

PLANNING AND ZONING

Cerro Gordo County Courthouse

220 N Washington Ave Mason City, IA 50401-3254 cgcounty.org/planning (641) 421-3075 (641) 421-3110 plz@cgcounty.org

SPECIAL EXCEPTION STAFF REPORT

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

<u>Case No.</u>: 22-3 <u>Hearing Date</u>: February 22, 2022

<u>Applicant</u> <u>Owner</u>

Cerro Gordo County Conservation William & Patricia Hansen
3501 Lime Creek Road 20230 Cardinal Avenue
Mason City, IA 50401 Clear Lake, IA 50428

Property Address: 22217 Cardinal Avenue

Brief Legal Description: Parcel A in W½ of the SW¼, Section 16, Grant Township

Zoning: A-1 Agricultural

Background

The Hansens are donating about 200 acres of their property to Cerro Gordo County that is under a Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) easement administered by the US Department of Agriculture. They intend to split off the acreage from the WRP land, which is 18' from the existing southernmost machine shed (See Figure 1). A rezoning from the current zoning to A-2 Agricultural is being requested in March for the proposed acreage to be split off as proposed. The Board is considering the resulting setback on the south side lot line.

SPECIAL EXCEPTION REQUEST*			
Structure	Request(s)	Requirement(s)	
Machine shed	18' south side yard setback	25' side yard setback (8.6-B)	

^{*}See Figure 2

FINDINGS OF FACT

- 1. William and Patricia Hansen are the owners of the subject property, located in the W½ of the SW¼, Section 16, Grant Township.
- 2. Cerro Gordo County is applying on behalf of the owners, with the intention of receiving about 200 acres of WRP land being donated by the Hansens.
- 3. The property is zoned A-1 Agricultural, with a rezoning to A-2 Agricultural being considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission in March.
- 4. The new south side property line is being proposed 18' from the existing southernmost machine shed.
- 5. The required side yard setback is 25' in the A-1 District.
- 6. The application was filed on January 11, 2022 with the Planning and Zoning Office.

ANALYSIS

The Board of Adjustment is provided the power to grant special exception under Section 24.4(A)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. The Board may grant special exception to bulk standards of the ordinance if, in its judgement, the standards established in Section 24.4(A)(2)(a) are met. In its review, the Board may attach certain conditions to any special exception granted in order to observe the spirit of the Zoning Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan and mitigate any potential impacts that may directly result from the requested special exception.

Discussion of Standards of Review

Strict compliance with the standards governing setback, frontage, height, or other bulk provisions of this ordinance would result in a practical difficulty upon the owner of such property and only where such exception does not exceed 50 percent of the particular limitation or number in question.

The proposed setback for the proposed south side lot line from the existing southernmost machine shed is 18'. A 25' side yard setback is required in the A-2 District (See Figure 2). The standard appears to be met.

The exception relates entirely to a permitted use (principal, special, or accessory) classified by applicable district regulations, or to a permitted sign or off-street parking or loading areas accessory to such a permitted use.

There is no change in use to the acreage as a result of the request. The structure is a typical building on an acreage. Workshops, storage, and similar uses are a permitted use in the A-2 District.

The practical difficulty is due to circumstances specific to the property and prohibits the use of the subject property in a manner reasonably similar to that of other property in the same district.

The WRP easement is a permanent status that runs with the land. The easement is required to be maintained as wildlife habitat. The proposed south property line is the boundary for this easement. Splitting up the land would place a burden on the owner of the acreage to maintain a small portion of land under the terms of the easement that would be difficult to enforce. This would severely limit the Conservation Department's ability to maintain the habitat as required if split onto a separate property. The standard appears to be met.

A grant of the special exception applied for, or a lesser relaxation of the restriction than applied for, is reasonably necessary due to practical difficulties related to the land in question and would do substantial justice to an applicant as well as to other property owners in the locality.

There is no other option for a potential split of the property, as the proposed property lines are the boundaries of the WRP easement. For the county to take ownership of the WRP easement differently, the easement would have to be split up or the property would have to be even more out of compliance form zoning rules. No lesser exception is reasonable as a result. The standard appears to be met.

Such practical difficulties cannot be overcome by any feasible alternative means other than an exception.

The proposed property lines are the WRP easement boundary itself. The standard appears to be met.

Relief can be granted in a manner that will not alter the essential character of the locality.

For the purpose of the land donation, there is no other alternative, as denial or a lesser approval would split off a portion of the easement and create an untenable situation. The standard appears to be met.

Discussion of Potential Impacts to Immediate Area

No change of use or new structures are being proposed as a result of this request. The request will only result in the change of ownership and have no tangible effects.

Staff Conclusions and Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the request. All standards of review appear to be met.

BOARD DECISION

The Board of Adjustment may consider the following alternatives:

<u>Alternatives</u>

- 1. Grant the requested special exception subject to any condition as deemed necessary by the Board.
- 2. Grant relief less or different from the requested special exception.
- 3. Deny the requested special exception.

