

**BOARD OF APPEALS  
VILLAGE OF TWIN LAKES**

**HINZ, Edward**

**November 29, 2007 - 6:30 P.M. - 7:30 P.M.**

\*tape available indefinitely\*

\*\*minutes transcribed from tape by Cynthia Skrypt\*\*

Meeting called to order by Chairman Tom Porps. Roll call: Jooss, Kuhlmeier, Myers, Nathan, Porps. Tim Popanda was also present. Porps announced that the purpose of the meeting was to hear the variance request of Edward Hinz – Waldeck Twin LLC, 465 Waldeck Drive, Twin Lakes, WI 53181. Porps gave the following instructions: This board meeting and public hearing to be considered today are open to the public. Anyone wishing to speak may do so providing they stand up, identify themselves and be sworn in. A tape recording is being made of these proceedings, therefore it is important that you state your name and address before addressing the Board. The purpose of this public hearing is to take evidence in this case. This Board is interested in hearing all of the evidence and will make a decision based on the evidence. Variances are not granted routinely. The applicant for a variance must clearly show the Board the three statutory standards that govern granting a variance will be met. The three standards are unnecessary hardship, unique property limitation, and protection of the public interest. For a dimensional variance, unnecessary hardship exists when compliance would unreasonably prevent the owner from using the property for a permitted purpose or would render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome. Whether this standard is met depends upon a consideration of the purpose of the zoning restrictions in question, its effect on the property, and the effect of a variance on the neighborhood and the larger public interest. Unique property limitation - unique physical characteristics of the property must prevent the applicant from developing in compliance with the zoning ordinance. Protection of the public interest – granting of a variance must neither harm the public interest nor undermine the purpose of the ordinance. The public interest includes the interests of the public at large, not just that of nearby property owners. Conditions may be attached to a variance to protect adjoining properties and to preserve the essential character of the neighborhood. A variance should include only the minimum relief necessary to allow reasonable use of a property. In granting a variance, this Board has the power to and will impose special conditions to insure that the public welfare will not be damaged.

EDWARD HINZ – WALDECK TWIN LLC VARIANCE REQUEST– 465 WALDECK DRIVE – 86-4-119-282-2351

Board of Appeals Clerk advised the news media, general public, applicant and property owners had been notified of this public hearing. Board members stated they reviewed the variance request and inspected the property in person. On site inspections, when conducted are in accordance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law. During the inspection process, no additional evidence was uncovered.

Joe Anselmo, 1122 Lucille Avenue, appeared on behalf of Edward Hinz – Waldeck Twin LLC and was sworn in.

Porps told Anselmo he always writes out what the applicant is asking for, which you have a copy of. Because the drawings did not have numbers on them, Porps scaled the drawings and asked Anselmo if they met with his approval. Porps read into the record Hinz' request for a variance: "You are requesting a variance to allow for the construction of a new home. Your plans depict a three story building in place of the two and one half story maximum with a total height of 42 feet in place of the 35 foot maximum. The drawing was scaled at 42 feet. Porps asked Anselmo if he agreed with that. Anselmo stated the height of the building dimensionally is from the curb or the front of the building setback through the mean of the roof and he gets 22 feet six inches. That's the Ordinance definition of the height taken from the curb or the building line. Sometimes there are other things about measuring from other places and averaging them but the item that was mentioned in here, 17.08.050 and 17.08.330 are the two that have to do with the height and the stories. The first one of it does not apply because it is only 22.6 feet. Popanda stated this has been talked about before. We have had a few policies that we have had to use and have adopted interpreting our particular archaic code and one of them is the height. We have some exceptionally tall pieces of property along roads and we have some that are 20 feet below the road. The Ordinance says as Anselmo just indicated that the height is measured from the center line of the road of the property that it is on. If you are in Twin Lakes Park and your property is 20 feet above the road, you would get a 15 foot tall structure. What we have done in this policy is we take the four corners of the building whether it is a walkout, a yard level home or a flat on grade – we take the four corners, add those together, divide them up with the mean elevation and that is what we measure for that 35 feet always hoping that it is the front of the property what you see is what that 35 foot is measured from. Now Anselmo alluded to something that we do not usually use and that mean of the roof so it is basically half of the roof from the center line of the roof of a gable or a hip. We have always gone to the top. The plans were refused because of the third floor. Our Residential Zoning Ordinance requires that the maximum height of the building be 35 feet and not exceed two and half stories. Now going back to the definitions and the definition of a story is if 50% of the basement is above grade or out of the ground. That is the case here. If you look at the cross section on page 404 of Anselmo's drawing, you will see that on that side nearly 90% of that wall is exposed and out of the ground. If you go to the next one on page 405, that is the opposite side and you can see there is approximately 60% to 70% of it is out of the ground. So it is clear to me that the lowest habitable space is no longer considered a basement. It is considered a floor. Taking that into account, it is a three story structure. The uniqueness of the property is that he doesn't know how else you could without bringing in fill to cover that lowest level to get it back to being a basement. That is really why we are here.

