

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING**

Thursday, November 21, 2019

2009 Township Drive

Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Rusty Rosman, Chairperson called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

ROLL CALL: Present:

Rusty Rosman, Chairperson

Robert Mistele, Secretary

Rick Sovel

Bill McKeever

Clarence Mills

Also Present:

Jay James, Engineer/Building Official

Paula Lankford, Assistant to the Planning Director

Chairperson Rosman introduced the Members of the Board to those present, as well as Jay James and Paula Lankford. She reviewed the requirements for receiving a dimensional variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, including the fact that all standards are to be met by the applicant. She assured the applicants present that the sites of the proposed variances have been visited by the members of the Zoning Board. She also explained that if a petitioner's variance request is granted, they will receive their letter of approval by mail. It is imperative that the letter be presented when applying for a building permit. A variance is valid for 365 days from the date of the approval letter. If the variance is used, it runs with the land; however, if it is not used, it expires. Lastly, she noted that any documents, photos or other items presented to the ZBA during the meeting by the petitioner to assist Board members in making a decision will be copied and retained for the permanent record.

B. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

MOTION by Mills, supported by Mistele, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting Agenda for November 21, 2019, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION by McKeever, supported by Mills, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting minutes of July 25, 2019 as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

None.

E. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES IN COMMERCE TOWNSHIP:

Rick Sovel – Township Board & Library

- We've had a lot of activity the last few months.
- The Michigan Airline Trail is now open. We were supposed to have a grand unveiling ribbon cutting, but it snowed, so that was postponed.
- The property behind here, behind Walmart at Pontiac Trail and M-5, which people refer to as the new mall, Five & Main; after at least 7 years worth of work,

the purchaser closed on the property. It will take about 18 months or more for the development, so maybe in 2021 it will open. We're happy for that.

- We still have a lot of bonds to pay for the road, and the Board is really happy about that part of it.
- We approved our 2020 budget.
- We made a major executive decision for the residents of the Township. We're going with a new garbage service, and we had to pick the color of the garbage cans. The recycling is going to be in blue, and the garbage cans will be dark green. Obviously we have 15,000 homes so we can't transfer it all in one day. It will take a two-week period to receive the new cans and have the old ones picked up. The garbage can will be 95-gallon, and recycling, instead of a bin, will go to a rolling 64-gallon size container. Both containers will be on wheels and have enclosed lids.

Bill McKeever – Planning Commission

- I was unable to attend the last meeting. I got stranded on a job site waiting for an inspector.

Chairperson Rosman – Jay, could you provide an update?

Jay James – There was a project on Crumb Road where the developer proposed to develop 100 apartment units. It's the parcel next to Meijer and west of Goodwill. The Planning Commission had a lot of concerns and questions. It was ultimately tabled for them to address those and come back if they so desire.

Another developer proposed constructing a building on the vacant lot in Homestead Industrial, on the corner of Pioneer Drive and Richardson Road. The Planning Commission also had questions and concerns on that proposal, and it was also tabled.

F. OLD BUSINESS:

ITEM F1: PA18-0012 – ERIC MOJICA – TABLED FROM JANUARY 24, 2019 - REMAIN TABLED

Eric Mojica of Commerce MI is requesting a variance from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct a new home that will exceed the maximum number of 2 ½ stories allowed located at 8147 Farrant. Sidwell No.: 17-01-431-008

Chairperson Rosman – Are we still on the table with this item?

Paula Lankford – Yes, until January and then he said he would ask to remove it. He's still working with the adjacent property owner on the easement.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM G1: PA19-0010 – LAURA FETZNER – PUBLIC HEARING

Laura Fetzner of Commerce MI is requesting variances from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct a new single-family home that will encroach into the required rear yard setback and both required front yard setbacks on a corner lot located at 3990 Watuga. Sidwell No.: 17-15-252-013

Chairperson Rosman opened the public hearing.

Chairperson Rosman – Laura, I want you to know that we have received the revised dimensions that you're requesting for the setback.

