BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE CITY OF PLATTEVILLE

Monday, February 17, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.
Council Chambers - City Hall
75 North Bonson Street
Platteville, Wisconsin 53818

AGENDA

1. Roll Call

2. Approve Minutes: December 16, 2019

3. Motion:

   1. Staff Presentation  
   2. Applicant Statement  
   3. Public Statements in Favor  
   4. Public Statements Against  
   5. Public Statements in General  
   6. Applicant Rebuttal  
   7. Board of Appeals Discussion  
   8. Board of Appeals Action  
   9. Findings of Fact

   A. Variance: 140 Lutjen Place – Laurie Baker & Keven Aide (BA20-VA01-01)
   B. Variance: 300 S. Water Street – Ben Reeves (BA20-VA02-02)
   C. Variance: 1590 Vision Drive/355 Enterprise Drive – Bill Breuer (BA20-VA03-03)

4. Adjournment

If your attendance requires special accommodation needs, write or call City Manager, P.O. Box 780, Platteville, Wisconsin 53818, (608)348-9741; for TDD accessibility (608)348-2313.
MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Knautz, Mary Miller, Mike Osterholz, Robin Cline
ALTERNATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Jennifer Ginter-Lyght
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
STAFF PRESENT: Joe Carroll (Community Development Director), Ric Riniker (Building Inspector)

A regular Board of Appeals meeting was held at 7:00 p.m., December 16, 2019 in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building. Let the records show that the meeting was properly posted according to the Open Meeting Law.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
Motion by Knautz, second by Osterholz, to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2019 meeting as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

VARIANCE REQUEST: 620 Boldt Street

Board member Miller introduced the variance request of Judy Baker who seeks permission to construct a porch addition onto the front of the house that will be less than 25 feet to the lot line. The proposed change would require a variance from Chapter 22.052(E) of the City of Platteville Municipal Code.

Joe Carroll gave the staff report. The applicant is considering purchasing an existing single-family home at 620 Boldt Street. The applicant would like to build a porch onto the front of the house that does not meet the required street-yard setback. The house currently has an open concrete porch that extends 6’ from the front of the house facing Boldt Street. The house itself is approximately 30’ from the curb and 21’-6” from the front lot line. The existing porch is approximately 15’-6” from the front lot line. The applicant would like to construct a larger covered porch that would still extend 6’ from the house but would be 24’ wide instead of the existing 8’ wide. The existing house is a legal non-conforming structure regarding the setback because it is 21’-6” from the lot line rather than the required 25’. The existing porch is legal because it is an uncovered concrete slab and only needs to be 15’ from the lot line. A covered porch must meet the required 25’ setback the same as the principle structure. The proposed porch would require a variance since it would be 15’-6” feet from the lot line rather than the required setback of 25’.

Joe Carroll addressed the three standards that must be considered for each variance request. He stated that it is questionable if the variance request meets all the standards needed for approval.

There is a precedent for this request. Similar variances were approved in 2016 for the property at 700 N. Court Street and in 2018 for the property at 715 Sickle Street. Those variances were for uncovered porches, but they both involved enlarging a front deck/porch facing the street and that didn’t meet the street yard setback.

The applicant statement was made by Judy Baker. She stated that the house has been empty for 1-1/2 years. In addition to the porch, she wants to replace the windows and doors and complete other improvements. The porch is desired to protect the house from the sun and the entrance from the weather, and reduce the air-conditioning expenses. She will be living in the house. In response to a question, she state that the porch will be framed with a Trex decking, not concrete.

No public statements against.
No public statements in general.

The Board discussed the proposed project. The members liked that someone will be moving into the house and completing some improvements. The porch will improve the appearance of the property. The style of the porch fits the house and the neighborhood.

Motion by Osterholz to approve the variance for the property at 620 Boldt Street as requested. Second by Knautze. Upon roll call vote, motion was approved 5 - 0.

The Findings of Fact were discussed:

The project will improve the house and the neighborhood.
The existing porch already extends out 6 feet from the house.
There will be no negative impact on the adjoining properties or the neighborhood.
It will be better for the community to have the house improved and occupied.

ADJOURN:
Motion by Knautz, second by Osterholz, to adjourn. Motion carried unanimously.

