Harper: Yeah, I was going to say... that answers all of my questions.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, if everyone is satisfied with all of the information that we've been given, does somebody care to make a motion in regards to this request?

Janelle Spies: This is Janelle. I move that we approve the Variance in order to replace the existing garage with a new 1,250 sq. ft. detached garage in the front yard space located only 25 feet from the front lot line, instead of the required 50 foot setback and also with the waiver of the elevation requirement for detached accessory structures over 600 sq. ft., and that it be conditional upon approval of the DNR.

Carol Schlueter: Is there a second?

Emily Geertz: I will second the motion.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, it's been moved and seconded that we approve this Variance as stated. Is there other questions or comments? I will have a roll call vote. Janelle?

Janelle Spies: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: Tom?

Tom Harper: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: Emily?

Emily Geertz: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: And I vote Aye. So it has passed. (Ayes-4; Nay-0; Absent-Clark)

Eric Furnas: Okay, so for those attending for the Bouchard case, this needs to be reviewed by the Board of Supervisors. They have the authority to either remand it back for further consideration or they can just accept it as is. You will get a notice of when that is on the Board of Supervisors agenda. It probably will be

the following Monday, which looks like the 14th of December, but we will let you know. You are not required to attend that meeting, but we will send you a letter concerning the outcome of the meeting. You are also not required to attend the rest of this Board of Adjustment meeting, however, you are more than welcome to still continue because it is a public meeting.

Diane Bouchard: Thank you Eric. Thank you members.

Carol Schlueter: You are welcome.

MUSCATINE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
By Eric S. Furnas, Planning, Zoning & Environmental Administrator

The Muscatine County Board of Adjustment held a virtual GoToMeeting on Friday, December 4, 2020, with Chairperson Carol Schlueter and members Emily Geertz, Janelle Spies and Tom Harper present, Charles Clark was absent. Eric S. Furnas, Planning, Zoning & Environmental Administrator and Dixie Seitz, Office Administrator also attended.

Present for this hearing: Gavin Curtis and Courtney Curtis.

Carol Schlueter: Eric, can you please read the next request?

Eric Furnas: Case #20-12-02. An application has been filed by Gavin L. or Courtney M. Curtis, Record Owners. This property is located in Lake Township, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ of Sec. 8-T77N-R2W, Tract A, 2335 Nye Avenue, containing approximately 4.33 acres, and is zoned A-1 Agricultural District. This request, if approved, would allow the Zoning Administrator to issue a Variance in order to build an addition onto the dwelling only 32 feet from the front lot line, instead of the required 50 foot setback.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you, was there any correspondence?

Eric Furnas: Madam Chairperson, I will tell you that I don't have any written correspondence, however in the beginning there was some phone calls and some questions from one of the neighbors. But I don't have anything that was officially submitted to the board in the form of an official correspondence.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you. Would the applicant please state your name and tell the board what you are requesting today?

Courtney Curtis: This is Courtney Curtis. We were hoping to be able to do a bedroom addition off the side of the home. When we were moving forward with it, our house actually is only 32 foot from road access lane. So we have to file a Variance in order to go ahead and add that addition.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you. Board members, do you have any questions or comments?

Emily Geertz: This is Emily, I don't have any questions.

Carol Schlueter: Eric, do you want to add your comments?

Eric Furnas: Sure, as you can see from the aerial photograph in your packet, there should be at least two of them and I also have it up on my screen for those of you on the computer. You can see the Nye Avenue road right-of-way extends into what is being used as the Curtis's front yard space. This is a dead-end road and in staff's opinion, does create a very unique situation. There is very little traffic. Obviously there is the Curtis's comings and goings to their dwelling, that would be the main traffic. I know that they have already spoken with the county road department and I think they are going to be pursuing vacating part of that road right-of-way. I believe that the County Engineer is supportive of that, but that process can take quite a while. So in order to proceed with this project they would need the Variance. You can see that the impact to the surrounding property owners, the public traffic, public safety would be extremely minimal, if not, none existent. So staff does support this Variance fully.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you. Any other questions from the board members?

Tom Harper: Yeah, this is Tom and I don't have any questions. I will go ahead and make a motion that we grant this Variance in order for the property owners to build an addition onto the dwelling that would only be 32 feet from the front lot line instead of the required 50 foot setback.

Carol Schlueter: Is there a second to that motion?

Janelle Spies: I will second that motion. This is Janelle.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, it has been moved and seconded that we approve this Variance in order to build an addition onto their dwelling that is only 32 feet from the front property line, instead of the required 50 foot setback. Any other questions or concerns from anyone? If not, we will do a roll call vote. Janelle?

Janelle Spies: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: Tom?

Tom Harper: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: Emily?

Emily Geertz: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: And I vote aye, this is Carol. The motion carried. (Ayes-4; Opposed-0; Absent-Clark).

