BISMARCK BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MEETING MINUTES
November 5, 2015

The Bismarck Board of Adjustment met on November 5, 2015 at 5:00 p.m. in the Tom Baker Meeting Room in the City-County Office Building, 221 North 5th Street. Chairman Marback presided.

Members present were Jennifer Clark, Ken Hoff, Chris Seifert and Michael Marback.

Members absent were Ken Heier and Jeff Ubl.

Staff members present were Brady Blaskowski – Building Official, Jenny Wollmuth – Planner and Hilary Balzum – Community Development Administrative Assistant.

MINUTES:

Chairman Marback called for approval of the minutes of the October 1, 2015 meeting of the Board of Adjustment.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hoff and seconded by Mr. Seifert to approve the minutes of the October 1, 2015, as presented. With Board Members Clark, Hoff, Marback and Seifert voting in favor, the minutes were approved.

VARIANCE FROM SECTION 14-04-01(6) OF THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES (RR – RESIDENTIAL)(REAR YARD) - LOT 3, BLOCK 4, NORTHWOOD ESTATES REPLAT (10710 OLIVE LANE)

Chairman Marback stated the applicants, Jeff and Kristen Blees, are requesting a variance to reduce the rear yard setback located along the west side of the property from seventy-five (75) feet to twenty (20) feet for the purpose of constructing an accessory building.

Ms. Wollmuth gave an overview of the request, including the following findings:

1. The need for a variance is not based on special circumstances or conditions unique to the specific parcel of land involved that are not generally applicable to other properties in this area and within the RR – Residential zoning classification.

2. The hardship is not caused by the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. Strict application of the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance would not deprive the property owner of reasonable use of the property.

4. The granting of the variance is not in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Wollmuth then gave the following additional information:

1. A request for approval of a Special Use Permit to increase the total area of accessory buildings located on the property to 3,200 square feet was approved by the Bismarck Planning and Zoning Commission at their meeting of October 28, 2018, with condition that a variance is approved to reduce the required rear yard setback for an accessory building from seventy-five (75) feet to twenty (20) feet.

Ms. Wollmuth said staff recommends reviewing the findings in the staff report and modifying them as necessary to support the decision of the Board, and if the Board approves the variance as proposed,

Mr. Blees explained that they need the variance due to the layout of the lot and with the highest elevation point being at the middle of the back yard, drainage flows towards the house then away so placing the accessory building anywhere else would disrupt that drainage. He said putting it where the ordinance requires would actually overlap the accessory building into the existing house and attached garage. He said access to the building would also have to be all the way around to the back of the building making it less accessible so moving it back further would allow more room for access and better drainage on the property overall. He said there would still be 10 feet between the building and the existing CenturyLink easement and their neighbors on both sides as well as multiple others in the neighborhood have stated they are ok with this request. He said they originally did want their house closer to the front property line but the builder moved it back 30 feet further than what was originally staked out so the location for an accessory building became restricted.

Mr. Hoff asked how long they have lived there. Mr. Blees said they have been there since 2013 and the building is mainly needed for storage and some hobby related items.

Mr. Hoff asked what the driveway to the building will be comprised of. Mr. Blees said it would be gravel for now and possibly crushed asphalt later.

Ms. Clark said this problem is not of the owners' making but it is possible there is an alternative to avoid or reduce the variance that has not been considered yet, such as making the building shorter.

Mr. Blees said the desired insulated space in the building would shrink resulting in less space for their recreational vehicles. He said putting it anywhere else would also block the windows of the house facing the backyard so all they would see is the building and there is also a water line on the property that they need to avoid building near. He said he thinks his neighbors would oppose moving the building near the front because it would look too commercial.

Ms. Clark asked if location of the building is considered when a special use permit is requested. Ms. Wollmuth explained that the special use permit considered by the

Planning and Zoning Commission determined if the requested size is acceptable with the recommendation that the Board of Adjustment approve the location.

Mr. Seifert said he feels like this can move forward with having to avoid the existing house and still make sure drainage is appropriate.

Ms. Clark said a variance could be avoided if the building were to be located on the back property line since it probably would not fit in the front with that setback requirement being 40 feet. She said she would like to find a way to avoid or reduce the variance if at all possible.

Chairman Marback opened the public hearing.