David Smith, 8615 Richardson, Commerce Township – We are the surveyors and engineers for the project, representing the Fetzner's. We've been on the site. Do you have questions?

Chairperson Rosman – No, but why don't you tell us what it is that you need.

David Smith – What is unique about the lot is the shape, and the setbacks really don't allow for any type of a house. The house that we're proposing fits the aesthetics of the neighborhood. The old houses are typically a tear-down. This is an old 2-bedroom house. We had the property perked. The Health Department agreed to a 3-bedroom. It will be a walkout because of the adverse conditions of the topography. The setbacks are the real issue. The edge of the road is tremendously away from where the lot lines are.

Chairperson Rosman – Are you speaking of Watuga?

David Smith – Watuga is approximately 33' from the southwest corner of the lot, the actual edge of the road; it's a 60' right-of-way. The uniqueness of this lot was because of an old house being there. There was a combination. This lot is actually part of two different subdivisions. To the northeast is a 30' right-of-way. You see a 27' disparity which really hampers the development of this lot, and that creates a certain hardship. On the easterly side of Ulmus Drive, there's a retaining wall there. I have dimensions on what are actually the existing site conditions. The retaining wall is 34.5' off the right-of-way line. If there hadn't been that change in right-of-ways – and I do agree with a 60' right-of-way, but it creates a hardship and practical difficulty on this lot. The County Health Department has made certain concessions, and I think they'll let us be 4 or 5' off the sidelines instead of 10'. This house would be a great addition to the community.

Kerri Huckestein, 3996 Watuga, Commerce Township – We live directly next door and have for 4 years. This is an overbuild of that lot. If this house gets built, we lose our whole sight on our deck. In 4 years, we've worked really hard to update and maintain our property, and invest in it, and we've had to deal with this. You've been there, you've seen it. We've had to deal with this eyesore for 4 years, and not a lot has been done. It's hard for us neighbors. We certainly would love to have it updated; however, a house this size takes away from our home and being able to enjoy the aesthetics of our home. We won't be able to see anything from our deck. This house is encroaching so close to our property that I don't even believe we'll be able to see the sunshine in either of those two bedrooms on the side of our house.

Kenneth Mangrum, 3996 Watuga, Commerce Township – I pretty much feel the same way.

Kerri Huckestein – This is my fiancée. We bought this house together. We feel fortunate to live on this street and we worked really hard to be able to have this home. If we wanted to live in a condo, we would have bought a condo. The fact that this small house is so close, and now you're going to build this big, huge house that will tower over. It's

too big. I can appreciate the fact that they want to invest. We cannot agree with these three variances.

Arthur Arndt, 679 Appalachi St, Commerce Township – I've lived here over 30 years. My family has been in Commerce Township over 75 years. I was here when all of these were dirt roads. I have seen in this neighborhood, people coming in to build huge homes. This is 2,000 square foot, it's a huge home. If they're going to build something like that, they would buy two homes, tear them down and put one large home on it. This home; I'm going to look out my windows and it's going to be standing right there in front of me like, Wow! I've been here over 30 years and not had to have something this huge built. Why can't he build something that is going to fit the property? This is overbuilding. It will be a total eyesore on the corner. When people drive by, they'll be like why is this mansion on this little piece of property? We have a nice clear view. The deer come walking through every day and I love seeing them. But this home is way too overbuilt.

There were -0- returns and -0- letters.

Chairperson Rosman closed the public hearing as there were no additional questions or comments.

Board Comments:

Chairperson Rosman – My biggest concern is the overbuild of the property and the amount of variance being asked for. I recognize that the size of the lot is a challenge and there's no question that whatever you do, there's going to be some need for some kind of a variance because of the two roads and the change of the road setbacks. I did turn to the Building Department and I asked Jay what would fit on the lot with the least amount of variances. Can you bring that up on the overhead, Jay?

Jay James – I can.

Chairperson Rosman – He did sketch out a 2-story house with 1,750 square feet, with an attached garage.