Eric Furnas: Okay, again this is for the Curtis's, you will get a notice of when this will go before the Board of Supervisors. The Board of Supervisors will review this Variance that was granted by this board and decide whether to remand it back for further discussion or not. It is not mandatory that you appear before them, and they are encouraging people to appear virtually also. As always you are welcome to stay on the line or you can leave at this time if you choose.

Courtney Curtis: Thank you very much.

MUSCATINE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
By Eric S. Furnas, Planning, Zoning & Environmental Administrator

The Muscatine County Board of Adjustment held a virtual GoToMeeting on Friday, December 4, 2020, with Chairperson Carol Schlueter and members Emily Geertz, Janelle Spies and Tom Harper present, Charles Clark was absent. Eric S. Furnas, Planning, Zoning & Environmental Administrator and Dixie Seitz, Office Administrator also attended.

Present for this hearing: Kirk Latta.

Carol Schlueter: Eric, can you please read the request?

Eric Furnas: Case #20-12-03. An application has been filed by Kirk and Kim Latta, Record Owners. This property is located in Moscow Township, in the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of Sec. 10-T78N-R2W, West of N. Isett Avenue, 1172 N. Isett Avenue, containing approximately 36.79 acres, and is zoned A-1 Agricultural District. This request, if approved, would allow the Zoning Administrator to issue a Special Use Permit in order to build a one family dwelling on approximately 4.92 acres after it has been split from the property. And I should mention that in addition to the record owners, Mr. & Mrs. Latta signing the application, it was signed by Jordan Graham, who is Mr. & Mrs. Latta's son-in-law. So this is really a joint application by their daughter and son-in-law and the record owners, the Latta's. So this would be to create a rural residence for Mr. & Mrs. Graham.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you Eric. Was there any correspondence?

Eric Furnas: No ma'am.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, Kirk are you there?

Kirk Latta: Yes I am here.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, so you understand we only have four members on the board today, so if it's a tie vote it would be a no vote. It would be your choice on whether you want us to vote on it today or table it until the next month.

Kirk Latta: I've been through this before. We'll try it again.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, so would you please state your name and tell us what you are wanting today?

Kirk Latta: Kirk Latta. And I am asking for a Variance in order to build a single family dwelling for my daughter on approximately 4.8 acres. It would be where the old house used to sit, the old farmstead. Some of those buildings are original. I would like to be able to build a house there for my daughter to live in.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you. So where you want to build this house, there was a house there originally?

Kirk Latta: Originally, that was the old farmstead, some of those buildings are part of the old farm, the corncrib and stuff, yes that was the old farmstead.

Carol Schlueter: So when was that house taken down or destroyed?

Kirk Latta: Oh I'm thinking maybe in the late 80's. I've owned the property for 30 years and the house was down but the buildings were there. You can see where the old foundation was.

Carol Schlueter: So when you purchased it the house was already gone?

Kirk Latta: The house was torn down, yes.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, board members any questions? Okay, if not, Eric can you tell us your concerns or take on this?

Eric Furnas: Yes, in the development report the one main concern that I have... and I'll bring up that first aerial that shows all the dwellings that are within the area. The building site would be within less than 750 feet to the existing dwelling, one house is where Mr. & Mrs. Latta. The building site, and I will switch screens here again for you, is that green space that is south of the existing ag buildings and closest to North Isett. It's that large yard space that would be approximately 4.92 acres. I point this out because the Board of Adjustment has been very consistent with the minimum separation distance of 750 feet. It is an option, it is within your authority to grant this Special Use Permit. That is something that the rural residence ordinance lists as being of moderate importance. That is something that the board has focused on pretty consistently. The CSR2 of this ground is below 55, you can see that it is not prime farm ground at all. A couple of more ... possibly less primary concerns, there is one cattle feed lot approximately 900 feet away. I point this out just because we try to view the potential conflicts of residential uses in the farming community. There is a bridge north of this location that is listed as structurally critical. The county may have to address it in the very near future and it may not be replaced, I'm just pointing that out. However there is access easily off of Hwy. 6, just about a half of a mile or less away from this property. Those are my comments.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you.

Kirk Latta: My only other comment would be, this farm is kind of pie shaped and it has not been farmed in over 20 years. It is highly erodible ground and it's close to the city, it's within about a quarter of a mile. It's a paved road that it's close to. The only thing is, it's close to my house and I have no objections to having a house put there.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank Kirk. Board members, any questions?

Eric Furnas: Madam Chairman, I might have a couple of more comments.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you.

