| City of La Porte Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting Minutes | |
|---|---|
| Tuesday, May 13, 2025 at 6:00 PM | |
| City Hall Council Chambers, 801 Michigan Ave. | |
| www.cityoflaporte.com | (219) 362-8260 |

A meeting of the City of La Porte Board of Zoning Appeals ("BZA"), was held at City Hall on Tuesday, May 13, 2025 at the hour of 6:00 PM, ("local time"), pursuant to notice duly given in accordance with the rules of the Commission and the Indiana Open Door Law.

ITEM 1. Call Meeting to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chair Brian Kajer at 6:00 PM.

ITEM 2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum

On a call of the roll, the members of the BZA were shown to be present or absent as follows:

| Members Present: | Members Absent: | Staff Present: |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| Chair, Brian Kajer | Pete Saunders | Mark Worthley, BZA Attorney |
| Vice Chair, Nate Loucks | | David Heinold, City Planner |
| Vickie Gushrowski | | Josette Schoof, Eng. Coor. |
| Mark Danielson | | Craig Phillips, CDP Director |
| | | |

ITEM 3. Approval of Minutes: April 8, 2025 Meeting Minutes

Chair Brian Kajer called for any changes or corrections to the April 8, 2025 Meeting Minutes. There being no changes or corrections to the meeting minutes, Nate Loucks made a motion to **approve the April 8, 2025 Meeting Minutes** and the motion was seconded by Vickie Gushrowski. The motion passed 4-0.

| |
|---|
| **ITEM 4. Variance of Development Standards # 25-04 Petition**<br>to Reduce the Minimum Front Yard Setback From 25 Feet to 17 Feet Along the South Property Line |
| **Type of Request:** Variance of Development Standards |
| **Staff Report:** David Heinold |

**APPLICANT**

| |
|---|
| Name – Herman Payton |

**PROPERTY OWNER**

| |
|---|
| Name – same |

**PREMISES AFFECTED**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parcel Number - 46-06-26-357-010.000-043 | | | | |
| Actual/approximate address or location from major streets – 401 Rockwood Street | | | | |
| Total Acreage – 0.13 acre | | Flood Zone on Site? – No | | |
| Zoning of Subject Property – R1C | | Use of Subject Property – Single Family Dwelling | | |
| Zoning of Adjacent Properties | North: R1C | South: R1C | East: R1C | West: R1C |
| Land Use of Adjacent Properties | North: Single Family Dwelling | South: Single Family Dwelling | East: Single Family Dwelling | West: Single Family Dwelling |

**SUMMARY:** The petitioner proposes to reduce the minimum front yard setback from 25 feet to 17 feet along the south property line to allow construction of a detached accessory building.

**HISTORY OF SITE:** Per the site aerial image, the total parcel size is 0.13 acre and is currently zoned R1C (Single Family Residential District). Currently, the subject property is a single family dwelling. The petitioner proposes to construct a detached accessory building within the minimum front yard building setback along the south property line for a corner lot in the R1C Zoning District.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED VARIANCE OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:**

The petitioner is requesting a variance of development standards to reduce the minimum front yard building setback from 25 feet to 17 feet along the south property line.

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE:** Section 7.04 Building Dimensional Requirements shall be met for the subject property. Section 16.02 (c), Table 16.02 allows detached accessory buildings within the corner lot side street yard provided that the minimum front yard setback of the zoning district be met from the property line. Additionally, Section 16.02 (g) sets the maximum area limitation for a detached accessory building of no more than 721 square feet.

**SITE REVIEW FINDINGS:** Site review is not required for this type of variance request.

**DECISION CRITERIA:**

**(1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community;**

The proposed reduction in the minimum front yard building setback for a detached accessory building will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community on a lot with a side street front yard. The proposed detached accessory building is less than the maximum area limitations for accessory buildings and will be located in the rear yard of the subject property.

**(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and**

The use and value of the area adjacent to the subject property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner with the reduction in the minimum front yard setback for a detached accessory building on a lot with a side street front yard. The proposed use of a detached accessory building less than the maximum area limitation for personal use and
storage will not affect the surrounding residential properties in a negative manner.