There being no comments, Chairman Marback closed the public hearing.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Clark to approve the variance to reduce the rear yard setback located along the west side of the property from seventy-five (75) feet to twenty (20) feet for the purpose of constructing an accessory building for Lot 3, Block 4, Northwood Estates Replat (10710 Olive Lane), based on the unique layout of the lot due to drainage and septic needs. The motion was seconded by Mr. Seifert and with Board Members Clark, Hoff, Seifert and Marback voting in favor of the motion, the motion was approved and the variance was granted.

VARIANCE FROM SECTION 14-04-01(10) OF THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES (RR – RESIDENTIAL)(SIDE YARD) – LOT 2, BLOCK 5, PRAIRIE VIEW SUBDIVISION (5520 MEADOWLARK LANE)

Chairman Marback stated the applicant, Cletus Ackerman, is requesting a variance to reduce the required side yard setback located along the east side of the property from fifteen (15) feet to three (3) feet for the purpose of constructing an accessory building.

Ms. Wollmuth gave an overview of the request, including the followings findings:

1. The need for a variance is not based on special circumstances or conditions unique to the specific parcel of land involved that are not generally applicable to other properties in this area and within the RR – Residential zoning classification.

2. The hardship is not caused by the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. Strict application of the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance would not deprive the property owner of reasonable use of the property.

4. The granting of the variance is not in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Wollmuth then gave the following additional information:

A request for approval of a Special Use Permit to increase the total area of accessory buildings located on the property to 2,088 square feet is scheduled for public hearing at the November 17, 2015 meeting of the Bismarck Planning and Zoning Commission. Approval of the proposed special use is required prior to issuing a building permit.

Ms. Wollmuth said staff recommends reviewing the findings in the staff report and modifying them as necessary to support the decision of the Board.

Chairman Marback asked what the dimensions of the building would be. Ms. Wollmuth said it would be 32 feet by 64 feet.

Mr. Seifert asked why there are concerns from Apple Creek Township on this request. Ms. Wollmuth said they are supportive of the size of the building but not the variance request.

Ms. Clark asked if Apple Creek Township has future plans for the development of Meadowlark Lane.

Ms. Wollmuth said Aberle Subdivision obtained that right-of-way and there is a lot of area to be developed yet to the east however a large portion of that property is in the Special Flood Hazard Area or 100-year flood plain and would need to be in compliance with floodplain regulations outlined in the zoning ordinance.

Chairman Marback opened the public hearing.

Mr. Ackerman said he wants the accessory building to be located where he has proposed to avoid the existing septic tank and to keep the building behind the front line of the house. He said the elevation is steep from the front of the lot to the back. The building would be used for recreational storage and to get items he uses for his business out of his yard.

Mr. Hoff asked if the requested driveway would be allowed to be placed in the reduced setback. Ms. Wollmuth said the variance only applies to structure so Mr. Ackerman could be allowed to place a driveway in the proposed location.

Mr. Blaskowski said the distance requirement for structures located near septic tanks is ten feet so if a site plan is submitted for this project, the septic tank or the building would have to move as there is not a variance option for items of that nature.

Mr. Ackerman said he could possibly move the building forward or reset the septic tank if needed.

Ms. Clark said some fill dirt will be needed regardless of where the building is placed, so why not move it to the backyard closer to the garden and shed.

Mr. Ackerman said there is an overhead electrical line and a concrete pad to work around as well as a 50 foot backyard setback requirement which would place the building very close to the house.

Ms. Clark asked if the variance is granted, would the septic tank be moved or would the building be placed closer to the house.

Mr. Ackerman said the elevation anywhere else on the lot is higher and the building would still have to be ten feet away from the house, so putting it anywhere else would be difficult.

Ms. Clark said she takes serious consideration of the Apple Creek Township concerns however it seems very unlikely that neighboring lots will be extensively developed because of the SFHA requirements.

Paul Silbernagel, 5801 Prairie Rose Loop, said he owns the lots to the south and to the east and eventually wants to develop all of them. He said there is a 50 foot waterway easement to work around and Mr. Ackerman's building would be three feet away from any fence a future owner might want to put on the neighboring lot. He said Mr. Ackerman has other options that he needs to explore and many of the neighbors around him have concerns about his request.