____________________________________
Joe Carroll
Community Development Director

Approved: ____________________________
STAFF REPORT TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS

From: Community Planning & Development Department

Date: January 20, 2020

Re: Variance from Zoning Ordinance

Case #: BA20-VA01-01

Request: Variance from Section 22.04(B) of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the size of accessory structures.

Applicant: Laurie Baker & Kevin Aide

Location: 140 Lutjen Place

Surrounding Uses and Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property in Question</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Centurylink</td>
<td>M-1</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Neal Wilkins School</td>
<td>I-1</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

1. The property at 140 Lutjen Place contains a single-family home, a garage and a storage shed. The applicant would like to construct an addition onto the garage which would result in the property exceeding the maximum area for accessory structures allowed by the zoning ordinance.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2. The property has an existing garage that is 32’ x 36’ in size (1,152 sq. ft.), and there is also an existing shed that is 8’ x 10’ in size (80 sq. ft.), which results in a total area for the accessory structures of 1,232 sq. ft. The applicant would like to construct a 24’ x 36’ (864 sq. ft.) addition onto the west side (rear) of the garage. Including the size of the addition, the total area of accessory structures on the property would be 2,096 sq. ft.

3. Section 22.04(B) of the zoning ordinance limits the area of accessory structures to a maximum of 1,200 sq. ft., so the total of the existing structures already exceeds this amount (1,232 sq. ft.). The addition would put the area of the accessory buildings at approximately 2,096 sq. ft.
STAFF ANALYSIS

4. As with any variance request, there are three standards that must be considered. The first standard requires the applicant to show that a strict application of the dimensional standards in the Zoning Ordinance would lead to an unnecessary hardship. The Wisconsin State Supreme Court has determined that a hardship exists only when the applicant can show that the regulations would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome. The property currently has an existing single-family use that can continue. Although the size of the current accessory buildings on the property are non-conforming, it is still legal to continue to use them. It does not appear that the first standard has been met for the variance request.

5. The second standard requires the applicant to show that the hardship is due to some unique feature of the property, such as an odd shape or the presence of natural features. The lot is relatively large (approximately 0.59 acres) for a single-family residential lot in the City. There are large accessory buildings on some of the adjacent properties, including some commercial structures to the east and some residential storage structures to the south and east. However, it is questionable if this meets the uniqueness standard.

6. The third standard requires the applicant to show that the variance, if granted, will not have a negative impact on the public interest. The primary impact of the project will be to the neighboring properties to the west and south based on the location of the building. The existing building is approximately 72' from the west lot line, and a minimum of 30' from the south lot line, so there will still be a significant setback after the addition. The addition is to the rear of the existing building, so will not be readily visible from the street. Overall, there should be no significant negative impact on the public. Again, it is questionable if the third standard has been met for the variance request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

7. It is questionable if the variance meets all the standards needed for approval; therefore, the variance should be denied.

The above constitutes the opinion and report of the Community Planning and Development Department.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Application
2. Location Maps
3. Building Site Sketch
APPLICATION TO THE
BOARD OF APPEALS
CITY OF PLATTEVILLE, WISCONSIN

General Information (please type or print clearly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Request: [ ] Variance from Code Requirements
[ ] Appeal of Administrative Decision

Property Information (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Address of Property in Question: 140 Lutjen Pl, Platteville, WI

Legal Description: ____________________________________________________________

Current Use and Improvements: SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
Proposed Use and Improvements: SAME WITH LARGER GARAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Is this a corner lot?</th>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Code Reference (Section No.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>____ YES [ ] NO</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>22.04(C)(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Side Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Side Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIZE OF ADDITIONAL STRUCTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFICE USE ONLY
Date Application Filed: 09/13/29
Board of Appeals Action & Date:
Conditions:

Fee Paid/Receipt #: 12-003299
Justification for the Request (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

APPEAL OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION: Provide a description of your appeal.

City official(s) who made the decision you are appealing:

Decision of official(s):

Describe your appeal:

VARIANCE: State in the spaces below how your variance request conforms to the Three Standards Test as described in the attached Q&A document. Attach a separate sheet if necessary.

1) Unnecessary Hardship is present because...

2) The hardship is due to unique features of the property in that...

3) The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because...