Eric Furnas: I just want to point out to the board, Mr. Latta did attempt to rezone this property, which would have alleviated the separation distance issue. Because had it been successfully rezoned to R-1 Residential District there would not be that separation limit. That was discussed at length in the Board of Supervisors hearing. There was some support, at least voiced verbally by some Board of Supervisor members for the building of one house. They had even tossed around the idea of possibly considering rezoning a portion of the property, but there still would be the issue of whether rezoning in this particular area was appropriate. There would be an obvious issue of spot zoning and they more or less directed Mr. Latta to possibly consider other options. Which I think in this case meant, trying to get a Special Use Permit, which would obviously be very limited, like just for one dwelling. I just wanted to give you a little history on this case, and the fact the Mr. Latta has exhausted other options prior to this one. Whether that impacts your decision or not, I don't know, but I just wanted you to be aware of what has taken place up to this point.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, thank you Eric. Board members... questions or comments? Well my concern is, I think that I have been pretty consistent with not voting for it if it is less 750 feet to another rural residence. That is my concern. I know that it's Mr. Latta's family member. If this Special Use Permit is granted, I understand that it is only for this family member. If they decide not to build there, it does not transfer to somebody else.

Tom Harper: Yeah, this is Tom. I don't have any more comments on this proposal, other than I know that it's been out here several times. I guess I don't... the separation distance, you know, it's close and ... also down the road on 112th Street there is a rather large subdivision built there in an unincorporated area. This whole area seems to be a lot of density there of farmsteads and homes. That's all I've got.

Carol Schlueter: Eric, this is Carol and I have one other question. Across the road, and maybe this isn't a concern... I thought at one time somebody applied to build a house over there ... was it the Maurer property? I'm sorry... maybe I was thinking of something else.

Kirk Latta: Well the only thing else I can say, my kids having another option, they can build out in the middle of the field. But if the concerns are that it's taking up agricultural ground, you know that's where it would be is in an agricultural field. That's why I thought that over by the shed it would be a lot better place where it's not agricultural, where it's not been farmed for 20 years. I would rather see it over by the buildings, not in the middle of the field. But like I said, you'd be taking up ag ground to do that.

Emily Geertz: Right, this is Emily Geertz. I guess, I'm curious and maybe Eric can point to where you are thinking about building. Because I have the same concern and I know that it's not high CSR2 ground, but still that's one of my concerns is that we don't take away valuable farmland.

Kirk Latta: Yeah, I can go on the other parcel and build a house, you know, closer to my house where the CSR2 is higher and that's actually a productive field. And I have another place out on Moscow Road where they can build in the middle of the farm field. But this seems like a lot better place with the buildings there, it's close to the city limits, it's got all your requirements except for being too close...may 100 some foot distance.

Eric Furnas: Emily are you able to see the map that I am sharing?

Emily Geertz: Yeah and I see the arrow and I assume that that's what you are talking about?

Eric Furnas: Yes, it's in the general vicinity just south of those existing ag structures is where they generally propose for the house. The area that he would be considering splitting off would be that whole grassy area. And like he pointed out, that's not been farmed for years.

Emily Geertz: Okay.

Carol Schlueter: Are the buildings going to get split off with this property?

Kirk Latta: No, I'm probably going to give them the whole rest of that parcel, no I'm not going to split it.

Eric Furnas: Okay, so clarification Kirk, this is Eric. So if this were to go through you would be giving them the entire 36 acre parcel minus your house?

Kirk Latta: Yeah, my house is a part of that.

Eric Furnas: Okay, so you are saying you would split off your house and they would get the rest of that parcel?

Kirk Latta: Yeah I would split my parcel and give them the buildings and all of the rest. They are going to end up with it anyway.

Eric Furnas: Well that's a little different than the original proposal but that's not really... I mean, it's none buildable.

Kirk Latta: Yeah there really is only one building spot on that.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, so how many acres are going with your house?

Kirk Latta: I had about 17 acres. Right now I'm not leaving my house, I'm not going so there would be 36 or 40 some acres left.

Carol Schlueter: So you are not planning on selling your house now?

Kirk Latta: No, not at this time. I kind of like it there.

Carol Schlueter: Yeah, I would too.

Kirk Latta: The problem is as you can see, I mow an awful lot of grass. This would cut it down to about five acres of mowing. I'm getting old and taking care of that property ... I'd like to have somebody out here ... I'd like my son-in-law, my daughter and my grandchildren out here to help me along.

Janelle Spies: This is Janelle. How short are they of the required distance?

Eric Furnas: From Mr. Latta's house approximately ... I think they would be in that 450 to 500 feet. So 200 to 250 feet from what is normally the minimum, of course, depending upon where they actually build.

Janelle Spies: And clearing some trees on the other side of the buildings isn't an option?

Kirk Latta: Oh no... that's a steep bank and it all goes down and I would be getting too close to the other house - which I own too. But you could fudge it one way or fudge it the other way...

Eric Furnas: Yeah where he has it would be achieving the most distance possible from all the other residences in the area. If you move to the south, it gets closer to his house... if you move north, it's closer to the other two houses. So it would be around that 500 feet distance, instead of the 750 feet. There is a pretty substantial tree line in between.

