

**OSHTEMO CHARTER TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

MINUTES OF A VIRTUAL MEETING HELD MAY 25, 2021

Agenda

Public Hearing – Meijer Lighting Variance Request

Consideration of the application of Fishbeck, on behalf of Meijer, Inc., for a variance from Article 54 Lighting, Section 54.60 Outdoor Lighting Standards, to allow pole-mounted lights that exceed 20,000 lumens per luminaire and to allow wall lights that exceed the 14-foot maximum mounting height. The subject property is located at 6660 West Main Street.

Site Plan - Dental Office Expansion

Dr. Katherine Bandos was requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 1,049 square foot addition to an existing 2,712 square foot dental office located at 5925 Venture Park.

A virtual meeting of the Oshtemo Charter Township Zoning Board of Appeals was held Tuesday, May 25, 2021 beginning at approximately 3:02 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Neil Sikora, Chair
Dusty Farmer
Fred Gould
Micki Maxwell
Anita Smith, Vice Chair
Louis Williams
(All attending within Oshtemo Township)

MEMBER ABSENT: Ollie Chambers

Also present were Iris Lubbert, Planning Director, James Porter, Township Attorney, Karen High, Zoning Administrator, and Martha Coash, Meeting Transcriptionist.

Guests present included Dr. Katherine Bandos and Mr. Steve Bandos.

Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chairperson Sikora called the meeting to order and invited those present to join in reciting the “Pledge of Allegiance.”

Chairperson Sikora welcomed new ZBA member Louis Williams.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Chair determined no changes were needed and requested a motion.

Mr. Williams made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Gould seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote, (5-0).

Chairperson Sikora moved to the next agenda item.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF April 27, 2021

Note: Ms. Smith joined the meeting at this point.

The Chair asked if there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the minutes of April 27, 2021.

Ms. Smith noted the second paragraph in the Huntington Run item incorrectly referred to Section 149.50(C) which should be corrected to 49.150(C).

Mr. Gould made a motion to approve the Minutes of April 27, 2021 as presented, with the correction as noted. Ms. Maxwell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.(6-0)

Chairperson Sikora moved to the next agenda item and asked Ms. High for her presentation.

Public Hearing – Meijer Lighting Variance Request **Consideration of the application of Fishbeck, on behalf of Meijer, Inc., for a variance from Article 54 Lighting, Section 54.60 Outdoor Lighting Standards, to allow pole-mounted lights that exceed 20,000 lumens per luminaire and to allow wall lights that exceed the 14-foot maximum mounting height. The subject property is located at 6660 West Main Street.**

Ms. High indicated Meijer, Inc is planning to replace the existing pole-mounted and building-mounted lighting on their 38-acre site at 6660 W Main Street. Most of the proposed lighting meets the requirements of Article 54 of the Zoning Ordinance, Lighting. However, the applicant was requesting relief from two requirements of Section 54.60, Outdoor Lighting Standards:

1. Allow pole-mounted luminaires to exceed the 20,000 lumen maximum at five (5) poles located directly in front of the store. Luminaires with 26,000 lumens were proposed.
2. Allow building-mounted lights to exceed the 14' mounting height maximum. This request includes 22 fixtures located at the north and east sides of the building that illuminate the truck dock and truck circulation area. Three fixtures are located at the front of the store near the curbside pickup area, where higher light

levels are desired. The applicant proposed to mount the lights at their current height of approximately 18'.

Ms. High said in their submitted letter of intent, the applicant reasoned that: "higher light levels near entry points and curbside pickup are desired to ensure pedestrian and employee safety during evening hours and to further help security camera systems more clearly show pedestrians and vehicles". The letter further states that: "at the back of the store and at the truck docks, the building-mounted lighting serves as area lighting in lieu of additional poles in areas of high truck traffic. When the building mounted lights were modelled with cutoff LED luminaires at 14' above grade, the average light levels and uniformity suffered as a result from the lowered height. This was especially true in the truck dock area, where poles cannot be added without becoming obstacles to the regular truck traffic in this area."

She explained the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) is required by law to consider the five criteria, and only the five criteria, outlined by the Michigan Courts when deciding on an application for a nonuse variance. She provided the analysis below of the proposal against these criteria.