Rusty asked me to look at our ordinance and provide a sample, based upon minimum size required under the ordinance for a 2-story house. I sketched this up roughly as to what could be built there. I took the 35' setback, a 2-story house, with equal square footage on the first and second floors. If we get a 20' wide house, with a little less than 44', that totals a little over 1,750 square feet. It also allows for a 20x20 2-car garage which is pretty much the minimum. Even with this, you would still require a variance for the front yard setback along Watuga. I believe it would meet the intent of ordinance for the rear and side yard setbacks and the square footage.

Chairperson Rosman – I appreciate that.

Sovel – On the desk tonight, we had these two pages. Are these from you, Jay?

Jay James – Yes, those are from me. I did one for a 2-story, and then one for a ranch. The ranch does not include a garage. You could probably fit a 1-car garage on with the ranch, but not 2.

Sovel – How does that overlay to the current sketches? How does it compare?

Jay James – Well, they are requesting three variances.

Sovel – I'm speaking of the corner of the house.

Jay James – I did not overlay them, but I can tell you that the sketch that I did, the house layout is more parallel to Watuga. Their layout is a little skewed. Mine forces the back end of this house a little more out toward the road. The corner is still going to be near the property line in either case. They are allowed to go within 4' to the side yard in this particular instance. You're meeting setbacks over here, in large part due to the septic field requirements.

Sovel – How would your 1,750 square foot, 2-story address their concerns here as far as sunlight and view?

Jay James – The height? They're not looking for a variance for the height. In looking at the building plans, they wouldn't be needing one. Any house is allowed to build 35' to mid-peak. In either case, there's no difference between the two as far as height.

Sovel – As far as how their view would be.

Jay James – Their view is still going to be impacted as the new house would be taller in height.

Chairperson Rosman – Addressing your concerns, which I completely understand. I live on a lake. Everybody has concerns about the site, but you do have property rights within your property, of which Ms. Fetzner would also have property rights. So long as she met the minimum requirements, if it went to 2-stories, she has that right. While I recognize it may not be perfect for you, and I know you could have solved the problem by buying the property yourself, I recognize that it's not ideal. We run into that all the time. I ran into that with neighbors and neighbors ran into it with me. Everybody does wherever you are, that's just the way it goes.

My biggest concern as a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals, my job is to find the least amount of variance necessary to make it livable and usable for a Commerce Township resident, which is why I asked Jay to sketch out what would work. That would take us from needing three variances to just one. I cannot speak to everybody else. They may need time to talk to each other and work things out.

Jay James – I'd like to add two things. One, my sketch does not take into account the interior layout of the house. I just did the block footprint because that would meet the minimum. Also, this property, due to the unique size and shape, could not be built on without some type of variance.

Chairperson Rosman – And we recognize that, which is why we're here.

McKeever – Does your layout take into consideration any living space over the garage?

Jay James – It does not. I considered doing that, but you get into a lot of different variables there.

McKeever – Even as restricted as your building footprint may sound, there's still a lot of ability ...

Jay James – Yes, the footprint I prepared ...

David Smith – Is that 46x20?

Jay James – It's 44x20.

David Smith – That's the house? Your overall footprint is the total square footage? When you say 1,750 square feet that's the 2-stories.

Jay James – That's 2-stories.

McKeever – But nothing over the garage.

David Smith – My question is ...

Chairperson Rosman – It has an 875 square foot second story.

David Smith – But it's an 875 square foot first floor too?

Jay James – Correct.

Chairperson Rosman – My point being, I believe your client would be much better served by taking some more time with you, and with Commerce Township Building Department, to see what you can do on this property that requires the least amount of variance, knowing something is going to have to give. We will have to help you out in some area, but again, knowing that our job is the least amount of variance necessary for this to be a viable property.

David Smith – We agree.

MOTION by Rosman, supported by Mistele, to table Item PA19-0010, Laura Fetzner.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Amber Fetzner – Can I add something? I am the person who was originally living at 3990 Watuga. Just as a point of contention, all due respect to your plan, the plan that we had specifically made with the architect was intended for handicap accessibility.

Chairperson Rosman – We understand that.

Amber Fetzner – So a second floor is not ideal.

Chairperson Rosman – But it still could have the first floor bedroom.