**(3) The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.**

The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the subject property because the lot with a side street front yard would not otherwise be able to construct a detached garage within the minimum front yard setback on a corner lot.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that the requested variance of development standards petition conforms to the goals and policies of the Countywide Land Development Plan. The requested variance to reduce the minimum front yard setback from 25 feet to 17 feet along the south property line.

Staff recommends **approval** of the petitioner's request to reduce the minimum front yard setback on a corner lot side street from 25 feet to 17 feet along the south property line as part of Variance of Development Standards Petition #25-04.

Submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals May 8th, 2025.

**Applicant Presentation**
Herman Payton of 401 Rockwood Street mentioned that his garage needs to be removed due to a tree that hit it. Herman Payton was told by the insurance company that the tree needs to come down. Herman Payton mentioned that he wants to rebuild the garage but make it bigger causing the set back to be reduced to 17 feet from 25 feet. Mr. Payton stated that the garage will be 24 x 30.

Nate Loucks asked if the current is 18 x 18.

Herman Payton stated it is 18 x 18 from the back of the property. Mr. Payton mentioned that it's 3 feet off. Mr. Payton stated that he's going to extend it from 18 to 30 out then 24 wide instead of 18 going toward the house.

Nate Loucks asked what was going to be done with all the extra room.

Herman Payton stated that he's going to park all his vehicles in the garage.

**Staff Presentation**
David Heinold, City Planner, mentioned that the reduction of minimum front yard setback from 25 feet to 17 feet is along the south property line. David Heinold mentioned that Rockwood and Warren are the cross streets, and the petitioner is requesting from the Warren Street property line. David Heinold stated that the parcel currently has a house on it and an existing garage. David Heinold mentioned that the proposed location for the detached garage is in the side street front yard of a corner lot. David Heinold stated that the requested size does meet the maximum area limitation for a detached accessory building of a maximum of 721 square feet. David Heinold stated that staff recommends approval of the petitioner's request to reduce the minimum front yard setback on a corner lot side street from 25 feet to 17 feet along the south property line.

**Public Comment**
Chair Brian Kajer opened the meeting to public comment and called for public comments either for or against the variance petition.

There being no public comment for or against the variance petition, Brian Kajer closed the floor to public comment.

**Board Discussion/Action**
There was no Board Discussion/Action.

Nate Loucks made a motion to **approve Variance of Development Standards Petition #25-04 to reduce the minimum front yard setback from 25 feet to 17 feet along the south property line** and the motion was seconded by Vickie Gushrowski. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 4-0.

Yes Brian Kajer Yes Nate Loucks

Yes Mark Danielson Yes Vickie Gushrowski

**Variance of Development Standards Petition #25-04 - Approved**

**ITEM 5. Use Variance # 25-01 Petition**
to Allow Expansion of Existing Powder Packaging Manufacturing Use in the R1B Zoning District

**Type of Request:** Use Variance

**Staff Report:** David Heinold

**APPLICANT**

| |
|---|
| Name – Maple City Packaging, LLC (David Ambers, Attorney Representative) |

**PROPERTY OWNER**

| |
|---|
| Name – Matthew D. Kosco and Linda Igleski as Trustees and not individually of the Matthew D. Kosco and Linda Igleski Revocable Living Trust dated 3/19/2021 |

**PREMISES AFFECTED**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parcel Number - 46-06-23-152-006.000-043 | | | | |
| Actual/approximate address or location from major streets – 2699 North State Road 39 | | | | |
| Total Acreage – 3.73 acres | | Flood Zone on Site? - No | | |
| Zoning of Subject Property – R1B | | Use of Subject Property – Existing Powder Packaging Use | | |
| Zoning of Adjacent Properties | North: R1B | South: R1B | East: R1B | West: M1 |
| Land Use of Adjacent Properties | North: Storage Units | South: Single Family Dwelling | East: Single Family Dwelling | West: Industrial |

**SUMMARY:** The petitioner proposes to allow expansion of an existing powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use on property zoned R1B Single Family Residential District.

