

TO: Verena M. Weber-CMC
Administrator/Clerk

FROM: Earl Anderson
11362 Grand Lake Road

RE: Request for Variance for Suellen Purlee

Verena,

I am unable to attend the Public hearing on the above request for Variance.

I will be in Milwaukee looking after my son who is under treatment for a very serious disease.

I hope you will present my attached comments to the Rockville Planning Commission concerning the request for Variance.

Thank you,

Earl

TO: Rockville Planning Commission

OCT 12 2015

FROM: Earl Anderson

11362 Grand Lake Road

RE: Request of Suellen Purlee for a variance from Impervious Surface and distance from structure in Shoreland Requirements.

This request seems to be about two variances. One for dealing with the impervious surface problem and the other about distance from structure.

I will address the distance from structure variance first.

The distance of the accessory building to the principal structure clearly violates the conditions of Ordinance No. 2007-40, Subdivision 2 Accessory Buildings, item D. The accessory building should not be closer than ten (10) feet to the principal structure. It is actually about five (5) feet away.

The siting of the accessory building was a part of a significant remodeling of the principal structure and was probably overseen by a general contractor who should have been well aware of the requirements of the Ordinance. At the very least, the general contractor should have informed the homeowner of the ordinance setback requirements.

Under Section 30: Variances/Appeals, Subdivision 2: Variances, I do not see any reason that justifies leaving the accessory building in its current location.

I urge the Planning Commission to reject the request for variance for distance from principal structure. The structure can be moved to the North to meet the requirements of the Ordinance.

The second variance request, for relief from the Impervious surface requirements, is harder to define. Water running off the roof of the accessory building would run towards Grand Lake. The previous owner of the property left many native plants, grasses and cattail plants to filter the runoff from the principal structure before it entered the lake. The current owner has chosen to remove many of these plants. If the planning commission allows the accessory building to stand, then some method must be required of the homeowner to capture, direct or contain this runoff water so that it does not directly enter the lake.

I would once again urge the planning Commission to deny the variance from the Impervious Surface requirement until the homeowner can produce a plan to handle the accessory building runoff water.

Respectively submitted for your consideration.