Criteria: *Unique Physical Circumstances*

Are there unique physical limitations or conditions which prevent compliance?

She said there appear to be no physical limitations or conditions which prevent compliance.

Criteria: *Conformance Unnecessarily Burdensome*

Are reasonable options for compliance available? Does reasonable use of the property exist with denial of the variance?

Ms. High said all the pole mounted lights on the site are proposed to be replaced. Existing poles vary in height from 25' to 39'. New poles will be placed in the same locations as the existing poles, but are proposed to be 22' tall with a new 2.5' concrete pole base to meet the 25' mounting height requirement of our current ordinance. The lower mounting height reduces average light levels and uniformity. To address this issue the applicant proposed to increase the lumen levels of the five light fixtures closest to the building to counteract this effect and to provide the desired light levels near entry points and curbside pickup to ensure pedestrian and employee safety. The applicant could reduce the spacing between light poles to increase light levels and meet the ordinance. However, changing the pole spacing on this previously developed site could be considered unnecessarily burdensome as it would require redesign of the site and the addition of underground utilities.

The existing wall lights are mounted at a height of approximately 18'. Our ordinance outlines a maximum mounting height of 14' for wall mounted lights. As noted above in the discussion of pole mounted lights, lowering the mounting height will reduce

average light levels and uniformity. Adding wall mounted fixtures to reduce spacing between them would increase light levels but may be unnecessarily burdensome.

In addition, she said the ordinance section that outlines a 14' maximum height for building-mounted lighting specifically relates to pedestrian walkways and doorways. The ordinance does not include a requirement for the mounting height of building mounted lighting to illuminate truck docks or truck circulation routes. As previously stated, 22 of the 25 wall mounted fixtures are to illuminate truck dock and truck circulation areas. The applicant suggests, and Planning Department staff agrees, that the 14' maximum mounting height does not allow for adequate lighting levels in these areas. If these areas were lit with pole mounted lights, a mounting height of 25' and 20,000 lumens would be permitted. The new wall mount fixtures are proposed to have luminaires with either 4,270 or 6,100 lumens. Our ordinance allows up to 8,000 lumens. The applicant suggests pole lights in the truck dock area could be a hazard in that the poles would block vehicular circulation. The higher building-mounted lighting is proposed to function as area lighting in lieu of additional poles in areas of high truck traffic. The three wall mounted fixtures above the entrance are proposed to remain at their existing 18' height to improve light levels and uniformity at the front entrance and curbside pickup area. This requirement could be considered unnecessarily burdensome.

Criteria: Minimum Necessary for Substantial Justice

Applied to both applicant as well as to other property owners in district. Review past decisions of the ZBA for consistency (precedence).

Ms. High explained Oshtemo Township adopted a new lighting ordinance in 2019. This is the first variance request received since the ordinance was adopted. The current ordinance regulates the maximum number of lumens allowed; the previous ordinance regulated wattage. Therefore, it is difficult to make direct comparisons with previous requests. However, Planning Department staff researched past Zoning Board of Appeals decisions that related to the amount of light allowed to help the ZBA consider past precedence. The two cases described below are similar to this request despite the fact that they are for watts rather than lumens. Staff was unable to identify previous decisions regarding the height of building mounted lights.

1. Costco, Parcel # 3905-25-240-001, 12/17/2013: The applicant requested a variance to allow 875 watt fixtures on all pole-mounted lights; the maximum permitted by ordinance was 400 watts. A total of 28 poles were proposed. The applicant stated that if the variance were denied, eight additional poles (35 poles total) with 400 watt fixtures would be needed to meet light levels. The Zoning Board of Appeals approved the request based on past precedence and because they felt that 35 poles would be unnecessarily burdensome and a detriment to the site.
2. SW Corner of Century and West Michigan Avenues, Parcel #3905-25-240-009, 5/26/2015: This site, now home to Sportsman's Warehouse, is adjacent to the site described above. The applicant again requested and was granted a

variance to allow 875 watt fixtures, exceeding the maximum limit of 400 watts. The Zoning Board of Appeals approved the request based on past precedence and on condition that light levels at the property line not exceed ordinance requirements.

Criteria: Self-Created Hardship

Are the conditions or circumstances which resulted in the variance request created by actions of the applicant?

