

Mt. Pleasant Zoning Board of Appeals
Minutes of Regular Meeting
November 28, 2012

Chairman White called the meeting to order at 7:11 p.m.

I. Roll Call: Staff called roll.

Members Present: Berkshire, Fokens, Kulick, Palm, Quast (arrived at 7:16) White (Chair),

Absent: Ellertson (Vice-Chair).

Staff: Kench, Murphy

II. Approval of Agenda:

Motion by Kulick, support by Fokens to approve agenda.

Motion to approve agenda approved.

III. Approval of Minutes from September 26, 2012:

Motion by Kulick, support by Palm, to approve the minutes from the September 26, 2012 meeting as submitted. Motion approved.

IV. Communications:

Staff reported that there were no communications to share at this time.

V. Public Comments:

Chairman White opened the floor for public comments.

There being no one who wished to address the Board, the Public Comments session was closed.

VI. Public Hearings:

Chairman White explained board proceedings, noting that a quorum was present.

A. Case ZBA-18-2012 - 506 W. Broadway.

Staff introduced the case, explaining that the applicant is seeking a variance from the sign provisions in the C-2 zoning district. The location is the home of *Mountain Town Station* and *Camille's on the River*. Staff noted that the ordinance allows 80 square feet of signage for the site and the applicant is requesting an increase to 94 square feet. Staff noted that the use is conforming for the zoning district and the future land use has been designated as commercial. Staff reminded the Board that they have asked the Planning Commission to look at the sign ordinance and also commented that although we are encouraging the use of ground signs, our current ordinance language significantly limits both the height and width. Staff reported that the proposed sign is made of durable materials and includes stonework and a trellis. The sign itself is designed at a height of 6'; and with the added detailing at the top, would extend to 8' high.

Staff noted that although the location is in the C-2 zoning district, the property is different from other C-2 businesses in that it is located on a fairly large site and provides its own parking. In addition, the site is bordered on two sides by a city park and the railroad and there is another business located directly in front of it. Staff noted that a similar variance was granted in the late 90's to allow additional signage for Mountain Town Station.

Jim Holton, owner of the businesses and applicant, addressed the Board, noting that 17 years ago he built *Mountain Town*. He recently added *Camille's on the River* and would like to upgrade the signage. Mr. Holton reported that the concrete abutment is already there and he would like to bring some of the same type of materials used in the recent building addition to build the new sign.

Mr. Holton asked the Board to take into consideration the size of the site (over 7 acres), the unique location, and the fact that there are two businesses operating from the site.

Commissioner Kulick asked if the smaller signs that are currently on site would remain. Mr. Holton noted that the smaller signs - the one for Camille's and the hours of operation would be gone. Hours of operation are posted on the door of the business.

Commissioner Kulick commented that the 7 acre site is not fully developed and questioned whether future development was planned and if so, would the requested signage be sufficient. Mr. Holton noted that much of the area in the back is located in the flood plain and he does not foresee putting any structures there in the future; the area may possibly be used for summertime gatherings/events.

Commissioner Palm expressed some concern over the Water Works business possibly wanting additional signage.

Commissioner Fokens asked if the existing signage on the face of the building would remain. Mr. Holton indicated that the signage for Camille's on the River would remain as is. The signage for Mountain Town Station may change in appearance; however, the size would remain the same.

Commissioner Fokens asked for clarification on the drawing submitted that indicates the top portion of the sign was optional. Mr. Holton stated that this was a note to him from the sign designer; and that he wishes to include that detail; therefore it is not "optional."

Commissioner Fokens stated that the signage would have a visual impact and noted a concern that the Water Works sign visibility may be impacted.

Chairman White opened the Public Hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Staff noted that there was no correspondence related to this request.

Board Discussion:

Commissioner Kulick commented that the site is unique in that it sits back from the road and has its own parking area; whereas other C-2 areas are more congested resulting in slower traffic. In addition, Commissioner Kulick commented that if something is eventually built on the parcel of land between this site and City Hall, it could potentially block the vision of the signage; therefore, he believes, based on the uniqueness of the site, that the request meets the requirements for granting a variance. Commissioner Kulick also noted that the site is adjacent to the railroad tracks to the west; and borders the Chippewa River and city park to the north and an electrical sub-station to the south.

Chairman White agreed that the uniqueness of the site warrants granting the request.

Commissioner Quast read through the six criteria for granting a variance.

Motion by Kulick, support by Quast to approve Case ZBA 18-2012 to allow an increase in the height of a ground sign to 6 ft. to the sign cabinet and permit the construction of the bracket detail not to exceed 8 ft. based on the applicant presenting sufficient evidence to meet the criteria for granting a variance under section 154.164 of the Ordinance. In addition, the Board noted that with the approval in 1996 to allow an increase to 60 square feet for Mountain Town Station, a variance to allow the additional 40 square feet to increase the signage to 94 square feet overall is not necessary.