Janelle Spies: And there wasn't any correspondence from any of the neighbors?

Eric Furnas: No.

Kirk Latta: No I have had correspondence with neighbors over the years and nobody has a problem with me building a house here.

Carol Schlueter: Eric can you bring the map down to show his other property to the south. Okay, so this is all hay ground now, correct?

Kirk Latta: Yeah that field right now is hay ground, alfalfa yep. We rotated out the beans because I didn't like the corn there. So hay and beans.

Carol Schlueter: But that would be the other option that you could get a farm exemption to build one on that property some place?

Kirk Latta: That's correct. And if that was the case it would be awfully close to my house. Yes, that is an option. I'd like to keep that as farm ground, but when I have a piece of ground that I don't farm...it makes a lot more sense. I mean it has a driveway in, water, electricity, it makes a lot more sense to be here.

Eric Furnas: That piece that you are talking about to the south would only be an option for a farm exemption for Mr. Latta as the farm owner. His daughter and son-in-law are not a part of the farm corporation and could not enjoy farm exemption.

Carol Schlueter: Oh, okay.

Kirk Latta: Well I could give them that piece of ground. You know, I've got options there. But I believe that this is the best option that I have right now.

Eric Furnas: That is true, if he were to give his daughter and son-in-law that entire southern parcel they would actually qualify for farm exemption once they start receiving income off of it. But then they would most likely be building a house and taking some of the viable ag ground out of production. So with this other option, he is right, it would not be taking any ground out of production.

Carol Schlueter: Right, right. Okay, Kirk, now everything you just said and this thing goes through and your daughter builds a house there, you are going to be using the same driveway, is that what you stated?

Kirk Latta: That's correct, we'll just bring it around that shed for the two houses.

Eric Furnas: The driveway from the north, Kirk, is that what you are talking about?

Kirk Latta: Yeah, the driveway to the north coming into the buildings could be used for her house.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, board members is there any questions or comments, or would somebody like to make a motion in regards to this request?

Tom Harper: I will go ahead and make a motion, this is Tom, that we grant this Special Use Permit in order for the property owner to split off approximately 4.92 acres from the larger property and for Mr. & Mrs. Graham to build a one family dwelling, and if this property were to be sold to somebody else than this permit would not be enforced.

Carol Schlueter: Well really we are not splitting, we are just giving him a Special Use Permit and then he has to come back in with the split, am I correct on that Eric?

Eric Furnas: Originally on the application he had listed a split of 4.92 acres, but you are correct that is kind of a secondary concern... but hearing from Mr. Latta today, that sounds like that option may have changed. However, it really doesn't change what you would be reviewing. Really what is before you is to grant a Special Use Permit to place a rural residence for his daughter and son-in-law in the approximately location of what was proposed. But he would have some options as to how to split it. I mean, it would have to be obviously split somehow before another house could be added. But it kind of sounds like he is considering splitting of his house and combining it with the other piece to the south or possibly just splitting it... The acreage may have changed, but that is somewhat less relevant.

Tom Harper: Do you want me to amend the motion?

Eric Furnas: You may just want to strike the part about splitting off the 4.92 acres and just granting the Special Use Permit for Mr. & Mrs. Graham to build a one family dwelling.

Tom Harper: I'll amend the motion to strike any reference to splitting off any acreage, this is for a Special Use Permit to build a one family rural residence on this property for Mr. & Mrs. Graham.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, is there a second?

Emily Geertz: It's Emily Geertz and I will second that.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, it's been moved and seconded that we issue a Special Use Permit in order to build a one family dwelling on this property after it has been split from the property, and again, this request just goes to Kirk Latta's daughter and son-in-law, Mr. & Mrs. Graham, to build on this. Is that correct people?

Tom Harper: Yes.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, any other questions or concerns from any board members? If not, we will have a roll call vote. Janelle?

Janelle Spies: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: Tom?

Tom Harper: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: Emily?

Emily Geertz: Aye.

Carol Schlueter: This is Carol – I vote Nay. (Aye-3; Nay-1; Absent-Clark) It passed Kirk.

Kirk Latta: Thank you.

Carol Schlueter: You are welcome.

Eric Furnas: Madam Chairman, I don't believe that there are any other matters to go before the Board of Adjustment.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, may I have a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Tom Harper: So moved, this is Tom.

Carol Schlueter: Is there a second?

Janelle Spies: I'll second the motion.

Carol Schlueter: Okay, it has been moved and seconded to close the meeting, all in favor please say Aye (4); Opposed (0); Absent-Clark. The motion carried, the meeting is adjourn. Thank you people.

MUSCATINE COUNTY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

By Eric S. Furnas, Planning, Zoning & Environmental Administrator