Ms. High indicated when the site was developed, the ordinance allowed for higher mounting heights of pole and wall mounted fixtures. Changing the lighting onsite could be considered a self-created hardship as it is the choice of the property owner to upgrade the lighting. However, the applicant describes the lighting on site as being approximately 30 years old, in poor condition, and in need of replacement. Our current ordinance requires that when fifty percent or more of existing outdoor light fixtures are replaced or modified, all lighting must be brought into compliance with the new lighting ordinance. Therefore, the applicant doesn't have the option to keep a few of the existing fixtures in place. Instead, they proposed replacing all fixtures, poles, and pole bases to provide uniform light levels and reduce energy usage. New LED fixtures, new 22' tall fiberglass poles, and new concrete pole bases will be installed. Overall, the proposed lighting meets ordinance requirements and will be an improvement.

Criteria: Public Safety and Welfare

If granted, will the spirit of the ordinance be observed, and public safety and welfare secured?

Article 54 was adopted to regulate the placement and arrangement of lighting within the Township.

The pole mounted fixtures with 26,000 lumens are located directly in front of the store, not near the property line. The building mounted fixtures will be no higher than the current fixtures. Required light levels at the property line will be met and will not impact neighboring properties.

Ms. High said through reviewing the outlined intentions of the code and considering the request at hand, it can be argued that approving this request would be in keeping with the intent of the Ordinance in that the public health, safety and general welfare will be protected, and nighttime safety and security will be provided.

POSSIBLE ACTIONS:

Ms. High indicated the following possible actions:

- Motion to approve as requested (conditions may be attached)
- Motion to approve with an alternate variance relief (conditions may be attached)
- Motion to deny

The motion should include the findings of fact relevant to the requested variance. Based on the staff analysis, the following findings of fact were presented:

- Support of variance approval:
 - Changing the locations of poles and height of building mounted lights on a previously developed site would be unnecessarily burdensome
 - There is precedence that variances have been granted to allow for increased lighting at other commercial establishments
 - Approving this request would benefit public health, safety, or welfare because uniform lighting will be provided, and energy use will be reduced.

- Support of variance denial:
 - Without relief, the lighting plan can be redesigned to meet current requirements. Conformance with the Zoning Ordinance is not unnecessarily burdensome.

Possible motions for the Zoning Board of Appeals to consider include:

1. Applicant's Request

Based on the findings of fact discussed in this memo, motion to approve the variance request, allowing the applicant to install pole-mounted luminaires with 26,000 lumens maximum at five (5) poles located directly in front of the store.

Also to allow the building-mounted lights to be installed at the existing height, exceeding the 14' mounting height maximum.

If the ZBA chose this motion, she requested a condition be attached requiring the property owner to complete the building permit process via the Southwest Michigan Building Authority and that the Zoning Board of Appeals send a request to the Planning Commission to consider an ordinance amendment that addresses building mounted lighting to illuminate truck docks or truck circulation routes.

2. Motion to deny the requested variance because reasonable use of the property is possible under the current Ordinance standards.

Chairperson Sikora thanked Ms. High for her presentation and asked for clarification regarding building mounted lighting.

Ms. High said the light ordinance does not address lighting on the back of industrial or commercial buildings that do not illuminate sidewalks or entrances.

Ms. Farmer asked Attorney Porter how building mounted lights relate to enforcement, noting Holiday Inn installed building mounted lights after the light ordinance had just been redone.

Attorney Porter noted the distinguishing factor is whether there is a specific purpose for the lights. Holiday Inn was lighting up the building in the sky. This request will light the parking lot. He sees a clear distinction for parking lots and pedestrian and traffic areas. He suggested if the Board supported this variance request that the Lighting ordinance be sent to the Planning Commission for revision.

Ms. High added the section of the ordinance addresses cosmetic lighting separately but applies even less in this situation since the purpose is not cosmetic.

Ms. Maxwell asked who determines the necessary lighting levels.

Ms. High said the ordinance states the maximum number of lumens allowed on the property and zero at the property line.

Hearing no further questions, Chairperson Sikora asked whether the applicant wished to speak.