Thank you

Signatures
The undersigned person(s) hereby give notice to the Board of Zoning Appeals of the City of Platteville, Wisconsin, of an appeal and/or request for a variance.

APPELLANT: Lonna Baker

DATE: 1/9/2020

APPELLANT: Kevin Wells

DATE: 1/8/2020
STAFF REPORT TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS

From: Community Planning & Development Department
Date: January 20, 2020
Re: Variance from Zoning Ordinance
Case #: BA20-VA02-02

Request: Variance from Section 22.11(G)(5) of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the size of an electronic sign.

Applicant: Ben Reeves

Location: 300 S. Water Street – Edward Jones/Nutrition World

Surrounding Uses and Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property in Question</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>B-3</td>
<td>Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>B-2</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

1. The property currently has a 4’-8” x 8’ changeable-copy freestanding sign near the corner of Water Street and Alden Avenue. The applicant would like to replace the sign with a new electronic sign that exceeds the area allowed by the zoning ordinance.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2. The proposed sign would be a 5’ x 8’ LED digital sign that would be mounted on a pole and located at a similar location to the existing sign. The actual sign location will be dependent upon the location of existing sewer mains but will be located to meet the ordinance requirements. The 40 sq. ft. area of the proposed sign exceeds the maximum area of 35 sq. ft. allowed for electronic signs in the B-2 district.

STAFF ANALYSIS

3. As with any variance request, there are three standards that must be considered. The first standard requires the applicant to show that a strict application of the dimensional standards in the Zoning Ordinance would lead to an unnecessary hardship. The Wisconsin
State Supreme Court has determined that a hardship exists only when the applicant can show that the regulations would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome. The applicant is allowed a slightly smaller sign than what is requested. Is the difference between the desired sign area and the allowed sign area critical to the operation of the businesses on this property, or create an unnecessary burden? Staff does not believe that to be the case. The ordinance does not prevent the applicant from installing signage or using the property for the desired use. For these reasons, a hardship is not present, and the first standard is not met for the variance request.

4. The second standard requires the applicant to show that the hardship is due to some unique feature of the property, such as an odd shape or the presence of natural features. The property does not have a unique physical characteristic that impacts the signage. It doesn’t appear that the uniqueness standard has been met for the variance request.

5. The third standard requires the applicant to show that the variance, if granted, will not have a negative impact on the public interest. Due to the similarity between the size of the existing sign and the proposed sign, the request should not have a negative impact on the general public. In addition, the proposed sign will be located higher above the ground, which will impact visibility less than the existing sign; therefore, the third standard has been met for the variance request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

6. Variance requests must meet all three standards of the Three Standards Test; however, it is questionable that the variance meets all the standards. If the Board decides the request fails to meet the legal standards needed for approval, the variance should be denied.

The above constitutes the opinion and report of the Community Planning and Development Department.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Application
2. Location Map
3. Sign Details
APPLICATION TO THE
BOARD OF APPEALS
CITY OF PLATTEVILLE, WISCONSIN

General Information (please type or print clearly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN REEVES</td>
<td>BEN REEVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 S. Water St</td>
<td>300 S. Water St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608-642-7711</td>
<td>608-642-7711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>Fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>888-267-2119</td>
<td>888-267-2119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Request: ☒ Variance from Code Requirements
☐ Appeal of Administrative Decision

Property Information (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Address of Property in Question: 300, 330, 360 S. Water St, Platteville, WI

Legal Description: Former Kwik Trip - Now Edward Jones and Nutrition World

Current Use and Improvements: Three unit strip mall - retail and office

Proposed Use and Improvements: Replace existing 4'8" by 8' letter/arrow sign with a 5'x8' LED digital sign. That will be 55sf larger (40sf) than B-2 normal maximum for electronic signs (35sf). A slightly larger sign will offset placement further from streets for better and safer visibility for traffic on corner of Water and Alder Streets.