Jay James – Yes, that’s why I wanted to point out that I had not taken into account the interior layout.

Amber Fetzner – It needs to meet certain criteria for hallway sizes.

Chairperson Rosman – That’s where you’re going to take this next couple months, work with David and the architect. Understand where we are coming from with the least amount of variance, so long as there's an option, and we feel there is one. I want you to take that time. We don’t want to vote yes or no tonight. We will carry it over and give you the time to work on it. Thank you for coming.

David Smith – Thanks for your time and consideration.

ITEM G2: PA19-0011 – ROBERT WYRABKIEWICZ – PUBLIC HEARING

Robert Wyrabkiewicz of Commerce MI is requesting variances from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct an attached garage onto a non-conforming home that will encroach into both required front yard setbacks on a corner lot located at 301 Charlevoix. Sidwell No.: 17-03-283-009

Chairperson Rosman opened the public hearing.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz, 301 Charlevoix, Commerce Township – I'm here today to build an attached garage to my home. I filed two variance requests to build this 2-car garage.

Chairperson Rosman – We know that you have a corner lot, and you have two front yards.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – Yes, I have a corner lot and it’s considered two front yards because it’s on the corner of Tuscola and Charlevoix. So, I'm trying to attach the garage to the house on the Tuscola side of the house. The garage door would be facing east. It will be facing the neighbor’s garage across the street.

I have a business. I have a work van with tools. I'm hoping to store it in the garage. I do have a shed, but it’s small and does not hold a lot.

Chairperson Rosman – Is there anything else you’d like to tell us before I call upon the public?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – No, you can call on the public.

Chairperson Rosman – Anyone from the public who would like to address this?

Josephine Morgan, 305 Charlevoix, Lot 44, Commerce Township – I moved in in 1991. When I moved in, there were dirt roads. I moved from the east side suburbs, so this was like a vacation spot, and that’s what our neighborhood is like. It was old cottages that were built for people to come on the weekends. In 1975, a builder came in and started buying the lots and building 3-bedroom starter homes. Bob and I have one of those. I've been there a long time and they paved the roads. A lot of people are doing a lot of things around the neighborhood to brighten it up and refurbish it. Since he has moved in, he’s done such a great job with his house. That’s what he does for a living, he’s in home improvement. We just want to respectfully ask that you reconsider because we

think it would be a benefit to the neighborhood to have the garage built for him on that property. I know the neighbor across the street had to get a variance years ago for his garage. I don't know all about this variance stuff.

Chairperson Rosman – You did a great job. Thank you.

Allen Morgan, 305 Charlevoix, Lot 44, Commerce Township – I'm Josephine's husband. As far as the garage being built in that location, it does not affect us in any way, shape or form. We are fine with it.

John Hett, 154 Charlevoix, Commerce Township – I really couldn't imagine not having a garage. Pretty much everyone has garages, and there are two homes in there that have very large garages as well. I think it would be a benefit.

Chairperson Rosman – Thank you very much.

There were -0- returns and -0- letters.

Chairperson Rosman closed the public hearing as there were no additional questions or comments.

Board Comments:

Mistele – There are two things that concern me a little bit about this. As I drove down the curve, it did seem like that would impact the visibility coming from Tuscola. As far as putting it on equal footing, it seems like a mixed bag; homes with and without garages. I don't necessarily think you're at a disadvantage without a garage. I don't necessarily know if the location of the garage is the correct placement for it. That being said, moving it to one of the sides, once again, is still going to cause issues. If you move it to where the septic field is and you have to move the septic field, that will probably put your septic field too close to your well.

Chairperson Rosman – That's not going to work.

Mistele – Right, so I don't think you could put it there, which means you'd put the garage on the other side where the well is, and I don't necessarily know if that would work either.

Chairperson Rosman – That's not going to work. Okay, thank you.

Mills – When I drove around, I didn't really think that there would be a negative visual impact coming around that corner. I stopped right on the corner and tried to visualize where the garage would be. To me, there was a lot of view around it. I didn't sense the same thing as Bob did.