Mr. Brian Thompson, electrical engineer on behalf of Meijer thanked the Board for their consideration and Ms. High for an excellent summary. He said light levels at the front of the store are acceptable and safe all hours of the day. The truck and back areas need adequate light levels. If pole mounted lights are required, they will cost more, create obstacles and will be more visible to neighbors and the community.

Ms. Maxwell asked what criteria is used to set light levels.

Mr. Thompson indicated there are national and international standards set to be considered. There are parameters for security lighting vs. pedestrian lighting. Meijer tries to keep at the lower level, with three footcandles at the front of the store where there is higher traffic, including customers, employees and curbside pick-up. The standards are recognized across the country. Local governmental units can set their own standards, but most utilize the national and international guidelines.

Ms. Lubbert added that the Township ordinance outlines 2-6 footcandles for the area in front of and entrances into a store, which is consistent with what Meijer's is proposing.

Mr. Gould wondered if the changes recommended would provide enough light to allow nearby cameras to capture images that could be used by law enforcement in addressing physical confrontation.

Mr. Thompson said the light levels should supply adequate footcandles to meet current codes and guidelines. They want higher light levels at the front, but he couldn't speak specifically to Meijer security systems, which are outside of the project.

Mr. Tony Kutzt, also with Fishbeck, said they refer to the lighting guidelines from the Illuminating Engineering Society and are trying to provide uniformity in light levels.

Poles at the front of the store are a concern because of the varying light levels: high near the poles and low when away from a pole. This desire for uniformity is the biggest reason they are asking for an increase.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Sikora moved to Public Comments. As there were no comments, he closed the hearing and moved to Board Deliberations.

Ms. Farmer said she worked on the lighting ordinance when on the Planning Commission. She had not thought a variance was necessary in this case but changed her initial thoughts and supports the variance request as it does not go against the dark skies initiative and does provide better safety and lower cost. The ordinance can be revisited to address rear, non-customer areas.

Mr. Sikora said it would be a big concern to him if the light at the property lines were increasing and he was glad that was not the case.

Mr. Gould agreed he was glad the neighbors to the east were taken into consideration and the bright light mitigated there so it is not an issue for them.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Sikora asked for a motion.

Ms. Maxwell made a motion to grant the variance to Meijer as requested, allowing the installation of pole-mounted luminaires with 26,000 lumens maximum at five (5) poles located directly in front of the store and to allow the building-mounted lights to be installed at the existing height, exceeding the 14' mounting height maximum, based on the findings of fact discussed in this meeting:

- Changing the locations of poles and height of building mounted lights on a previously developed site would be unnecessarily burdensome
- There is precedence that variances have been granted to allow for increased lighting at other commercial establishments
- Approving this request would benefit public health, safety, or welfare because uniform lighting will be provided and energy use will be reduced.

In addition the property owner will be required to complete the building permit process via the Southwest Michigan Building Authority, and the Zoning Board of Appeals will send a request to the Planning Commission to consider an ordinance amendment that addresses building mounted lighting to illuminate truck docks or truck circulation routes. Mr. Gould seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.

Chairperson Sikora moved to the next agenda item. He noted Dr. Bandos is his dentist, but he has no conflict of interest in considering the site plan amendment, and asked Ms. High for her report.

Site Plan - Dental Office Expansion

Dr. Katherine Bandos was requesting Site Plan approval to construct a 1,049 square foot addition to an existing 2,712 square foot dental office located at 5925 Venture Park.

Ms. High explained Dr. Katherine Bandos was requesting Site Plan approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals to construct a 1,049 square foot addition to an existing 2,712 square foot dental office located at 5925 Venture Park. The property is located north of Stadium Drive, east of Quail Run Road.

She said the property is zoned C: Local Business District. Uses permitted in the C zoning district are outlined in Article 18 of the Township's Zoning Code. Offices, hospitals and medical clinics are identified as Permitted Uses within this section. Because the scale of the addition is more than one-fourth of the floor area of the existing structure, review and approval of the proposal is required by the Zoning Board of Appeals (Section 64.20). She provided the following compliance information.

Zoning: 5925 Venture Park Road is located within the C: Local Business District. Land to the north, south, east and west is also in the C: Local Business District. The building addition is proposed to the north of the existing structure. If approved, the total building area will be 3,761 square feet.

Setbacks: The proposed addition meets all setback requirements.