Additional written comments in opposition to this request are attached as Exhibit A.

There being no further comments, Chairman Marback closed the public hearing.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Hoff to continue the variance to reduce the required side yard setback located along the east side of the property from fifteen (15) feet to three (3) feet for the purpose of constructing an accessory building on Lot 2, Block 5, Prairie View Subdivision (5520 Meadowlark Lane), to allow time for further discussions with Apple Creek Township. The motion was seconded by Ms. Clark and with Board Members Clark, Hoff, Seifert and Marback opposing the motion, the motion failed.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Seifert to deny the variance to reduce the required side yard setback located along the east side of the property from fifteen (15) feet to three (3) feet for the purpose of constructing an accessory building on Lot 2, Block 5, Prairie View Subdivision (5520 Meadowlark Lane). The motion was seconded by Ms. Clark and with Board Members

Clark, Hoff, Seifert and Marback voting in favor of the motion, the motion was approved and the variance was denied.

VARIANCE FROM SECTION 14-04-03(8) OF THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES (R5 – RESIDENTIAL)(SIDE YARD) – LOT 5, BLOCK 2, GRANDVIEW HEIGHTS (1929 NORTH GRANDVIEW LANE)

Chairman Marback stated the applicants, Mike and Denise Kambeitz, are requesting a variance to reduce the required side yard setback located along the west side of the property from six (6) feet to four (4) feet for the purpose of constructing an addition to the existing attached garage.

Ms. Wollmuth gave an overview of the request, including the following findings for any variance:

1. The need for a variance is not based on special circumstances or conditions unique to the specific parcel of land involved that are not generally applicable to other properties in this area and within the R5 – Residential zoning classification.

2. The hardship is not caused by the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. Strict application of the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance would not deprive the property owner of reasonable use of the property.

4. The granting of the variance is not in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Wollmuth said based on the above findings, staff recommends reviewing the above findings and modifying them as necessary to support the decision of the Board.

Chairman Marback opened the public hearing.

Jordan Anderson, Big River Builders, said the 12 foot by 40 foot addition to the home would maintain and streamline the elevation aesthetics of the home as well as those around it. He said it would not be symmetrical if it was smaller and the front line of the addition is in line with the neighboring homes as well.

Mr. Kambeitz said the neighbor to the west of him as comfortable with his request and the addition is needed to accommodate the vehicle he uses for work. He said a standard garage would not be big enough as he needs a wider stall and a wider door.

Mr. Hoff asked what the door height is on the existing garage. Mr. Anderson said it is seven feet tall and the new additional garage would be eight feet tall.

Mr. Hoff asked if drainage on the property would be affected at all by the addition. Mr. Anderson it would be constructed so that drainage diverts between the homes and away from the houses.

Additional comments in opposition to this request are attached as Exhibits B, C and D.

There being no further comments, Chairman Marback closed the public hearing.

MOTION: A motion was made by Mr. Seifert to approve the variance to reduce the required side yard setback located along the west side of the property from six (6) feet to four (4) feet for the purpose of constructing an addition to the existing attached garage on Lot 5, Block 2, Grandview Heights (1929 North Grandview Lane), based on special circumstances that the lot is utilized to the best use with the least possible impact on the neighboring property. The motion was seconded by Ms. Clark and with Board Members Hoff, Marback, Seifert and Clark voting in favor of the motion, the motion was approved and the variance was granted.

VARIANCES FROM SECTION 14-04-03(7) OF THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES (R5-RESIDENTIAL)(FRONT YARD) – THE NORTH 70 FEET OF LOTS 13-14, BLOCK 18, NORTHERN PACIFIC ADDITION (521 NORTH WASHINGTON STREET)

Chairman Marback stated the applicants, Larry and Peggy Shireley, are requesting variances to reduce the required front yard setback located along the north side of the property from twenty-five (25) feet to nineteen (19) feet and to increase the allowed lot coverage from 30% to 31.7% for the purpose of constructing an addition to the existing single family house.

Ms. Wollmuth gave an overview of the request, including the following findings:

1. The need for a variance is not based on special circumstances or conditions unique to the specific parcel of land involved that are not generally applicable to other properties in this area and within the R5 – Residential zoning classification.