**HISTORY OF SITE:** Per the site aerial image, the parcel is 3.73 acres and is currently zoned R1B (Single Family Residential District). Historically, the property has been used as a powder packaging manufacturing use previously approved by the La Porte County Board of Zoning Appeals since February 16, 2021 (see attached letter from La Porte County Board of Zoning Appeals). The subject property was annexed by the City of La Porte on March 11, 2024, which allowed the continuation of the previously approved powder packaging manufacturing use.

The petitioner proposes to allow expansion of an existing powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use on property zoned R1B Single Family Residential District.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED USE VARIANCE:**
The petitioner is requesting a use variance to allow expansion of an existing powder packaging manufacturing use on property zoned R1B Single Family Residential District.

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE:** Section 4.02 Uses sets forth requirements for how land and buildings may be used within the residential zoning districts. In addition, the development of the site shall be required to meet the development standards as set forth in Section 9.04 Building Dimensional Requirements for building setbacks. Table 17.02 (c)(2) requires a minimum of 50 feet of landscape screening between the powder packaging manufacturing use and adjacent R1B District Single Family Residential property to the east and south.

**SITE REVIEW FINDINGS:** Site review was held on 5/7/2025 and City staff provided feedback on the proposed building additions. City Engineer Nick Minich explained that a detailed drainage plan will need to be submitted prior to the building permit being issued to review proposed increased drainage from the building additions. Nick also mentioned that the warehouse building additions would be considered occupied space and need to be submitted for state design release before the building permit.

City Planner David Heinold explained that he met with business owner, Scott Kosco, on May 2, 2025 to review the site and the proposed building additions. During the on site meeting, David provided Mr. Kosco with a copy of the City staff recommendation for reduced landscaping buffers along the southern half of the subject property from adjacent residential single family dwellings. A copy of the City staff recommendation for landscaping buffer areas are included in the staff report packet for your review.

**DECISION CRITERIA:**

**(1) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community;**
The approval to allow the expansion of the existing powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use on the property zoned R1B Single Family Residential District will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community because the use has been approved on the subject property since February 16, 2021. The petitioner is not planning any major changes to the overall operations of the existing approved land use other than the proposed building addition phases as indicated on the attached site plan.

**(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and**
The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner because the majority of the surrounding properties on the north and west side of the subject property are commercial or industrial land uses. The remaining land to the east and south side of the subject property are single family residential dwellings on large lots.

**(3) The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved;**
The need for the use variance arises from the condition peculiar to the property involved because the petitioner is requesting to expand the previously approved powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use in the R1B Single Family Residential District that was recently annexed into the city limits from La Porte County on March 11, 2024. The use variance request to allow future

building expansion is an appropriate need based on the current use of the subject property as previously approved by the La Porte County Board of Zoning Appeals.

**(4) The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.**

The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance to not allow expansion of the previously approved powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use in the R1B Zoning District will constitute an unnecessary hardship because the subject property would not be allowed to develop without the approval of the variance request.

**(5) The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Land Development Plan.**

The approval of the variance request to allow expansion of the powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Land Development Plan because the plan aims to encourage full use of land in established communities. The result of this goal is to eliminate unintended regulatory impediments to residential and commercial infill development that is consistent with established neighborhood patterns and character. The proposed expansion of the powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use is consistent with the storage units to the north and industrial use to the west of the subject property.

| |
|---|
| **ITEM 6. Variance of Development Standards #25-05 Petition** to Reduce the Minimum Landscape Setback From 50 Feet to 10 Feet on the South and East Property Boundaries; and to Reduce the Minimum Parking Requirements from 50 Parking Spaces to 20 Parking Spaces |
| **Type of Request:** Variance of Development Standards |
| **Staff Report:** David Heinold |

**APPLICANT**

| |
|---|
| Name – Maple City Packaging, LLC (David Ambers, Attorney Representative) |

