

**OSHTEMO CHARTER TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD NOVEMBER 27, 2018

Agenda

**PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE REQUEST FROM METRO LEASING, LLC
METRO LEASING, LLC, ON BEHALF OF RYKSES PROPERTIES LLC,
REQUESTED VARIANCES FROM SECTION 30.409.A AND SECTION 30.409.D OF
THE C: LOCAL BUSINESS DISTRICT ORDINANCE TO ALLOW THE EXISTING
SALES OFFICE AT 5850 STADIUM DRIVE TO FUNCTION AS THE CAR SALES
OFFICE FOR THE SUBJECT PARCEL AND TO UTILIZE THE EXISTING PARKING
LOT FOUND AT 5924 STADIUM DRIVE, WHICH VIOLATES THE CURRENT
SETBACK ORDINANCE. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS ADDRESSED AS 5924
STADIUM DRIVE, PARCEL NO. 3905-25-305-030.**

**SITE PLAN REVIEW: D & R SPORTS
D & R SPORTS REQUESTED SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR AN EXPANSION TO
THEIR EXISTING RETAIL FACILITY LOCATED AT 8178 WEST MAIN STREET,
PARCEL NO. 3905-16-280-012.**

A meeting of the Oshtemo Charter Township Zoning Board was held Tuesday, November 27, 2018 at approximately 3:00 p.m. at the Oshtemo Charter Township Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: James Sterenberg, Chair
 Nancy Culp
 Neil Sikora, Vice Chair
 Anita Smith
 Bruce VanderWeele

MEMBER ABSENT: Bob Anderson

Also present were Julie Johnston, Planning Director, James Porter, Township Attorney and Martha Coash, Meeting Transcriptionist. Four other persons were in attendance.

Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance

Chairperson Sterenberg called the meeting to order and invited those present to join in reciting the "Pledge of Allegiance."

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

There were no comments on non-agenda items.

Approval of the Minutes of October 23, 2018

Chairperson Sterenberg asked if there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the minutes of October 23, 2018. Hearing none, he asked for a motion.

Mr. Sikora made a motion to approve the Minutes of October 23, 2018, as presented. Mr. VanderWeele supported the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING: VARIANCE REQUEST FROM METRO LEASING, LLC METRO LEASING, LLC, ON BEHALF OF RYKSES PROPERTIES LLC, REQUESTED VARIANCES FROM SECTION 30.409.A AND SECTION 30.409.D OF THE C: LOCAL BUSINESS DISTRICT ORDINANCE TO ALLOW THE EXISTING SALES OFFICE AT 5850 STADIUM DRIVE TO FUNCTION AS THE CAR SALES OFFICE FOR THE SUBJECT PARCEL AND TO UTILIZE THE EXISTING PARKING LOT FOUND AT 5924 STADIUM DRIVE, WHICH VIOLATES THE CURRENT SETBACK ORDINANCE. THE SUBJECT PROPERTY IS ADDRESSED AS 5924 STADIUM DRIVE, PARCEL 3905-25-305-030.

Chairperson Sterenberg moved to the next item on the agenda and asked Ms. Johnston for her report.

Ms. Johnston indicated Metro Leasing, LLC, located at 5850 Stadium Drive, was interested in purchasing the Rykse's restaurant property to expand their automotive sales lot. The subject property is located to the west of the existing automotive sales business, across Quail Run Drive, at 5924 Stadium Drive. She noted the area to the north is zoned R-4.

She noted car sales lots are a special exception use under Section 30.409 of the C: Local Business District ordinance, which will also require Planning Commission approval. The applicant's hope is to demolish the existing restaurant building and utilize the extent of the current parking lot for their sales lot, requiring needed relief from Section 30.409, which states the following:

Section 30.409: *New and/or used car sales lots; recreational vehicle sales lots; mobile home sales lots outside of mobile home parks; farm machinery and other equipment sales lots; boat sales lots; and other businesses involving substantial outdoor sales or activities connected with retail sales, subject to the conditions and limitations:*

-
- a. No such outdoor sales or activities in connection therewith shall be conducted upon premises which do not contain a sales office in a building.*

- d. *All operations and business activities, including the parking or display of sales items and equipment and outdoor sales and display area enclosures, shall comply with the setback requirements for buildings and structures contained in the Ordinance.*

She explained the two variances requested:

Variance request #1: The applicant would like to utilize the existing sales office located at 5850 Stadium Drive, which is across Quail Run Drive to the east, to meet the Ordinance requirement outlined in Section 30.409.a.