2. The hardship is not caused by the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

3. Strict application of the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance would not deprive the property owner of the reasonable use of the property.

4. The requested variance is not the minimum variance that would accomplish the relief sought by the applicant.

5. The granting of the variance is not in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Wollmuth then gave the following additional information:

A variance from Section 14-04-03(9) of the City Code of Ordinances (R5 – Residential)(Rear Yard) to reduce the required rear yard setback along the south side of the property from twenty (20) feet to ten (10) feet four (4) inches in order to construct an addition to the existing single-family dwelling was approved in May 2015. According to the information submitted with the application the dimensions of the addition grew slightly after the variance was approved and it was discovered that the proposed sunroom addition was not included in the calculation for lot coverage.

Ms. Wollmuth said staff recommends reviewing the findings in the staff report and modifying them as necessary to support the decision of the Board.

Chairman Marback opened the public hearing.

Ms. Shireley said their home is part of the Historical District and they have found a solution to improve its functionality so they can safely remain in their home as their physical needs have changed over the year. She said they have received significant support from their neighbors on their request.

Ms. Clark asked how their plans have changed compared to what was proposed in May. Ms. Shireley said the plans had to change in order to accommodate the footings of the existing garage as they are located where the proposed bedroom would go but the footprint of the addition compared to the original is the same.

Mr. Blaskowski explained that the Building Inspections staff did issue a building permit with the understanding that a variance was in place, not realizing the previous variance granted pertained to the setback requirement and not lot coverage.

Mr. Anderson said when he took on the project he discovered the new bedroom suite would be on the existing garage footings and the footprint would move eight inches. He said the line of the footings is not perfectly parallel to the adjacent sidewalk so the addition encroaches into the setback requirement but only in one small part. He said the interior square footage would remain even and completely handicap accessible if the variance is granted for that small part that encroaches.

Emily Sakariassen, 603 North Mandan Street, said she is a nearby neighbor and she supports this request as a historical preservation activist and she feels the new addition will in no way be distracting or result in the loss of any historical aesthetics of the home.

Additional comments are attached as Exhibits E, F and G.

There being no further comments, Chairman Marback closed the public hearing.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Clark to approve the variance to reduce the required front yard setback located along the north side of the property from twenty-five (25) feet to nineteen (19) feet and to increase the allowed lot coverage from 30% to 31.7% for the purpose of constructing an addition to the existing single family house on the North 70 feet of Lots 13-14, Block 18, Northern Pacific Addition (521 North Washington Street), based on the understanding that the addition will be consistent with the neighboring aesthetics. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoff and with Board Members Hoff, Marback, Seifert and Clark voting in favor of the motion, the motion was approved and the variance was granted.

OTHER BUSINESS

BYLAWS OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Chairman Marback said he would entertain a motion to continue discussion of the bylaws of the Board of Adjustment to the next meeting.

MOTION: A motion was made by Ms. Clark to table discussion of the bylaws of the Board of Adjustment. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hoff and with Board Members Hoff, Marback, Seifert and Clark voting in favor of the motion, the motion was approved.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Marback declared the meeting of the Bismarck Board of Adjustment adjourned at 6:42 p.m. to meet again on December 3, 2015.

Respectfully Submitted,

Hilary Balzum
Recording Secretary

APPROVED:

Michael Marback, Chairman

Exhibit A.

Sandra Bogaczyk

From: roberts.chester.herb@gmail.com on behalf of HERB ROBERTS <hcr60@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 1:59 PM
To: Planning - General Mailbox
Subject: C let us Ackerman varia,ce

Looking at the amount of land Mr Ackerman has I don't see the necessity of putting a building that close to the property line.I am therfore against the variance.

Herb Roberts

242 59 the st ne Bis Nd

Exhibit B.

Hilary Balzum

From: Planning - General Mailbox
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 11:13 AM
To: Carl Hokenstad; Daniel Nairn; Hilary Balzum; Jason Tomanek; Jenny Wollmuth; Kim Lee
Subject: FW: picture of sign 1929 N Grandview Ln

From: Tim Herrmann [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 9:16 PM
To: Planning - General Mailbox
Subject: picture of sign 1929 N Grandview Ln

picture:

On Nov 3, 2015, at 8:56 PM, Tim Herrmann wrote:

I am responding to the request for side yard set back variance from Mr Kambeitz. It appears from the sign on their boulevard yard that they are operating a construction business out of their home and plan to park the equipment in the proposed garage. First of all I don't think that the sign is in compliance in terms of placement

on the boulevard and in size (see photo attached). Secondly, is the storage and parking of construction equipment allowed in R5 zoning?