**PROPERTY OWNER**

| |
|---|
| Name – Matthew D. Kosco and Linda Igleski as Trustees and not individually of the Matthew D. Kosco and Linda Igleski Revocable Living Trust dated 3/19/2021 |

**PREMISES AFFECTED**

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parcel Number - 46-06-23-152-006.000-043 | | | | |
| Actual/approximate address or location from major streets – 2699 North State Road 39 | | | | |
| Total Acreage – 3.73 acres | | Flood Zone on Site? - No | | |
| Zoning of Subject Property – R1B | | Use of Subject Property – Single Family Dwelling | | |
| Zoning of Adjacent Properties | North: R1B | South: R1B | East: R1B | West: M1 |
| Land Use of Adjacent Properties | North: Storage Units | South: Single Family Dwelling | East: Single Family Dwelling | West: Industrial |

**SUMMARY:** The petitioner proposes to allow expansion of an existing powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use on property zoned R1B Single Family Residential District. The variance of development standards request is to reduce the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet on the south and east property boundaries; and to reduce the minimum parking requirements from 50 parking spaces to 20 parking spaces.

**HISTORY OF SITE:** Per the site aerial image, the parcel is 3.73 acres and is currently zoned R1B (Single Family Residential District). Historically, the property has been used as a powder packaging manufacturing use previously approved by the La Porte County Board of Zoning Appeals since

February 16, 2021 (see attached letter from La Porte County Board of Zoning Appeals). The subject property was annexed by the City of La Porte on March 11, 2024, which allowed the continuation of the previously approved powder packaging manufacturing use.

**DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED VARIANCE OF DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:**
The petitioner is requesting a variance of development standards to reduce the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet on the south and east property boundaries; and to reduce the minimum parking requirements from 50 parking spaces to 20 parking spaces.

**STATEMENT OF COMPLIANCE:** Section 7.04 Building Dimensional Requirements shall be met for the subject property.

**SITE REVIEW FINDINGS:** Site review was held on 5/7/2025 and City staff provided feedback on the proposed building additions. City Engineer Nick Minich explained that a detailed drainage plan will need to be submitted prior to the building permit being issued to review proposed increased drainage from the building additions. Nick also mentioned that the warehouse building additions would be considered occupied space and need to be submitted for state design release before the building permit.

City Planner David Heinold explained that he met with business owner, Scott Kosco, on May 2, 2025 to review the site and the proposed building additions. During the on site meeting, David provided Mr. Kosco with a copy of the City staff recommendation for reduced landscaping buffers along the southern half of the subject property from adjacent residential single family dwellings. A copy of the City staff recommendation for landscaping buffer areas are included in the staff report packet for your review.

**DECISION CRITERIA:**

**(2) The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community;**
The approval of the requested variance to reduce the minimum parking requirements from 50 parking spaces to 20 parking spaces will not be injurious to public health, safety, morals, and general welfare of the community because the subject property has enough parking area to accommodate the number of employees for each shift and loading areas as part of the proposed expansion of the existing powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution land use.

The petitioner described in the attached narrative the company currently employs 18 people and would add an additional 7 employees on a second shift. The petitioner has demonstrated that a maximum of 20 parking spaces is adequate for the number of employees planned to be on site at a given time.

The approval of the requested variance to reduce the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet along the east and south property boundaries is appropriate because the existing gravel driving surface is approximately at 10 feet to the east property line and the corner of an existing building on the subject property is within the 50 foot landscape setback.

**(2) The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner; and**
The use and value of the area adjacent to the property will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner for the requested variance to reduce the minimum parking spaces from 50 parking spaces to 20 parking spaces because the amount of parking needed for the type of manufacturing, storage, and distribution business can be accommodated on the existing property without the need for additional

parking surface area. The requested variance for reduction of the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet will negatively impact the use of surrounding properties due to the proximity of existing residential single family dwellings on the south side of the subject property.