Anselmo marked this if you look at that same section from the grade to the midpoint of the roof which is what the code defines as height 38 feet and that would be at the low side of the building. So those corners would roughly be about 38 feet. The front

is 22.6 feet. It is still less than 35 feet if you took the four points. Porps stated you have the front at 22.6 feet. He has it at 26 feet scaled off your drawing to the ridge. Anselmo stated the code defines it as midpoint. He believed Porps was right at 26 feet to the ridge. Porps stated the real question here is the fact that it is a three story building not a two and a half story building and the total height is not really in question at all. Popanda stated that was correct. Porps stated you can scratch that out and he will send an updated copy of that. With that scratched out, does that accurately describe what you are asking for? Anselmo stated yes, he believed it did.

Anselmo stated he usually attempts to try to comply to all codes especially with a new construction. They tried moving this building all around to see at some point it would make sense without causing that basement problem. Part of the original criteria was when he moved to the house next door, part of the problem was trying to get down those grades to the lower area. My suggestion at one point was to try and move something down where they could maybe get some flatter grade but it turned out no matter where you go from the road, you can't get the basement out of the ground enough to qualify because of the pitch. No matter where you start you can't do it until you go all the way to the flat part, which is evidently a filled in wetland. It was Hinz' clear attempt to not attempt to try to come in down the road any more but come in initially at the grade at the top so they could have a garage and entryway at the ground level and then have the basement below it. His entry to the other house is already down a story and that allows us to get by with a little one car garage upstairs so that you can drive into the garage and then go into the house. But to have additional garage space for their original cars or boat storage and other things like that on the lower garage in the basement. That was the driving force there since there was no place else on the site to alleviate the problem no matter where you went the basement was always the third story. The only relief is to request consideration for a third story in the fact that this variance be granted as a necessity to support the building. They have to go down that far. They have to go down all the way to the adjacent grade. If we had to fill that up again, we'd be filling it up with more fill and crawl space or something. None of it made any sense. It is a fairly small footprint because the longer the building gets, the worse the problem is. If you try to pinch it back to try to accommodate just that entry and the great room on the first floor, have the master suite, two bedrooms and the bathroom on the second floor and then a garage and just a recreation room on the lower level. Porps stated the lot was 60 feet wide and the building is 23 or 24 feet wide. Is there any reason why you did not make the building any wider? Anselmo stated they were within a foot, they came in at 13 feet at the one side and the other side is probably closer to 20 feet. He always likes to try and get at least a half of foot in for construction tolerances. It is a 12 foot setback on line there. You can see the building is about a foot further out. Then the 18 foot setback runs parallel, maybe a foot and a half or two feet from the other side. Porps stated the bottom line is how wide do you show the building? He shows the building at 23 feet. Anselmo believed it was 24 feet total. Porps stated he did not like the height from the lake. He has a real problem with that. He hears complaints all the time from people. People say, "How did the variance board grant the thing in town?" Porps answers, there was no variance granted. When he looks at this and he looks at that elevation, he sees that measured from the grade of the front of the building, he knows that does not come into the legal aspect of it but it does from the protection of the public interest aspect. The building is 42 feet tall plus quite a ways up that hill. Looking at the lake, this is going to be about 60 feet over the water. He really does not like it. He did some drawings scaling this and if you increase this building to 30 feet wide – that would make the garage on the first floor a two car garage and lose the one in the basement which would make this a two story building and as far as actual square footage – you have roughly 2,618 – and if you made it 30 feet wide and eliminated one floor it would be about 2,550 – pretty close to the same thing. Anselmo stated the 61 feet is on a diagonal. We are dealing between the side lots – the side lines and we've got about three feet of flex in there. We pulled in about 13 feet from the 12 foot side and we are averaging 20 from the 18 foot side. The lot is not 60 feet. Porps stated he had a survey here showing the lot is 60 feet. Anselmo stated that was the frontage on the road. If you take the distance between the two side lots – which is the way when the building is parallel to them – I don't remember exactly what it is – It is actually about 57 feet wide. If you take the 20 off of that and actually being that it is a little less than 60 feet side – they will reduce slightly. There is about 27 feet and they are 24 feet with the building and that is where the three feet is – one foot on one side and two on the other. Porps stated personally he would rather see Hinz go for a side yard variance than this.