Variance request #2: Per Section 30.409.d, the sale and display of cars must meet the same setback requirements as any building or structure onsite. This would require the following setbacks per Sections 64.100, 64.300, and 64.700 of the Setback Ordinance:

- 120 feet from the centerline of Stadium Drive
- 70 feet from the right-of-way of Quail Run Drive
- 85 feet from the rear property line and the adjacent R-4 property, which is a supplemental setback between residentially and commercially zoned properties
- 20 feet from the west property line adjacent to the Consumers Energy parcel, which is also zoned C: Local Business District

Ms. Johnston explained the applicant would like to utilize the existing pavement found at the site for the display of vehicles, which has the following setbacks:

- 83 feet from the centerline of Stadium Drive, requiring a 37-foot variance
- 11 feet from the right-of-way of Quail Run Drive, requiring a 59-foot variance (The applicant's statement indicates the parking lot is approximately 26 feet from the edge of Quail Run Drive. From staff's review of aerial photography, this dimension appears to be from the Quail Run Drive pavement, not the right-of-way or property boundary. The applicant cannot utilize linear feet within the right-of-way towards required setbacks.)
- 9 feet from the rear (north) property line, requiring a 76-foot variance
- 15 feet from the side (west) property line, requiring a 5-foot variance

Ms. Johnston said Staff has analyzed the request against the Standards of Approval established by Michigan courts and offered the following information:

Standards of Approval of a Nonuse Variance (practical difficulty):

Standard: Unique Physical Circumstances
Are there unique physical limitations or conditions which prevent compliance?

Comment: There are no unique physical conditions to the land hindering development of this parcel like steep slopes, unusual lot shape, water

features, or unstable soils, that would justify a variance. However, there are two circumstances related to this property that warrant consideration. The first is the property is a corner parcel requiring additional front yard setbacks, which is particularly difficult for this request because the display of vehicles for sale must also meet these setbacks. While not necessarily unique, corner lots do carry an extra setback burden having two front yards. The designated highway setback from Stadium Drive would require the placement of vehicles to be a minimum of 120 feet from the centerline of the road. This would locate the setback approximately 56 feet from the property boundary, or 86 feet from the pavement of Stadium Drive. Meeting this setback would eliminate the front row of parking currently existing on site. The setback from Quail Run Drive is 70 feet from the right-of-way. This would remove the entire parking area along the east side of the existing restaurant building. Please see the Setback Area Map provided with this report.

The second item to consider is the existing configuration of the asphalt lot, which currently allows vehicular travel and parking in areas that would not be permitted if the site was built today due the landscape setback requirements. If a new business was to utilize the existing building on site, staff would not require any changes to the existing parking lot configuration. Section 62.152 of the Nonconforming Ordinance indicates that uses of land, existing and lawful at the time the use commenced, may be continued, even though such use does not conform to the provisions of the ordinance.

*Standard: Conformance Unnecessarily Burdensome
Are reasonable options for compliance available?
Does reasonable use of the property exist with denial of the variance?*

Comment: The matter of a vehicular sales lot expansion is discretionary, and reasonable use of the property in general does exist for other commercial ventures, even if the variance requests are denied. Parking lots for other commercial uses would not be required to meet the building setback standards, only the landscape ordinance requirements. That being said, utilizing this site for a car sales lot within the confines of the ordinance would be difficult. After setbacks are met, approximately 25,000 square feet or 29 percent of the 2.0-acre (87,120 square feet) parcel is available for the display of vehicles. This significant reduction in allowable space is unnecessarily burdensome.

With regard to the elimination of the sales building, Section 30.409.a. states that the sales office must be on the same “premises” as the sales lot. Section 11:000: Definitions does not provide a definition for “premises.” Staff has interpreted “premises” outlined in Section 30.409.a to mean the sales office must be on the same parcel in which the outdoor

sales activity takes place. Unfortunately, because of the Quail Run Drive right-of-way, the applicant is not able to adjoin the subject property with their current business at 5850 Stadium Drive, necessitating the variance request. Requiring a sales office at the subject property could be considered unnecessarily burdensome to this particular applicant because of the existing sales office at the neighboring property. If the subject property was not to become part of the larger existing car sales operation, then requiring the sales office would be necessary to ensure a lasting and functional business.