The eastern boundary of the subject property has an approximately 10 foot landscape setback where the existing gravel driving surface is located and there is a partial row of trees near the property line. City staff suggests a modification of the variance request to allow a reduction in the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet on the east property boundary and from 50 feet to 20 feet on the south property boundary. The recommendation for a reduced landscape setback on the south property boundary to 20 feet is consistent with the existing landscape area along the property line adjacent to the existing single family dwelling.

**(3) The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.**

The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance to require a minimum of 50 parking spaces for the proposed building additions will constitute an unnecessary hardship due to the limited amount of space available on the subject property to allow for expansion of the existing powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution business.

The requirement for a minimum of 50 foot landscape setback between the industrial and residential uses will constitute an unnecessary hardship because of the large amount land area that would have to be dedicated to landscaping along the south and east property boundaries. Both of these minimum requirements would otherwise not make the proposed expansion of the existing powder packaging manufacturing business possible without the need for the requested variance based on the type of land use.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff finds that the requested variance of development standards petition conforms to the goals and policies of the Countywide Land Development Plan. The requested variance to reduce the minimum parking requirement from 50 parking spaces to 20 parking spaces is appropriate for the type of industrial business.

The requested variance for reduction of the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet will negatively impact the use of surrounding properties due to the proximity of existing residential single family dwellings on the south side of the subject property. The eastern boundary of the subject property has an approximately 10 foot landscape setback where the existing gravel driving surface is located and there is a partial row of trees near the property line on the neighbor's property.

City staff suggests a modification of the variance request to allow a reduction in the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet on the east property boundary and from 50 feet to 20 feet on the south property boundary. The recommendation for a reduced landscape setback on the south property boundary to 20 feet is consistent with the existing landscape area along the property line adjacent to the existing single family dwelling.

Staff recommends **approval** of the petitioner's request to reduce the minimum parking requirements from 50 parking spaces to 20 parking spaces; and modification of the variance request to reduce the minimum landscape setback from 50 feet to 10 feet on the east property boundary and from 50 feet to 20

feet on the south property boundary as part of Variance of Development Standards Petition #25-05 with the following conditions:

1. The minimum number of parking spaces required shall be 20 parking spaces.
2. The minimum landscape setback shall be 10 feet on the east property boundary and 20 feet from the south property boundary. Landscaping must be a minimum of 6 feet tall and placed 20 feet apart along the south and east property boundaries. The enforcement official may review and approve of the proposed landscaping buffer areas.

Submitted to the Board of Zoning Appeals May 8th, 2025.

**Applicant Presentation**
Dave Ambers, Attorney at Law of 601 State Street, Suite B in the City of La Porte, stated that he was there on behalf of Maple City Packaging. Dave Ambers explained that Maple City Packaging moved from Illinois to La Porte in 2021. Dave Ambers mentioned that Maple City Packaging would like to expand upon their property on Highway 39 North. Dave Ambers mentioned that they are asking for two variances. Dave Ambers explained that back in 2021 a variance was granted by the County to allow Maple City Packaging to be put at its current location. Dave Ambers stated that the city has since annexed the property. Dave Ambers mentioned that the first variance is to allow the expansion of the existing manufacturing facility and that it is zoned at R1B. Dave Ambers mentioned that everything across Highway 39 is zoned as Heavy Industrial. Dave Ambers mentioned that the second variance is to reduce the landscape setback from 50 feet to 20 feet on the south location. Dave Ambers mentioned that David Heinold changed the original request to meet the vegetation that is there now to 20 feet instead of 10 feet. On the east side Dave mentioned there will be a 10-foot landscape barrier instead of 50 to keep in line with the current landscaping. Dave Ambers mentioned that the change will reduce the parking spaces from 50 to 20. Dave stated that based on the square footage of the building they would need 50 under the ordinance but given the number of employees they can easily get by with 20 parking spaces.

**Staff Presentation**
David Heinold, City Planner, mentioned that Use Variance 25-01 Petition is specifically to allow the expansion of the existing manufacturing that was previously approved when it was in Laporte County in 2021. David Heinold explained that the expansion included all future buildings. After much discussion David Heinold stated that staff recommends approval of both variances with recommended conditions.