Porps asked the board members had any questions. Kuhlmeier asked Popanda if he had a problem with the height of this on the lake side. Popanda believed the property was unique. He thought that Anselmo has explained why there has to be that opening at the bottom – why it has to be so much exposed but he also has to sort of agree with Porps – if the Board would be willing to make the concession for the side yard and he can get more square footage – if they would go along with that, he would rather see the two story with the larger garage at the top than a three story building. The lowest floor would get removed in a sense or pushed into the hill. Anselmo stated the problem was the foundation and the way it drops. You have the foundation below and they have to fill – in other words build another story of foundation and then fill it up and then the foundation would still drop 17 feet to the grade. When you look at drawing 403, the ground is down here and the road is up here so you still have to have a foundation under there. The foundation still has to go four feet below ground so we would end up with a 20 foot or so foundation wall holding the building up because of the way the grade is. It is a lot like Mount Moriah and the issues with it. The problem is the ground is falling away and we still have to bring the building down – a two story building coming off grade. Porps stated maybe he did not specify himself clear enough. Just eliminate the top floor. Your basement is not going to change; just the top floor will be gone. What you're considering now the second floor becomes your first floor and your basement is what would be your first floor. If you make the building 30 feet wide, your garage would then be about 19 feet – it is currently 13 feet on the first floor. It would be a good size two car garage. You can still enter from the street except from the

street side; it would just be a one story building. Anselmo stated they did not look at the building being much wider but the bedrooms – you are talking master suite and a couple other bedrooms and a bath – you would almost have to double the footprint to get it all on one level what is on the two levels now – living space and bedroom space. You still need an entry and a garage. Porps stated the total square footage would be roughly the same – how you laid it out could be a little problematic for you but he believed there could be a remedy. Anselmo stated they looked at trying to do it without the second story coming in and going down and that was a problem itself. Part of what he is trying to do is to come in from the driveway at the road into the garage and no matter what you do, you still drop down so far – the bigger the floor plan gets any length – the foundation just drops further down – it could be pulled back a little – that would help a little bit – I don't know what we could get in the width – you are still going to be down another story and a half to grade and that basement there is already built up with fill and a slab. This minimizes it by having the basement walkout. You still have to build all that up. It will basically be a walkout basement without anything else. He does not know if they could accommodate all of the program requirements without starting all over. There are some other issues with the roadway that comes down now serving the existing house that is there. That is one of the reasons they pushed it to the far side is to stay away from the easement there that serves both properties that comes down the driveway. It could probably be reconfigured a little bit but it still has to start at that point and follow the grade. It is a very difficult situation because this is pinched in between the road and setbacks.

Jooss asked with the height of the three story building from the lake side – would this be a fire fighting problem. Even though you could be on the road and fight it from that aspect – if you had to fight it from the bottom without being able to get a hook and ladder truck or something down there – would that be a problem on the third floor from the bottom side as a fire fighter. Popanda stated he would give information based on his fire fighting experience for a different community. From his experience it could pose a problem simply because of the height of the ladder truck. It is important to note that fire fighters are never trying to save the top of the roof with the ladder. They just want to get to a window that will open or side of the building where they may be someone in a room. If they can get to the roof from the front, they can always shimmy themselves across to cut an access hole. He believes the upper landing is accessible from the front of the building (lake side) with a hand operated ladder. It is a challenge to do but it could be done. It could also be accessed from the front. All fire fighters believe in the system as work smarter not harder.