Access: Vehicle access to the site will remain unchanged. The existing curb cut and drive to Venture Park Road will continue to be utilized.

Parking: Per Section 52.100, Minimum Required Parking Spaces, Medical, Dental Offices and Clinics are required to have one parking space for each 150 square feet of net floor area. Therefore, 25 parking spaces are required, at least two of which must meet ADA requirements for accessibility. The site currently has 19 parking spaces, including one ADA spot. The maximum number of parking spaces permitted per 52.50 H, Maximum Number of Spaces, is 28, or 110% of the minimum number of parking spaces. Nine additional parking spaces are proposed, for a total of 28 parking spaces. Included in the 28 parking spaces are two new concrete ADA parking spaces. They are located across the drive aisle, not immediately adjacent to the entrance. Oshtemo's Public Works Department noted that the grades shown for the ADA spaces need to be revised slightly to meet code. They also note that more information is needed to ensure ADA requirements are met for the route across the driveway and up to the entrance. If feasible, a preferred solution is to relocate the ADA spaces closer to the entrance. Staff recommended approval be conditioned on the applicant working with Public Works staff to ensure all ADA requirements for access are met.

Sidewalk – Per Section 57.90, sidewalks indicated on the Township's Non-motorized Plan shall be installed by the developer when properties adjacent to planned nonmotorized facilities receive site plan approval from the municipality. The Township's Nonmotorized Plan shows a sidewalk in front of this property. A proposed sidewalk is shown on the plan. However, the applicant has requested a waiver of this requirement

because there are no connecting sidewalks on either adjacent property. They also note that because the site is located on a curve, approximately 500' of sidewalk is required. They indicate this is disproportionate to the scale of the 1,049 square foot addition.

Building Design

The building addition is designed to complement the existing building. Siding will be brick. The proposed asphalt shingle roofing will match the roofing and pitch of the roof of the existing building.

Landscaping

Landscaping is required along Venture Park Drive per Section 53.60 Street Rights-of-Way Greenbelts. In this instance, existing trees to be preserved meet all planting requirements. Landscaping is also required for the parking lot expansion. One tree and three shrubs are required. The site plan shows the location of the required plantings but the plant species and sizes are needed to ensure that requirements for native species and minimum size at planting are met. Staff recommended a revised landscape plan be required as a condition of approval.

Site Lighting

The applicant states that no pole lights are proposed. One new building mounted soffit light is shown above the new exit on the north side. More information is needed to ensure this fixture meets all ordinance requirements. Staff recommended a lighting plan be required as a condition of approval.

Engineering

Prein & Newhof, the Township's civil engineering agent, reviewed the project site plan. Aside from the ADA concerns noted previously, all requirements are met.

Fire Department

Oshtemo's Fire Department reviewed the site plan and indicated all requirements are met. A flow test was conducted to ensure the existing hydrant in the area had adequate water flow.

RECOMMENDATION:

Ms. High recommended the Zoning Board of Appeals approve the proposed Site Plan for the Dental Office Expansion with the following conditions:

1. A revised landscape plan shall be required prior to issuance of a building permit to ensure that requirements for native species and minimum size at time of planting are met.
2. A lighting plan shall be required prior to issuance of a building permit to ensure the proposed wall mounted fixture meets ordinance requirements.
3. A sidewalk SAD agreement is entered into prior to building permit issuance.

4. A revised site plan that meets ADA requirements for parking and access shall be required prior to issuance of a building permit.

Chairperson Sikora thanked Ms. High for her presentation and asked if Board members had questions for her.

Ms. Farmer said it was stated a waiver was requested for sidewalks, but that SAD is not really a waiver. The requirement is a requirement for now or later, not a waiver forever.

Ms. High agreed that is the intent and that a SAD form has been completed.

Ms. Farmer asked if the 7 additional non-ADA spaces are necessary and whether they will require new asphalt.

Ms. High said the new spaces will be newly asphalted and the applicant feels they need every parking spot they are allowed and may consider seeking a variance in the future for additional spaces if needed.

Ms. Lubbert noted the spaces shown on the plan are the maximum required by code. She noted applicants usually request to have fewer spaces.

Ms. High commented that the SAD will be triggered when the township feels it is appropriate and, when triggered, cannot be opposed.