**Board Discussion/Action**
Nate Loucks asked Matthew Kosco, the owner of Maple City Packaging, if there will be more employees or will it be kept at the amount it is now.

Matthew Kosco stated that initially the employee amount will remain the same, however there may be an expansion to a second shift. Mr. Kosco stated that the additional space would potentially allow for a second shift to be staffed on a regular basis. Mr. Kosco mentioned that once he's fully up and going he doesn't think that a second shift will be necessary.

Nate Loucks stated that he appreciates all the companies that are patient with the city, and he thanked Mr. Kosco for petitioning and growing with the city.

Vickie Gushrowski mentioned regarding both the variances there are some conditions, and she wanted to know if Mr. Kosco was aware and was ok with those conditions.

Matthew Kosco stated yes.

Nate Loucks asked Mr. Kosco how soon he would get started.

Matthew Kosco stated as soon as possible. Matthew Kosco mentioned that he has a quote from a contractor, but he is waiting for the contractor's availability, and he is hoping to have construction completed by the end of the year.

Vickie Gushrowski asked if there will be truck traffic during the second shift.

Matthew Kosco stated there will be no shipping and receiving conducted on the second shift if there's a second shift.

**Public Comment**
Chair Brian Kajer opened the meeting to public comment and called for public comments either for or against the variance petition.

There being no public comment for or against the variance petition, Brian Kajer closed the floor to public comment.

Vickie Gushrowski made a motion to **approve Use Variance of #25-01 to Allow Expansion of Existing Powder Packaging Manufacturing Use R1B Zoning District with the staff recommended conditions** that were put in place by the city and the motion was seconded by Nate Loucks. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 4-0.

Yes Brian Kajer Yes Nate Loucks

Yes Mark Danielson Yes Vickie Gushrowski

**Use Variance # 25-01 Petition-Approved w/ the following conditions:**

1. The powder packaging manufacturing, storage, and distribution use shall be permitted in the R1B Zoning District. All future building additions shall be in accordance with the M1 Light Industrial District Building Dimensional Requirements as set forth in Section 9.04 of the 2017 City of La Porte Revised Joint Zoning Ordinance.
2. The existing lighted pole sign shall be permitted. Any additional signage shall meet the requirements of Article 19 of the 2017 City of La Porte Revised Joint Zoning Ordinance.
3. The hours of operation are from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm. The hours of operation for second shift are from 4:00 pm to 12:30 am.
4. That two existing driveway approaches off North Kuchar Drive shall be hard surfaced with asphalt within one year of paving North Kuchar Drive road surface.

Nate Loucks made a motion to **approve Variance of Development Standards #25-05 Petition to Reduce the Minimum Landscape Setback From 50 Feet to 10 Feet on the South and East Property Boundaries; and to Reduce the Minimum Parking Requirements from 50 Parking Spaces to 20 Parking Spaces with the staff recommended conditions** and the motion was seconded by Mark Danielson. A roll call vote was taken. The motion passed 4-0.

Yes Brian Kajer Yes Nate Loucks

Yes Mark Danielson Yes Vickie Gushrowski

**Variance of Development Standards #25-05 Petition-Approved w/ the following conditions:**

1. The minimum number of parking spaces required shall be 20 parking spaces.

2. The minimum landscape setback shall be 10 feet on the east property boundary and 20 feet from the south property boundary. Landscaping must be a minimum of 6 feet tall and placed 20 feet apart along the south and east property boundaries. The enforcement official may review and approve of the proposed landscaping buffer areas.

ITEM 7. Old Business

There was no old business.

ITEM 8. New Business

There was no new business.

ITEM 9. Other Business

A. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items

ITEM 10. Adjournment

Nate Loucks made a motion to **adjourn,** and the motion was seconded by Vickie Gushrowski. The motion to **adjourn** passed 4-0. The meeting was **adjourned** at 6.27 pm.

_____ _____

Brian Kajer, Chair Josette Schoof, Secretary