Jooss asked on the drawing that was submitted it says return to original property line. When he looks at the picture from Kenosha County, he sees a little blurb on the property and he does not see a blurb on the drawing. Anselmo stated the drawing does show the line that comes from the front corner – it comes right into the building that little dot there and then it goes back on a diagonal down to this dot near the front of the existing house. The main line that runs through here is the original line. This jog was put in by Mr. Hinz because he owned both properties to accommodate this drive coming down being on his main property. It was bent in there to that side lot. In order to do this, of course that does not give any buildable width. The intent was to go back to the original plot. Jooss asked if those were two tax lots. So then that would have to be changed – it would have to be changed as the drawing as shown. Anselmo stated there has been a submission for reviewing that to return the lot line adjustment. Popanda stated it would be approved per an earlier conversation with David Cox, Village Administrator. The applicant needs to submit an actual certified survey map. That is the only way we can do a lot line amendment. About a year ago we changed the procedure so it is not required for lot line adjustments that are not creating a new buildable lot – it is just a configuration change – they can go through staff level. It does not have to go to the Plan Commission or the Village Board. It does still have to be done by way of a certified survey map. Porps thought when changes were made to lot line adjustments that could not be undone. Once you combined something, you were stuck with it. Popanda responded these were not combined. That previous adjustment was not done with the blessing of the Village Plan Commission or the Village Board. Technically, the Village would not honor what is there now. The Village wants it back to what it is suppose to be. Popanda believed that Porps was referring to combination of lots. Once you combine non-conforming pre-existing lots which is less than 60 feet, the Village would not allow somebody to split that back off. This is not the case.

Jooss asked on the drawing showing the elevation of the land, the topographical map, you have the building starting at 842 and on the drawing the proposed level is 847. Is that built up? This would be your drawing on the side when you go to give elevations. Popanda explained it to Anselmo. Anselmo stated the floor is 847. The original grade is shown and then it slopes down here – the original grade and the dotted line here is the approximate grade of the existing driveway. The dark line is the proposed grade they are building up – you can see probably eight feet from the existing grade up here to get that as high as they can even though the basement walkout is yet considerably above that. It just keeps falling off and at that point here they have leveled it off but then it drops off to catch up with the original grade again. This is the heart of the problem of this third floor. It is because the grade just keeps falling away. Jooss stated so then this picture here to meet that 847, that building will actually have to be going up the hill a little bit from where it is drawn on the proposal. Anselmo stated the corner of the building is at 836 roughly. Popanda explained it to Jooss. Jooss stated he understood it. Anselmo stated the topographic line on the corner of the house, which represents this corner; is at about 836 feet and that is about where this original grade line shows. We have to build up from there. This keeps going and then that plateau will be like a patio area drops down. If this were a flatter piece of land, they could just put a two story house on the grade. (Further discussion continued regarding the grade of the property and what could be done with the home.)

The Board had no further questions. Popanda stated he believed the property was a unique piece of property. He understands why this has to be or why he is proposing this in order to make habitable space from the road and still put a foundation in without spending a great deal of money. His only concern is this seven feet of sub basement or sub first floor. This speaks to the design. At the garage transition between the proposed basement elevation that is labeled on page 404 and the garage if that stepped down, there might be the possibility to eliminate that seven feet. Whether or not that would bring the roof line down with it and each floor coming down, I don't know. Looking at it from the lake, you see three stories but what is that seven feet sticking out of the ground? Is that the bow of the ship? Now there are others in the Village and Porps alluded to one right downtown. The dimensions of that that is truly a basement, 50% of it just barely but 50% of it is in the ground, stuffed back in the ground. The grade comes down very slowly along side of it and then opens up at the base where it is all open in the front. If you heard what we said at the beginning of this conversation about it is allowed to have two and a half stories – so that first story is not counted. It is a basement. Then you have two. Then you have that quarter of a story – that bird's eye or that bird outlook up on the town. So it is in compliance. Now the one that is downtown is in full compliance. No variance was necessary.