Dimensions: Required | Requested
--- | ---
Street Yard | ft. | ft.
Left Side Yard | ft. | ft.
Right Side Yard | ft. | ft.
Rear Yard | ft. | ft.
Area | sq. ft. | sq. ft.
Other

Is this a corner lot? ☒ YES ☐ NO

Zoning District: □ B-2

Code Reference (Section No.): 22.11 (G)(5)

OFFICE USE ONLY
Date Application Filed: 1/9/2020
Board of Appeals Action & Date:
Conditions:

File Number:
Fee Paid/Receipt #: 
Justification for the Request
(Attach additional sheets if necessary)

**APPEAL OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION:** Provide a description of your appeal.

City official(s) who made the decision you are appealing:

Decision of official(s):

Describe your appeal:

**VARIANCE:** State in the spaces below how your variance request conforms to the Three Standards Test as described in the attached Q&A document. Attach a separate sheet if necessary.

1) **Unnecessary Hardship** is present because... We are asking to increase the maximum area of the electronic message from 35 sf to 40 sf to accommodate a 5' x 8' digital message center. Because we are voluntarily setting the sign back from the corner so far to increase visibility at the Water and Alden St intersection, the smaller 35' sign would be less readable.

2) The hardship is due to **unique features of the property** in that... Although we are zoned B2 which I believe means we could have zero setback, I have voluntarily kept building and sign back from Water St and Alden St to maximize visibility and safety. That, that makes signage harder to see when further than required from streets!

3) The variance will not be **contrary to the public interest** because... We are only increasing maximum allowed by 5sf while leaving even better visibility than there currently is with our arrow/letter sign because we are using pylon sign where bottom of sign is seven feet above grade vs 17 feet above grade with current letter sign. It also intend to intersperse uplifting phrases with marketing messages (eg. Gratefulness is uplifting all year long) "Thank you emergency services personnel-you are appreciated!" "Thank you Veterans for your sacrifices and our freedoms!"

**Signatures**
The undersigned person(s) hereby give notice to the Board of Zoning Appeals of the City of Platteville, Wisconsin, of an appeal and/or request for a variance.

**APPELLANT:** Bow Reenee  
**DATE:** 1/9/2020

**APPELLANT:**  
**DATE:**

**TRONIC DISPLAY SPECIFICATIONS**

- Manufacture and install (1) D/F pylon sign with EMC as shown.
- Skin & Bones construction, .063" aluminum skin, 1 1/2" x 1 1/2" x 3/16" aluminum single skeleton structure, prepped and painted to match PMS 439C.
- W x 60" H Desay digital display with a matrix of 140x224.
- 6" steel support tube directly embedded into formed and finished concrete base.
- 120 Volt, UL Listed & Labeled, power supplies mounted inside of cabinet.
- To be provided by customer.

**Survey Needed**
Detailed survey of existing conditions required prior to beginning manufacturing.

---

**CLIENT** Edward Jones  
**SALESMAN** Rick Brunton  
**JOE SITE** Platteville, WI

**ARTIST** Kaitlin  
**DATE** 12/06/19  
**DRAWING** 08077-01a

**CUSTOMERS SIGNATURE** X...
STAFF REPORT TO THE BOARD OF APPEALS

From: Community Planning & Development Department
Date: February 17, 2020
Re: Variance from Zoning Ordinance
Case #: BA20-VA03-03

Request: Variance from Section 22.09(C)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance regarding having hard-surfacd parking.

Applicant: Bill Breuer/B&M Auto
Location: 355 Enterprise Drive/1590 Vision Drive

Surrounding Uses and Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Comprehensive Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property in Question</td>
<td>Vacant Building/ Vacant Land</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>DMV Office</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Hypro Warehouse</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant Land</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Mound View Dairy</td>
<td>M-4</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BACKGROUND

1. The applicant is interested in purchasing the building at 355 Enterprise Drive. The building is vacant but was most recently used as the location for the Timmernans Supply business. The applicant would use the building for the B&M Auto Tire & Towing business. The applicant would also like to purchase part of the vacant lot at 1590 Vision Drive. Part of this lot is located just to the east and is owned by the City. This land would be used as a secure storage area and impound area for the towing business.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2. The property contains an existing building and paved parking area. The applicant would like to use the existing building for auto repair, tire service and office space, and the existing parking lot would be for customer and employee parking. The applicant would like to purchase additional vacant land to the east of the property for use as a vehicle storage area and impound lot for the towing business. The zoning ordinance requires vehicle parking areas to have a hard surface of asphalt, concrete, concrete pavers, or similar surface. Gravel or crushed stone doesn't meet this requirement. The applicant would like the surface of this
vehicle storage and impound area to be gravel, so the request is for a variance from this requirement.