The applicant has provided an alternate definition for “premises” from the Township’s General Ordinance, Section 126.000: Medical Marihuana Operations Ordinance, as follows:

*“**Facility** or Premises means one (1) commercial business premises having a separate or independent postal address...”*

While a legitimate definition within the General Ordinance, the variance request is for the requirement within the Zoning Ordinance, which staff believes is clearly intended to require sales offices and sales lots on the same parcel.

*Standard: 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).*

Comment: In researching past Zoning Board of Appeals decisions regarding setbacks for the display of cars for sale, staff investigated car dealerships within the Township – Halli’s Auto, Maple Hill Auto Group, Metro Toyota, and DeNooyer Chevrolet. All four dealerships sought and were granted variances from the setback requirement for the sales display area.

In addition to the car dealerships, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance in September of 2000 to Steensma Lawn and Power Equipment at 7561 Stadium Drive to allow the display of merchandise at the right-of-way line.

Certainly, past precedence has been set to allow some flexibility for the display of merchandise for sale. However, for the current application staff questions if the request is the minimum necessary for substantial justice considering the landscape setbacks also required. Providing the landscape setbacks would offer some consistency along Quail Run Drive and provide an opportunity for better screening between the requested site and the R-4 zoned property to the north.

No past precedent could be found for the variance request to not have a sales office on the subject parcel. However, considering the subject property will be incorporated into the larger Metro Toyota business, substantial justice is achieved as a sales office building currently exists.

Standard: Self-Created Hardship

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

Comment: The request to allow the existing sales office at 5850 Stadium Drive to function as the sales office for this parcel is technically created by the applicant. However, expansion of the business can only happen to the west of their current parcel, unless Metro Toyota intends to move from this location entirely. With that said, the true hardship is the right-of-way of Quail Run Drive. If the parcels had been legally described to the centerline of road instead of the right-of-way line, the parcels could have been combined and the variance for the sales office would not be needed. Unfortunately, this is not the case and therefore the ordinance language related to “premises” prevails.

In the case of the setback variances, the applicant is requesting to use the existing parking lot area, which was not self-created.

Ms. Johnston noted in addition to the above principles, the Zoning Enabling Act of Michigan states that when considering a variance request, the Zoning Board of Appeals must ensure that the “spirit of the ordinance is observed, public safety secured, and substantial justice done.” To help ensure these standards are met for both the applicant and adjacent property owners, the Zoning Board of Appeals may want to consider conditioning any variances granted on meeting the landscaping requirements of Section 75.000 of the Zoning Ordinance. This suggestion is more thoroughly described in the Alternatives section below.

In addition, any consideration for the variance related to the sales office should be closely tied to the existing Metro Toyota business. Granting a variance to the subject parcel eliminating the requirement for a sales office could open up the parcel for future outdoor display sales without a sales building if Metro Toyota ever decides to sell the property. Any considered approval should instead state that the variance is to allow the existing sales office at 5850 Stadium Drive to function as the sales building for the subject parcel. That way, if the parcel ever sells and a new outdoor display use moves in, a sales building would still be required.

Ms. Johnston said the Zoning Board of Appeals might wish to consider an alternative to the requested setback variances. Currently, the applicant is requesting variances be granted so the existing parking lot can continue in its current configuration. However, it is likely that some redevelopment will happen on the site. If the variance to remove the sales office/building is permitted, then the existing restaurant structure will be demolished. If that variance request is denied, the applicant will likely demolish a

portion of the building to allow more space for the outdoor sale of cars. With these inevitable changes to the site, additional alterations could be considered.

She explained that as some yards within the site do not meet current landscaping setback requirements, an alternative to the requested setback variance would be to grant relief to the current requirements for landscaping. This would equate to the following setbacks and variances:

- 20-foot setback from the right-of-way line of Stadium Drive, approximately an 85-foot variance
- 20-foot setback from the right-of-way of Quail Run Drive, a 50-foot variance
- 35-foot setback from the rear (north) property line, a 50-foot variance
- 10-foot setback from the side (west) property line, no variance needed

In addition, the Zoning Board of Appeals could condition the variance to also require the landscape materials outlined in Section 75.130. This would be particularly important to the residentially zoned property to the north. Providing the necessary 35-foot greenspace with the required canopy, understory, and evergreen trees would help to screen the new sales lot use. As the requested use also requires special exception use approval, the Planning Commission would likely require landscaping compliance. Conditioning it as part of any variance consideration would provide surety to the residential neighbors to the north.