Kuhlmeier stated something says to him that you would want to negotiate that hill inside the house rather than outside the house because if you eliminate the bottom one, then you have to fall out someplace or have a large staircase. Popanda stated he hated to do this on behalf of the applicant and Anselmo and the fact that they are going to be missing a game, maybe the possibility is to widen the home, take the top story off or some type of an adjustment. Maybe the adjustment is getting it closer to the road. You have the ability to ask them to go back and make reapplication and give them a strong poll of what you think about reducing that 25 foot setback. Nathan believed just by looking at the ground even if you moved it closer or back with the way the house is set up, you are going to end up at the same place. Popanda believed he was right. Nathan stated the only other thing he could see is if you drop that basement door closer to the existing driveway grade – it is only four feet -- but it gets you four feet into the – Popanda asked if he was looking at 404. Nathan stated he was looking at 404. If you would bring it down, then it would get this closer to grade. Anselmo stated you have to keep in mind that the adjacent property is that road that is kind of a drainage spillway. There is a proposal to try and rework that a little bit and get through and make that a little more palatable. We could raise this grade further up but then you build a retaining wall for the road. It has to continue down at a reasonable pitch from the very top so you can get down. This was a balance between the adjacent grade which is not going anywhere and the house which is starting at ground zero at the top and they tried to split it and bring this out as far that was reasonable. Porps understood everything Anselmo is saying. What he proposed was making it a one story home and making it wider. That does not seem to interest you. Anselmo stated the footprint is up there and he does not see even if you had no setbacks – you have to have a roadway setback. The shaded area on there is between the street setback and side yards even if they were varied a little bit and the drive and the road that comes down, might add 10% to 15% square footage on a level. There is no way they could get three bedrooms and a living area with an extra 15 or so percent. They did have a scheme at one time to try and come in at the top level and drop the rooms down. Then you are coming in if the bedrooms are upstairs, you are coming in at the bedroom level and having to go through the hallway and down to the living level. That functionally was not making sense. That scheme certainly did not meet Mr. Hinz' needs. After working several schemes, the only thing that really made sense was to come into the house like a standard home with the bedrooms upstairs and have the walkout. They did not look at doing the house any wider because of the side yards. Part of the side yards are going to be swaled to let the drainage continue on down. It was not an easy site.

Porps asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to speak in favor of granting this appeal. Ira Mizell, 473 Waldeck, is a neighbor of Mr. Hinz from the road side it would be the right. He is in favor of what Hinz is going to do. The only concern he has is the water drainage situation but the plans look pretty extensive and certainly the height issue is not something that the neighbors would be of concerned for. The neighbors are in favor of the proposal.

Porps asked if there were any letters of support. There were none.

Porps asked if there was anyone in the audience wishing to express an opposing view to this appeal. There were none.

Porps asked if there were any letters of opposition. There was none.

Lack of opposition is not a reason for granting a variance.

Porps asked the board members if they had any more questions. Jooss stated there is a house very similar to that one, the one that Bill Westerlund built on Storms Drive. Popanda stated that was very true, somewhat of the same circumstances. What really makes this one stand out is that overhead garage door on the side. It cuts back the fill area exposing more basement where Westerlund's home has soil going down the sides of it. From the lake it looks like a three story but it truly is a two story because that first level does not count. It is a basement that happens to be exposed at the bottom. What is different about this is this entire side that we see on page 404 and then all across the front, 100% of it is exposed. Jooss stated they could do some landscaping to knock out some of the height. Anselmo stated as Popanda points out on the grade where the door is the dotted line is the grade and it is just this little corner of the door that's retained in the retaining wall there. It is just that little triangle

otherwise that is where the natural grade already comes down and continues on down and around. So that was a natural place because it is just under this level. Porps asked if that was the natural grade or the grade after they put the driveway in. Anselmo stated the natural grade is down here. Porps stated he was saying natural grade in reality or after they install the driveway. Anselmo stated this is the existing grade at 842 is where that driveway is as it starts to turn the corner. Porps asked what the grade was prior to installing the driveway. Anselmo stated 842 is the original grade where that driveway is. Nathan stated it looks like 846 comes right into the corner. Anselmo stated 846 was the floor of the garage. The grades that were there continue on up at the corner of the garage door.

The Board's action cannot be based upon its attitude toward the applicant or the proposed use. The Board's decision must be based upon the Zoning Ordinance and the facts presented at this hearing.

Unique Property Limitation – Porps stated there was no question about the fact that there is a unique property limitation. The slope itself justifies that. The Board agreed.

Unnecessary Hardship – Porps stated he believed the applicant has proved an unnecessary hardship. It is a difficult site and the applicant has attempted to meet some criteria to try and make it the best. The Board agreed.