The following motions are provided for the Board's consideration:

Provided motion of approval:

• I move to adopt the staff report as the Board's findings and to approve the special exception as requested by Cerro Gordo County Conservation for William and Patricia Hansen.

Provided motion of denial:

 I move to adopt the staff report as the Board's findings and to deny the special exception as requested by Cerro Gordo County Conservation for William and Patricia Hansen for the following reasons:

[STATE REASONS FOR DENIAL]

EXHIBITS

- Exhibit 1: Figures
- Exhibit 2: Special Exception Application
- Exhibit 3: Plot Plan
- Exhibit 4: Aerial photo of site

Figure 1Looking at the southernmost machine shed



January 27, 2022, J. Robbins

Figure 2
Looking east along the proposed south lot line



January 27, 2022, J. Robbins

SPECIAL EXCEPTION APPEAL

APPLICATION

Date Filed	Case Number: 225
Applicant Name: Cerro Gordo County Conservaiton Ph	one: 641-423-5309 E-Mail: mwebb@cgcounty.org
Mailing Address: 3501Lime Creek Road Mason City, IA 50401	
	one: 641-425-2840 E-Mail: patjhansen@gmail.com
Property Owner Address: 20230 Cardinal Ave Clear Lake, IA	50428
Property Description (Not to be used on legal documents): Parcel # 0	11630000300 (1 of 5) Township Grant
Property Address: NE corner of Cardinal and 310th Street	2217 Cardinal Albring: A-1
Brief Legal Description: Sec 16, Township 92 North, Range 2	
Sec 10, Township 32 North, Nange 2	2 VVCSt approximation 200 doles
	A / (A
Project Description	Decision Date: NA
The Hansen's are donating 200 acres of property to property is under a Wetland Reserve Program (WRF US Department of Agriculture.	the county and a portion of the) easement administered by the
Special Exception(s) Requested (As cited on results from denied Zoning A portion of the WRP boundary (new property boundary building when the property is split from the acreage.	Permit Application) r) will be within the 25 foot requirement of a
Criteria Justifying Special Exception under Standards for Review (You m	ay add more details in the Additional Information)
Not having the current WRP easement boundary as the practical difficulty in management and compliance of the established and monitoried by the NRCS states that the having complete control of the WRP will create a complete property as 1 contract even if there are 2 landowners a compliance, the whole property would be out of compliant maintained as a 1 owner property. Breaking up the WR County Conservation Boards ability to maintain the region of the property was ability to maintain the region of the property was ability to maintain the region of the property was ability to maintain the region of the property. The line is at an arrow the standard 25 foot boundary. The line is at an arrow to the property was a standard 25 foot boundary. The line is at an arrow to the property was a standard 25 foot boundary.	e newly established property line will create a e WRP easement. The conservation easement e area must be maintained for wildlife habitat. Not liance hardship, as the NRCS will keep the WRP and if any portion of the WRP area is out of ance. The NRCS encourages the WRP property be RP would severly limit and create a hardship on the uired WRP easment rules. The proposed boundary g the WRP boundary will create a 18-20 foot boundary
I am the ☐ Owner ☐ Contract Purchaser ☑ Other (Explain)	Receiver of Donation
of the property affe	cted.
I, the applicant, being duly sworn, depose and say that I am the owner, or that I a who makes the accompanying application; that the application and plan are true work, and use to which the structure is to be placed if a special exception is grant the above property in reviewing this Application.	and contain a correct description of the proposed building, lot,
Applicant Signature Mike Webb (CGCC Director)	Date 1/3/2022

SPECIAL EXCEPTION APPEAL

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Please provide any additional details below needed to fully address the standards for review and any potential impacts to the immediate vicinity that may directly result from the special exception requested.

The current code states that buildings must be 25 feet from the property line. The Hansen's plan to donate the WRP to the County and maintain the acreage adjacent to the WRP. This division will place the new property line boundary at minimum 18 feet from an existing building. As stated earlier the NRCS will keep the existing WRP area as 1 contract and if the new property boundary is placed at 25 feet from the building it will cause the WRP contract to have 2 owners. If either landowner fails to fulfill the requirements of the WRP contract the whole contract will be out of compliance. The County would be at a huge disadvange, if a 0.05 acre of WRP remained with the acreage. If the acreage owner did not follow the rules of the WRP easement it would negatively impact the remaining 200 acres of WRP owned by the County. The Conservation Board feels it is in their best interest to have the whole WRP contract area within their boundaries. The NRCS encourages the County to have the WRP boundary also be the property boundary, to help prevent future encroachment issues in the future and not having to encumber the acreage with a WRP easement on their property. The building being within 18 feet of the property line will not impact any management activities the Conservation Board will have with the WRP property. The Hansen's who are donating the WRP property are in agreement with the WRP boundaries remaining intact and used as the new property line and the County being the sole owner of the entire WRP contract. The new property line will not be parallel with the shed, at the closest point the shed will be 18' from the new property line which is greater than the minimum requirement of 12.5'.