Mr. Gould had a concern about the proposed new ADA parking spaces as it appears a person would be required to cross the parking lot aisle. He felt they should be closer to the entrance.

Ms. High agreed the public works department has concerns, but that the building and sidewalk are existing. That is why the language is there regarding the existing grades if they do not permit moving the spaces closer to the door. Public works will work with the applicant to ensure that what is installed meets the ADA requirements.

Hearing no further questions, Chairperson Sikora asked if the applicant wished to speak.

Dr. Katherine Bandos said with the additional space more patients will be seen and more professional staff hired.

Mr. Steve Bandos thanked the board for their consideration. He indicated they understand the parking concerns and are willing to work with the public works committee. He noted they already have one accessible spot near the front door and ramp, that the two new spots are in line with the ramp, and they feel they are readily accessible. Four of the other seven new spots will be for new staff. They expect all additional spots to be necessary.

He added they are clear on the sidewalk SAD and are happy to comply. They will provide whatever is required for landscaping and will provide whatever additional documentation is needed. They enjoy the view and like the beauty of the area. They will also provide a new lighting design if needed.

Ms. High said both the landscaping and lighting concerns will be simple fixes.

Ms. Farmer reiterated the sidewalks will definitely go in at some point.

Mr. Bandos said they will comply, reconvene with contractors and move forward.

Chairperson Sikora asked if there were comments from the public. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing and moved to Board Deliberations.

Both Ms. Maxwell and Mr. Gould said they were satisfied with the amendment.

Ms. Farmer said this is an interesting area with businesses next to residences and that it is important to support compatibility between them. She felt this addition will be a positive improvement and thanked the Bandos.

Chairperson Sikora asked for a motion.

Ms. Farmer made a motion to approve the site plan amendment to allow a 1,049 square foot building addition at 5925 Venture Park Road with the following four conditions recommended by staff:

1. A revised landscape plan shall be required prior to issuance of a building permit to ensure that requirements for native species and minimum size at time of planting are met.
2. A lighting plan shall be required prior to issuance of a building permit to ensure the proposed wall mounted fixture meets ordinance requirements.
3. A sidewalk SAD agreement is entered into prior to building permit issuance.
4. A revised site plan that meets ADA requirements for parking and access shall be required prior to issuance of a building permit.

Ms. Maxwell seconded the motion. The motion was approved unanimously by roll call vote.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

There were no comments from the public.

Other Updates and Business

Ms. Lubbert explained currently the Township can continue virtual meetings through 2021. The Township Board is discussing this issue. If there are any changes, she will update ZBA members.

Attorney Porter said he anticipates Kalamazoo County to rescind the state of emergency orders in July or August which would mean a return to in-person meetings.

Ms. Farmer said the Township is working on the possibility of a hybrid meeting, likely meaning that only members of the public could attend virtually if the state of emergency is lifted.

Ms. Lubbert said she currently has one item for the June 22nd agenda.

Chairperson Sikora again extended a welcome to new member Louis Williams.

Mr. Gould asked if ZBA members are expected to understand blueprints or if they are covered by engineers and commented on the small size print. He also wondered about providing a zoning ordinance book for ZBA members for reference.

Ms. Lubbert said Professional staff looks at all the technical details on prints. That is not expected of ZBA members. They can print plans on larger paper if that would be helpful. The zoning ordinance document is very large, is updated regularly and it is a "living animal" available online, and as such hard copies have not been provided.

Mr. Gould said he'd like to be on the "hard copy" list. He also mentioned concern about being able to stack 20 cars at the existing egress described in the Huntington Run item from last month.

Ms. Smith said she has looked at that area, that the ingress/egress area is quite wide, and there is quite a bit of space to stack cars if necessary.

The Chair noted they acknowledged at the meeting they were making the best of a bad situation.

Ms. Lubbert said about 216 feet are available to stack cars from the entrance to the circle and noted traffic engineers had looked at the site. She acknowledged ZBA members should take arguments made by applicants with a grain of salt.

Adjournment

Chairperson Sikora noted the Zoning Board of Appeals had exhausted its Agenda. There being no other business, he adjourned the meeting at approximately 4:23 p.m.

Minutes prepared: May 26, 2021
Minutes approved: June 22, 2021