Ms. Johnston noted the Board may take 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 findings of fact are:

Variance request #1: Elimination of a sales office building at 5924 Stadium Drive

Support of variance approval:

- Conformance to the ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome and substantial justice is achieved as a sales office exists for the entirety of the automotive sales business.

Support of variance denial:

- Reasonable use of the property still exists under the C: Local Business District for any other allowable use.

Variance request #2: Setback variance to allow the use of the existing asphalt

Support of variance approval:

- The physical condition of a corner property places an extra burden on the parcel to meet front yard setback requirements.

- Significant precedence has been set allowing encroachment into the required setbacks, especially along rights-of-way.
- The requested setback variances are not the minimum which could still provide substantial justice to both applicant and neighboring residential uses.

Support of variance denial:

- Reasonable use of the property still exists under the C: Local Business District for any other allowable use.

Ms. Johnston listed the following four possible motions for the Zoning Board of Appeals to consider:

1. Applicant Request

Based on the findings of fact, motion to approve to allow the sales office at 5850 Stadium Drive to function as the sales office for 5924 Stadium Drive and to allow the following outdoor sales display setbacks:

- 76 feet from the center of Stadium Drive
- 11 feet from the right-of-way of Quail Run Drive
- 9 feet from the rear (north) property line
- 15 feet from the side (west) property line

2. Alternate Approach

Based on the findings of fact, motion to approve to allow the sales office at 5850 Stadium Drive to function as the sales office for 5924 Stadium Drive and to allow the following outdoor sales display setbacks with the required landscaping outlined in Section 75.130 of the Landscape Ordinance:

- 20-foot setback from the right-of-way line of Stadium Drive
- 20-foot setback from the right-of-way of Quail Run Drive
- 35-foot setback from the rear (north) property line
- 10-foot setback from the side (west) property line

3. Motion to deny the requested variances because reasonable use of the property is possible under the C: Local Business District for any other allowable use.
4. A combination motion that would approve one and deny the other variance request, utilizing the findings of fact and the possible motions outlined above.

Attorney Porter noted the Board should develop a motion after determining the findings of fact.

Chairperson Sterenberg asked if Board Members had questions for Ms. Johnston.

In response to questions from the Chair, Ms. Johnston said the variance granted to the existing DeNooyer Chevrolet site is to allow car display up to the right-of-way on Stadium Drive. She noted the request had been noticed and the only response

received was from one neighbor who asked for written information, which was provided. No further response was received.

Mr. Sikora asked if in the future someone bought both the 5850 and 5924 Stadium properties they could still use the sales office for both.

Ms. Johnston said technically that would be allowed; Attorney Porter explained only new and used car lots would be allowed the sales office under a subsection of the Ordinance.

There were no further questions from Board Members; Chairperson Sterenberg asked whether the applicant wished to speak.

Mr. Matthew VanDyke, Miller Johnson, 100 W. Michigan Avenue, representing the applicant, complimented Ms. Johnston on her presentation and development of the information for the Board to consider, noting not every municipality provides comparable assistance. He noted if the properties abutted without the Quail Run right of way, there wouldn't be a question. He felt their request is consistent and appropriate, they are not asking for a change from what is there. He expressed concern with the suggested alternative that would increase the rear yard setback.

Mr. Jeff DeNooyer, 1426 Edgemoor, owner of Metro Toyota, said his company sees their future growth area in used cars. They considered putting up a new office but determined it would be a burden for customers and for paperwork completion. He said he wants to continue to grow his business in Oshtemo Township, that this is a wonderful opportunity, and the increase in frontage is needed.

In answer to a question from Ms. Smith as to whether they had considered a smaller annex building for basic paperwork, Mr. DeNooyer said he did not know how they would use such a facility; customers will be better served with the existing building which has enough capacity for the expansion. What is needed is more display space for cars.