STAFF ANALYSIS

3. As with any variance request, there are three standards that must be considered. The first standard requires the applicant to show that a strict application of the dimensional standards in the Zoning Ordinance would lead to an unnecessary hardship. The Wisconsin State Supreme Court has determined that a hardship exists only when the applicant can show that the regulations would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome. The 355 Enterprise Drive property has a viable use with the existing building and parking area. The applicant is also allowed to expand the use on the other property and install the secure storage area/impound lot. The question is whether or not it is a burden to require the hard surfacing rather than gravel. From a legal standard, it is questionable if the first standard has been met for the variance request.

4. The second standard requires the applicant to show that the hardship is due to some unique feature of the property, such as an odd shape or the presence of natural features. The property itself doesn’t have any unique physical features that prevent the ordinance from being met. The issue is that the proposed use of the property as a secure vehicle storage area/impound lot is somewhat different than a standard parking lot. The gravel surface meets the needs of the applicant better than a hard surface. From a legal standard, it is questionable if the first standard has been met for the variance request.

5. The third standard requires the applicant to show that the variance, if granted, will not have a negative impact on the public interest. The code requirement for hard surfacing is primarily due to concerns about dust and general appearance. Since this area is for more for vehicle storage rather than parking, the traffic should be low enough that dust isn’t an issue. The concern about the appearance of the area could be an issue. The applicant is proposing to provide fencing around the storage area already. If this fencing was an opaque style to provide screening, that would help alleviate the concerns about the appearance of the area. There should only be minor negative impacts on the general public, which could be reduced with proper fencing and screening. Therefore, it appears that the third standard may have been met for the variance request.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

6. Variance requests must meet all three standards of the Three Standards Test. It is questionable if the request has met all three standards necessary for approval, therefore the variance should be denied.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Application
2. Location Map
**APPLICATION TO THE**
**BOARD OF APPEALS**
**CITY OF PLATTEVILLE, WISCONSIN**

**General Information** (please type or print clearly)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Breuer/B&amp;M Auto, Tire and Towing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 Honey Lane, Bloomington, WI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 994 2454</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>608 994 3254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Request: ☑ Variance from Code Requirements  
☐ Appeal of Administrative Decision

**Property Information** (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

Address of Property in Question: 355 Enterprise Drive, Platteville, WI

Legal Description: Vacant lot East of the building at 355 Enterprise Drive

Current Use and Improvements: Currently empty lot owned by the city of Platteville

Proposed Use and Improvements: If I purchase the lot at 355 Enterprise Drive, my intention would be to create a secured storage area and impound facility for my towing business that I would be operating at that address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions:</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>Is this a corner lot? ____ YES ☑ NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left Side Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right Side Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td>ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td>sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning District: M-4

Code Reference (Section No.): 27.09 (c)(4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OFFICE USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Application Filed: 1/21/2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee Paid/Receipt #: 1203429</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Justification for the Request (Attach additional sheets if necessary)

APPEAL OF AN ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION: Provide a description of your appeal.

City official(s) who made the decision you are appealing: Information received at a face to face meeting with Joe Carroll on 10-17-19.

Decision of official(s): City policy to have hard surface for parking.

Describe your appeal: I am proposing for the allowance of gravel instead of a hard surface lot at this property. I plan to use a breaker run base with gravel on top. I am aware of the run off and catch pond requirements that would need to be in place.

VARIANCE: State in the spaces below how your variance request conforms to the Three Standards Test as described in the attached Q&A document. Attach a separate sheet if necessary.

1) Unnecessary Hardship is present because... Vehicles with missing wheels or dragging parts may damage blacktop or cement. Gasoline and battery acid will also damage these surfaces while oil will make these surfaces extremely slippery. A gravel lot is also easily maintained in case of any of these instances.

2) The hardship is due to unique features of the property in that... The requirement of a hard surface is not ideal for my proposed plans for this lot.

3) The variance will not be contrary to the public interest because... This lot will be a storage area for wrecked and/or impounded vehicles for the city and the county. It will be private property and not for public use.

Signatures
The undersigned person(s) hereby give notice to the Board of Zoning Appeals of the City of Platteville, Wisconsin, of an appeal and/or request for a variance.