Is there any way the garage can be moved 2.7' to the south to minimize that one variance? You're looking for a variance 2.7' from Charlevoix, which is to the north. Can the garage be moved south 2.7' to eliminate that variance?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I have my septic tank there, and right now I'm 10' within the septic tank to the side of the garage. I need that limit there for that. I worked with

Oakland County Health Department and we staked out the tank, and then we pushed the garage to the north to get that 10' between the tank and the foundation.

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, he worked with Oakland County, so they helped him determine where it needed to go based upon their setbacks.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I did have it more to the south, but then we had to push it.

McKeever – I understand the hardship of multiple front yards. The concern I came up with was the distance from the front of garage, facing Tuscola and the edge of the pavement, and with a car parked in that driveway. Without knowing where the septic tank was, my question was going to be ...

Chairperson Rosman – It's next to the shed.

McKeever – Yeah. Have you thought about putting the entry to the garage on the south side?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I did but my field is there.

McKeever – What if your door was on the north side, off of Charlevoix? That would give you a longer driveway.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I didn't consider that.

McKeever – My concern is cars being out in the road, but it's not a deal breaker.

Discussions took place as Mr. Wyrabkiewicz reviewed Mr. McKeever's suggestion. Jay James reviewed the measurements. Mr. Mistele preferred this layout.

Sovel – Were you planning on keeping the shed also?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – After the garage is built, I am planning on taking the shed down and building a smaller one. The old one has a gambrel roof and I want it to match my house.

Sovel – You've got your deck with your barbecue. Where is that going to go if you have the garage?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – If I have the garage, I could always do a small deck on the back of my house.

Sovel – We don't want to do something then have you come back and ask for another variance, because this variance created another situation for you. I have a question for Jay. He has a front door and a side door. If he eliminates that door, because it now becomes the garage, does he need another door to exit the house, or can he just have one?

Jay James – You can just have one under the Building Code.

Chairperson Rosman – Do you have a door wall or anything to get you outside to the backyard?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I would put a man door on the south side of the garage wall.

Discussion continued regarding the layout of the house and the doors.

Chairperson Rosman – Can he put a deck on there without a variance?

Jay James – On the south side? He can but that's where the septic is at.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – It is, except that my septic does not lie in front of my shed. That part is just land.

Jay James – There's probably room. He has to stay 10' from the field and tank with the deck.

Chairperson Rosman – We just don't want to create another need for a variance.

Sovel – I don't have a problem with what you're asking for.

Chairperson Rosman – I like the idea that Bill had for the north entry.

Jay James – You could do it, and I was looking to see if this tree would end up having to be removed. You could swing around that, but it's not ideal to have a drive on a curve.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – That's why I have it facing my neighbor's garage on Tuscola.

Jay James – It would go from 28' wide, 24' deep, to being 24' wide by 28' deep. It's still wide enough for a 2-car garage.

Chairperson Rosman – Can you live with that?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I hate garages that you pull into and you can't open your doors without hitting your other car. That's a lot of concrete that would take up most of my budget. I would prefer to keep it the way I've drawn it.

Chairperson Rosman – Our job is the least amount of variance necessary.

Jay James – It's the same variances either way.

Sovel – Why do we care where the door goes?

Jay James – I think Bill's concern was to the driveway and parking. Will you be parking in the garage?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I'm going to park my vehicle in the garage.

Jay James – So parking may not be an issue in the driveway itself.

Chairperson Rosman – But when company comes.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I also have a gravel pad.

Chairperson Rosman – I saw that, by the fence.

McKeever – Are you keeping your existing driveway also?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I have that driveway pad. I would pave that for visitor parking as well if I could. It's 3-cars wide.

McKeever – Like I said, it wasn't a deal breaker for me. I was just throwing it out there. I know how tight parking creates issues down the road.

Chairperson Rosman – My concern is to get things out of the street, out of the yard, and under a roof. We don't want stuff everywhere. Once you have a 2-car garage, is that all going to become storage and you're still parking outside? That's what we don't want to happen.

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – No that's not going to happen. I'm parking my vehicle in my garage locked up at night.