Chairperson Sterenberg asked if there were comments from the public.

Ms. Dusty Farmer, resident of Quail Run and member of the Home Owners Association (HOA), said she received feedback that not every home owner was noticed since they were not within 300 feet of the proposed development. She noted there are 48 units, all co-owners even though they may not live within the 300 feet requirement for notice. Notification was sent to the HOA President who shared it at a HOA meeting. Residents are concerned about an increase in lighting and noise, especially from unloading which is already a concern with the current lot. She said she expects concerns will likely be expressed at the Planning Commission level.

There were no further comments; Chairperson Sterenberg closed the public hearing and moved to Board Deliberations.

The Chair, after confirmation from Attorney Porter, said the legal obligation for notice was met and reiterated discussion should focus first on findings of fact and then on particulars of a possible motion.

Attorney Porter indicated that although the legal obligation for public notice was met, in the future the HOA will be noticed.

In response to a question from Mr. Sikora, Ms. Johnston said if the variances are granted by the ZBA, a Planning Commission public hearing will be required to consider the outdoor display of cars, which is a special exception use.

The Chairperson asked if required landscaping could be tweaked by the Planning Commission to try to address residents' concerns.

Ms. Johnston said the PC tries to bring properties into compliance as much as they can, but non-conforming lots are legal if they stay as they are. The existing nine feet of green space is not enough to accommodate required landscape materials. The alternate approach to the possible variance, meeting the required landscape setback of 35-feet, is necessary in order to add the required landscaping at the north property line.

Attorney Porter said the Planning Commission will have latitude to help the neighbors with screening if the north setback is increased as a condition of variance.

Mr. VanDyke commented the request was for nine feet on the north property line, agreed the ZBA has discretion, but felt 20 feet would be plenty for landscaping.

Attorney Porter told the Board they could draw the line where they saw fit as a result of their findings.

Ms. Johnston explained the landscape ordinance requirement of 35 feet between commercial and residential properties is greater to accommodate the number of required plantings, which is evergreens, canopy trees, understory trees and shrubs. A wide space is needed; 20 feet would not be sufficient. She noted there is already a six foot fence along that property line, which is the maximum height allowed by ordinance.

Several Board Members expressed support for a 35 foot set back from the north property line in order to provide screening for residents.

Mr. Sikora had safety concerns regarding street crossing to the sales office, but considering the variables, felt the best way to address the sales office is as proposed.

Chairperson Sterenberg agreed, noting the new sales area would be mostly for car display and there would not be a lot of travel back and forth across the street.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chair asked for a motion.

Mr. Sikora said his motion was based on the following findings of fact:

- Conformance to the ordinance is unnecessarily burdensome and substantial justice is achieved as a sales office exists for the entirety of the automotive sales business.
- The physical condition of a corner property places an extra burden on the parcel to meet front yard setback requirements.
- Significant precedence has been set allowing encroachment into the required setbacks, especially along rights-of-way.

Mr. Sikora moved and Mr. VanderWeele supported the motion to approve that the sales office at 5850 Stadium Drive function as the sales office for 5924 Stadium Drive and to allow the following outdoor sales display setbacks, which are the minimum necessary to ensure substantial justice to both the applicant and neighboring residential uses:

- 20-foot setback from the right-of-way line of Stadium Drive
- 20-foot setback from the right-of-way of Quail Run Drive
- 35-foot setback from the rear (north) property line
- 10-foot setback from the side (west) property line

The motion also included the condition that the required landscaping materials outlined in Section 75.130 of the Landscape Ordinance be installed within these required setbacks. The motion carried unanimously.

SITE PLAN REVIEW: D & R SPORTS: D & R SPORTS REQUESTED SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR AN EXPANSION TO THEIR EXISTING RETAIL FACILITY LOCATED AT 8178 WEST MAIN STREET, PARCEL NUMBER 3905-16-280-012.

Chairperson Sterenberg moved to the next item on the agenda and asked Ms. Johnston for her review.

Ms. Johnston said the subject parcel consists of 15-acres, located on the north side of West Main Street, approximately 900 feet west of North 6th Street. The location of a large outdoor recreation retail operation for a number of years, the owner wanted to add an additional 9,000 square feet of store space to the west end of the existing main building near West Main Street. Zoned *C: Local Business District*, the proposed retail expansion is permitted by right, per section 30.200 of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs such uses in the C zoning district.