Regards,

Tim Herrmann

Tim Herrmann
701-319-3200 cell
701-751-5829 office
Transworld Business Advisors
www.tworld/bismarck

Tim Herrmann
701-319-3200 cell
701-751-5829 office
Transworld Business Advisors
www.tworld/bismarck

Exhibit C.

Hilary Balzum

From: Planning - General Mailbox
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 10:03 AM
To: Carl Hokenstad; Daniel Nairn; Hilary Balzum; Jason Tomanek; Jenny Wollmuth; Kim Lee
Subject: FW: Comment re: Kambeitz Variance Request (Lot 5, Block 2, Grandview Heights)

From: Aaron Dorrheim [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 8:22 AM
To: Planning - General Mailbox
Subject: Comment re: Kambeitz Variance Request (Lot 5, Block 2, Grandview Heights)

To the Board of Adjustment:

Marcia and I are the owners of 1937 North Grandview Lane, the abutting lot to the west of Mike and Denise Kambeitz's lot. We appreciate Mike and Denise's decision to significantly invest in improvements to their home. As such, we are generally not opposed to their requested variance.

We also respect the Board's understanding and expertise regarding the relevant code provisions and related issues. Thank you for your consideration.

Aaron and Marcia Dorrheim

Exhibit D.

Hilary Balzum

From: Charles Rothberg <cobrajet1970@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 11:53 AM
To: Planning - General Mailbox
Subject: Kambeitz variance 1929 N Grandview Lane

Dear Board Members

In regards to the requested variance from 6' to 4', I am not in favor. As a resident of N Grandview Lane, the distance between properties is appropriate, buildings are not "too" close and the neighborhood is nicely symmetrical. Possibly they could redesign their plans so as to maintain the symmetry.

Thank you

C. Rothberg

2016 North Grandview Lane

Exhibit E.

Hilary Balzum

From: Tom Mayer <tamayer@midco.net>
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2015 12:20 PM
To: Planning - General Mailbox
Subject: Variance at 521 North Washington St.

We received notice of a public hearing on a variance request related to property at 521 No. Washington St. The hearing is November 5th.

Isn't the hearing a sham? What if I and other property owners wanted to object to the variance? Would it make a wit of difference? I think not.

The property owners at 521 North Washington St. have been building for about a month. The footings, support walls and the garage floor have been poured. The trusses have been delivered.

It strikes me that a variance hearing should be held before a building permit is issued.

Tom and Jan Mayer
612 Mandan St.
Bismarck, ND 58501

Exhibit F.

Hilary Balzum

From: Planning - General Mailbox
Sent: Wednesday, November 04, 2015 11:13 AM
To: Carl Hokenstad; Daniel Nairn; Hilary Balzum; Jason Tomanek; Jenny Wollmuth; Kim Lee
Subject: FW: Shireley variance - 521 North Washington Street

Importance: High

From: Julius [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Tuesday, November 03, 2015 9:39 PM
To: Planning - General Mailbox
Subject: Shireley variance - 521 North Washington Street

To: Jenny Wollmuth and Bismarck Board of Adjustment

Thank you for providing a safety net for residential variances in our neighborhoods. We live across the street from the Shireley's home and have no objection to their front yard setback. Our address is 226 West Avenue B and we are basically across the street from their driveway. It would probably be safe to say that small variances in our neighborhood only add to the attraction of having a home in this part of town. Thank you for your concern and it is our wish that you allow the Shireley family and builder to continue with their construction.

Julius and Patricia Lorz
226 West Avenue B
Bismarck ND 58501
[redacted]

Exhibit 6.

A personal note ...

Oct. 30, 2015

this is a Note to whoever has to make the decision on Larry + Peggy Shirley's remodel. I understand the boundary is by a bit. I am their next door neighbor + want you to know this small area will not bother me. please do what you can so they can continue with the construction -

thank you -
Marion Eastgate
225 W Ave B -
Bis - ND -

Exhibit H.