Chairperson Rosman – You talked about 2 cars. Do you have another?

Robert Wyrabkiewicz – I do have a weekend car.

Sovel – From my point-of-view, the door location is up to him. If it's not impacting the variance, it makes no difference to let him have it where he wants.

Mills – You did a great job staking the site.

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, the staking was great!

MOTION by Mills, supported by Sovel, to approve Item PA19-0011, the request by Robert Wyrabkiewicz of Commerce MI for variances from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct an attached garage onto a non-conforming home that will encroach into both required front yard setbacks on a corner lot located at 301 Charlevoix. Sidwell No.: 17-03-283-009

Approval is for a dimensional variance of 24.54 feet relative to the minimum front setback requirement along Tuscola Street, and a dimensional variance of 2.77 feet relative to the minimum front setback requirement along Charlevoix Street.

The variance will do substantial justice for the applicant as he will be able to use his property similar to others in the neighborhood.

Based on the presentation and the comments we have heard, I believe the applicant has satisfied all of the criteria of Section 41.09.A of the Zoning Ordinance for granting dimensional variances.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM G3: 2020 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Schedule

MOTION by Sovel, seconded by Mills, to approve the 2020 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Schedule as presented. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Sovel – Is January still going to be an educational meeting?

Paula Lankford – Yes.

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, and we're going to come to that because I have a question.

Sovel – What time is it starting and do we need to put that in here?

Paula Lankford – No, I'll just post it as a special.
I wanted to make sure you understood that your May meeting is the Thursday of Memorial week.

ITEM G4: Election of Officers

MOTION by Mills, seconded by Mistele, to continue with the same capacity, with Rusty Rosman as Chairperson, Clarence Mills as Vice Chairperson, and Robert Mistele as Secretary of the Zoning Board of Appeals. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

H. OTHER MATTERS:

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, we are having an educational meeting in January if we can come up with a topic.

Paula Lankford – We've asked Hans to look into that. We've asked Jay. Dave Campbell and I are thinking on it. It might be a half hour or an hour before the meeting. We may order pizza.

Mills – I don't know what all of the ordinances are, but I would like to suggest that we consider solar panels; whether they're on the roofs, or front yard or back yard. Something along that line as a suggestion.

Chairperson Rosman – Have you guys done any solar panels at Planning?

McKeever – Not specifically, but it would fall under ...

Jay James – We treat them as an accessory structure. If they want to put them up, not on the roof but separately, it's treated as if it's a shed or detached garage. It has to meet setbacks and size requirements.

McKeever – Is there something specifically against them being on the roof, or is it an engineering thing?

Jay James – No, they can put them on the roof.

McKeever – Is there additional engineering involved?

Jay James – They do have to provide some calculations that the additional weight is not being increased by more than 10%.

Paula Lankford – Can they exceed the 35'?

Jay James – They don't, they just lay flat on the roof.

Chairperson Rosman – What about those wind turbines? Can private residents have those?

Jay James – We have an ordinance on that, and yes you can, under certain conditions. You need a decent size piece of property.

Discussions continued regarding wind turbines, the ordinance, noise issues, pole mounting of the turbines, et cetera.

Chairperson Rosman – Anybody have any other ideas for an educational meeting? We've done signs. We've done what to do to avoid going to court. What else?

Sovel – Variance requests are way down.

Paula Lankford – They are, they're way down.

Jay James – I will tell you that it has a large part to do with your Planning Department. They vet them out.

Paula Lankford – It's not just Planning; it's Building too.

Jay James – We tell people, you're always welcome to ask, but we don't think you'll get it because it doesn't meet the criteria.

Chairperson Rosman – Well I really want to compliment all of us for working hard, we as the Zoning Board of Appeals, along with you and with Hans. We have really tightened things up a lot.

I. CORRESPONDENCE:

None.

J. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

No report in Dave Campbell's absence.

K. ADJOURNMENT:

NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: JANUARY 23, 2020 @7:00PM

MOTION by Rosman, supported by Mistele, to adjourn the meeting at 8:03pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Robert Mistele, Secretary