She said Staff reviewed the project site plan and determined that along with the general use, the dimensions, placement, and overall design of the addition are largely in compliance with the applicable standards of the Zoning Ordinance. However, the new parking area south and west of the expansion does not contain the necessary interior landscaping features; an amended site plan will be required. The proposed project site plan contains a surplus of 14 to 18 parking spaces, eight of which can be converted into landscape features without causing ordinance compliance issues. This approach would remedy any interior landscaping deficiencies without impacting the proposed site layout.

Staff also noted the project site plan does not include the necessary 20-foot-wide landscape buffer between the new paving area and the West Main Street right-of-way. Elimination of the new parking spaces in this area will resolve the balance of the parking spaces count overage as well as provide the required landscape buffer area.

The proposed photometric plan also needs revision as light levels in excess of 0.1 foot-candles are indicated at and beyond the subject parcel's south boundary.

Ms. Johnston recommended approval of the project site plan with the following conditions, resolution of which to be administratively reviewed and approved prior to the issuance of a building permit:

1. The recently-installed on-site fire hydrant shall be dedicated to the Township as a public facility, via recorded easement.
2. In order to satisfy internal parking lot landscape requirements, eight spaces within the new parking area shall be converted to landscaped peninsulas, in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance. A revised site plan illustrating such shall be submitted for staff approval.
3. In order to provide the necessary landscape buffer along West Main Street and resolve the remainder of the parking space surplus, the seven new parking stalls currently indicated adjacent to West Main Street shall be eliminated. A revised site plan illustrating such shall be submitted for staff approval.
4. The Township Engineer shall be satisfied that no revised notation or adjustments are needed for the site plan.
5. A revised photometric plan shall be submitted to the Township, indicating that light levels from any new fixtures do not exceed 0.1 foot-candles at or beyond any property line.

Chairperson Sterenberg asked if there were question for Ms. Johnston.

In answer to questions, Ms. Johnston indicated she did not know why D&R wanted extra parking spaces; they are not needed by Ordinance. The Township

determines needed spaces on net retail square feet and the D&R plan calculated them based on gross retail space.

There was no public input; the Chair moved to Board Discussion.

Mr. Sikora noted that people park along M-43 when D&R has special events.

Ms. Johnston said the Township cannot force D&R to prohibit parking along M-43 as it is a state highway and not under Township jurisdiction.

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

Mr. VanderWeele made a motion to approve the site plan as requested by D&R, including the five conditions suggested by Staff. Ms. Culp supported the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

Any Other Business

a. MEETING DATES FOR 2019

Ms. Johnston provided proposed meeting dates in the regular pattern for 2019. She noted Thanksgiving falls on Thursday, November 28th in 2019 and asked if the Board prefers to meet Tuesday, November 26 or move the date up a week to the 19th.

The group agreed they prefer the November meeting be scheduled for the 19th.

<i>Month</i>	<i>Meeting Date</i>
January	22 nd
February	26 th
March	26 th
April	23 rd
May	28 th
June	25 th
July	23 rd
August	27 th
September	24 th
October	22 nd

November	19 th *
December	17 th *

*Changed from normal meeting date due to holiday

JOINT MEETINGS (tentative – still to be approved by Township Board)
 April 16th, October 15th

Ms. Culp made a motion to approve the ZBA 2019 Meeting Dates as proposed, with the November meeting on the 19th. Mr. Sikora supported the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

b. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF BOARD MEMBER END OF TERM

Chairperson Sterenberg and the Board acknowledged that Mr. Anderson was leaving the Zoning Board of Appeals after serving since January of 2012. He said the Board had benefitted over the years from his insight and experience and noted Mr. Anderson would receive a certificate of appreciation for his seven years of service.

ZBA Member Comments

Ms. Johnston reported Mr. Fred Antosz, who has completed his term on the Planning Commission, will be joining the ZBA in January as a sixth member. One more member is still needed.

Adjournment

Chairperson Sterenberg noted the Zoning Board of Appeals had exhausted its Agenda. There being no other business, he adjourned the meeting at 4:20 p.m.

Minutes prepared:
 November 29, 2018

Minutes approved:
 January 22, 2019