November 4, 2015

Community Development Department – Planning Division
Attn: Jenny Wallmuth
PO Box 5503
Bismarck, ND 58506-5503

Dear Mrs. Wallmuth,

We have no objections to the variance requests for the building addition at the Shireley residence located at 521 N Washington St and hope that they are granted.

Some of our comments supporting this opinion include:

- The house addition has been well planned and they have been working with an architect to ensure the look of the house remains consistent with those found in the Cathedral District.
- The house was originally constructed before these building codes were in place and it appears that the proposed change from the existing setback is only 2.5 feet.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and we hope that these variance requests are granted. Feel free to contact us with any questions.

Sincerely,

Laith Hintz
Home Owners at 515 N Washington St
701-426-0817

Kristi Hintz

Exhibit I

Julius

From: "Julius" <julorz@bis.midco.net>
Date: Tuesday, November 3, 2015 9:39 PM
To: <planning@bismarcknd.gov>
Subject: Shireley variance - 521 North Washington Street

To: Jenny Wollmuth and Bismarck Board of Adjustment

Thank you for providing a safety net for residential variances in our neighborhoods. We live across the street from the Shireley's home and have no objection to their front yard setback. Our address is 226 West Avenue B and we are basically across the street from their driveway. It would probably be safe to say that small variances in our neighborhood only add to the attraction of having a home in this part of town. Thank you for your concern and it is our wish that you allow the Shireley family and builder to continue with their construction.

Julius and Patricia Lorz
226 West Avenue B
Bismarck ND 58501
701-224-0183

Exhibit J.

November 5, 2015

To whom it may concern:
Bismarck Community Development Department

RE: Larry and Peggy Shireley remodel

My husband Bill and I have lived at 204 Ave. B West since 1980 (in Bill's boyhood home). The Shireley's home on the corner of Ave. B and Washington is within sight of our home. We both feel that they should be allowed the necessary variance to continue with and complete the addition to their home.

Ater seeing the architect's plans that not only make their house more liveable but also adhere to the architectural style of the home (the first home on this site was actually stucco and the current home is an update of that one),we feel that the Shireley home will continue to fit in with the other homes in our federal and state historic area.

The Shireleys have kept all their neighbors (within sight of their historic home) informed about their plans and have gotten permission from everyone affected by the construction. For this reason, we hope that they will be allowed to continue to improve their home and our historic district.

William P. and Ann Z. Pearce

204 Ave. B West
Bismarck, N. Dak. 58501

EXHIBIT K.

Petition summary and background	formal request to encroach 6ft into the North yard setback
Action petitioned for	Harry & Peggy Shirley at 521 North Washington Street

Printed Name	Signature	Address	Comment	Date
Richard Olson		221 W Ave B	No concern	11/1/15
Dennis Burdolski	Dennis Burdolski	520 N Mandan	stop bugging them	11/1/15
Becky Burdolski	Becky Burdolski	520 N Mandan		11/1/15
Amanda Perry		514 N. Mandan	No problem with the remodel	11/1/15
Connie Sheehan	Connie Sheehan	118 W. Ave B	love renovations!	11/1/15
Emily Sakariassen		603 N. Mandan St.	It looks great!	11/1/15
Jon Sakariassen		603 N. Mandan	Love to plan!!	11/1/15
John Erik Sakariassen	JOHN ERIK SAKARIASSEN	603 N MANDAN ST	GREAT IMPROVEMENT	11/1/15
Katherine Sathrom	KATHERINE SATHROM	216 Ave B West	It looks great! (former owner)	11/1/15
Charleen Laschkewitsch	Charleen Laschkewitsch	232 ave B W	It's going good!	11/1/15
Julius Patrick Lorz	Patrick Lnt	226 W. Ave B	We appreciate what they are doing for the neighborhood.	11/3/15
Renay Zundel	RENAY ZUNDEL	219 W Ave B	The renovation	11/3/15
Don Zundel	Don Zundel	219 W Ave B	will look Wonderful	11/3/15
Steve Bagny		119 W Ave B	looking forward to the improvements	11/3/15
ANN E PEARCE		204 Ave. B W.	looks great!!	11/5/15
Bill Pearce		204 Ave B West	pleased to see what you are doing	11/5/15