Public Interest – Porps stated he was having trouble with protection of the public interest. As stated earlier, he does not like the height from the lake. One of the protection of the public interest questions comes – preserve the essential character of the neighborhood. There is nothing in that neighborhood that he sees that is roughly 60 feet high from the lake or 42 feet high above the ground. In his opinion, the applicant has not met the public interest question. Kuhlmeier stated he would argue with that because there is a house to the east of this one that he was looking at a couple of weeks ago. The house is way on the top but if you walk over to the edge at the end of the driveway, it is like 40 feet straight down. Kids would definitely have a problem with that. Jooss did not believe it was as big of a problem because it is stuck back in the bay where you really do not see it unless you want to go back there and look. It is not sitting out in the open like Lake Mary Condo's. He did not believe it would be a big problem. Kuhlmeier believed it was good use of the land. Jooss believed with proper landscaping with trees and bushes to take part of that bottom part out so you do not see it would be acceptable. Meyers stated Porps earlier stated it was roughly 60 feet above the lake. It looks like it would even be higher than that above the lake. What Jooss mentioned about landscaping would conceal the bottom floor making it look less intrusive for the height. Nathan did not have a problem with it except for the seven feet of the sub basement that is sticking out. The existing dwelling needs to be removed so if you could remove some of that earth from below that and flatten that out a little bit and berm it up in front of it and flatten it out a little bit. Anselmo stated he understood what Nathan was talking about. He has spent a lot of time trying to study what the impacts are. The original grade is just going to keep going once they get beyond the building. So the more you build up the more retaining wall or – Nathan stated it drops so much to the existing building from your plan. When you are driving a machine down there taking that building out some of that hill could be moved and leveled out so it does not drop so much. Anselmo stated they are working with the site as best they can. Nobody is trying to make it look taller. It appeared to be the balance point there – if we can get it higher – there certainly is enough retaining wall around there. Once they start moving things around there, they would certainly try to minimize it. Nathan stated that extra seven feet makes it look like four stories instead of only three.

Variances are not precedent setting. Each case is judged on its own merit. Likewise, similar existing cases or past practices are not reasons for granting a variance.

In granting a variance, the Board of Appeals overrules one or more Village Ordinances. If a variance is granted today, any aggrieved party will have 30 days to appeal the decision to the circuit court.

In addition to meeting the statutory requirements, the following conditions are required. The motion to grant or deny the variance is based on the survey presented at this time, the plans presented and the actual statement of the variance requested. The survey is to be marked as Exhibit A. The plans are to be marked as Exhibit B. Edward Hinz – Waldeck Twin LLC: “You are requesting a variance to allow for the construction of a new home. Your plans depict a three story building in place of the two and one half story maximum.” Edward Hinz circled yes and made a notation of the deleted section “~~with a total height of 42 feet in place of the 35 foot maximum~~”.

After the motion to grant or deny the variance has been made, seconded, discussion held, if any, and voted upon, the matter is closed. If you are not satisfied with the results, and you can present substantial new evidence, you may reapply and pay the associated fees. You may also appeal the Boards' decision to the circuit court. The variance is based on the survey as presented and the actual placement must substantially conform to the survey as presented. This variance, if granted, is conditional upon the owner having the title amended to include the variance. (Variances “run with the land”, this will protect you or any future owner should any question ever arise over the encroachment in the setback area.) Any and all fees, legal, recording etc. are the applicant's responsibility. The Building Inspector or the Board of Appeals will verify the amendment prior to issuing a building permit.

The contemplated completion date of the project is 11/29/09.

MOTION BY JOOSS, KUHLMEY, TO GRANT THE VARIANCE CONTINGENT ON THE PROPERTY LINE RETURNING TO THE ORIGINAL AND ALSO THAT PROPER LANDSCAPING BE DONE ON THE BASE OF THE BUILDING TO COVER UP THAT BOTTOM SPACE WITH TREES OR SOMETHING OF THAT NATURE SO THERE IS NOT AN EMPTY SPACE AT THE BOTTOM. ROLL CALL: JOOSS-YES; KUHLMEY-YES; MYERS-YES; NATHAN-YES; PORPS-NO. MOTION CARRIED (4-1). VARIANCE GRANTED.

Motion by Nathan, Myers, carried, to approve the minutes of October 10, 2007 – Christine Tenerelli.

Motion by Nathan, Myers, carried, to approve the minutes of October 23, 2007 – Christine Tenerelli Continuance.

Motion by Kuhlmeiy, Myers, carried, to adjourn @ 7:30 p.m.

***SIGNED COPY AVAILABLE AT THE VILLAGE HALL***

Cynthia Skrypt  
Board of Appeals Clerk

G:\COMMON\WPDOCS\CINDY\Board of Appeals\hinz.app.doc

***DISTRIBUTION***

*Board of Appeals (7)  
Village Administrator  
Library*

*Village Board (7)  
Village Hall*

*Building Inspector  
Post Office*