Motion carried.

B. C. & D. Case ZBA-19-2012 1020 & 1006 S. Washington; Case ZBA-20-2012 - 1008 S. Washington; Case ZBA-21-2012 - 1010 S. Washington.

Staff introduced Cases ZBA-19-2012, ZBA-20-2012 and ZBA 21-2012, noting that these cases were submitted by Joe Olivieri on behalf of United Investments. The applicant has submitted these three cases as a "package" and they will be reviewed together. Staff explained that Case ZBA-19-2012 is located at 1020 S. Washington and also involves the vacant parcel of land at 1006 S. Washington. Staff explained that in 2001 the parcel at 1020 S. Washington received approval from the Planning Commission to construct an 11 unit 52 occupant apartment building, however, the land area from the lot at 1006 was included in the land area calculation. The applicant would now like to develop the site at 1006 S. Washington, and is therefore requesting a variance to reduce the land area per person on 1020 S. Washington Street to 753.25 square feet based on the available land area of 39,198 Ft² and the 52 occupants on the site.

Staff explained that although the review in 2001 considered the two properties (1020 and 1006) as one zoning lot in determining the maximum number of occupants that may reside on the development, the two parcels of land are not contiguous. The zoning ordinance defines the property located at 1006 S. Washington as a lot and the five lots that make up 1020 S. Washington Street as a zoning lot.

If approved, the applicant will go before the Planning Commission for site plan review and a Special Use Permit to develop a rooming dwelling at 1006 S. Washington for 8 occupants, to comply with zoning requirements.

As part of the proposed package, the applicant is also asking for variances to redevelop the sites at 1008 and 1010 S. Washington, and is asking for an increase in occupancy at both of these sites from the 8 occupants allowed by ordinance, based on land area, to 9. Staff noted that 1008 S. Washington is currently licensed for five and 1010 S. Washington is currently licensed for 6.

Also as part of the proposal, the facade at 1020 S. Washington will be updated with new architectural features and details. Staff shared the proposed renderings for the facade improvements, along with the proposed renderings for the other sites. Staff further noted that the site at 1020 S. Washington complies with the setback requirements and exceeds the parking requirements, providing 58 onsite parking spaces for 52 occupants. The variance would be for the land area per person, ending up with 52 occupants on a parcel that has enough land area for 43.

Commissioner Berkshire commented that to get the 52 occupants at 1020 S. Washington, which the property is currently licensed for, they need the land area from the two lots together, noting for clarification purposes, that they aren't asking to increase the number of occupants at 1020 S. Washington, but will be reducing the land area per person for the number currently licensed for. Staff acknowledged this was correct.

Staff noted that this proposal is not a traditional request and is somewhat confusing in its complexity. Staff further commented that unlike some of the recent requests that the Board has considered, this proposal offers little in the reduction of non-conformities. Both 1008 and 1010 S. Washington meet setback requirements and have sufficient parking for their tenants at this time.

Joe Olivieri, applicant, addressed the Board, explaining that United Investments had approached him about possibly redeveloping the sites at 1008 and 1010 S. Washington. In viewing the property, he noted that the vacant lot at 1006, which is currently being used as a parking lot, does not fit the character of the neighborhood. Mr. Olivieri reported that this led to discussion with staff regarding the 2001 approval. Mr. Olivieri commented that there has not been any problem with 52 occupants on 1020 S. Washington and this development has not had any detrimental effects on the neighborhood. He is therefore proposing to develop the parking lot at 1006 S. Washington and get it back on the tax roll.

Mr. Olivieri commented that we have the opportunity to redevelop the entire side of this block, which would have a tremendous impact, and shared the proposed renderings for the facade upgrade at 1020 S. Washington.

Chairman White acknowledged the uniqueness of this request, noting that we have an opportunity to clean up the zoning lot/lot issue and would like to see it done right. He further commented that because 1006, 1008 and 1010 S. Washington are included with this package request he would like to see some uniformity across the lots in regards to the designs.

Commissioner Quast disagreed, noting that she would like to see each one have their own unique characteristics and not be too similar.

Chairman White clarified that he wants to see more architectural features on the proposed developments as shown on the 1020 upgrade, noting that these properties deserve more detail in the elevations. Commissioner Palm agreed, also noting the importance of style diversity.

Chairman White commented that he would like to see this project move forward; however, does not feel that we can get to a place where an increase in occupancy for 1008 and 1010 can be approved as there will be little to no reductions of non-conformities with this redevelopment. Chairman White noted that because this is a package deal, and the applicant is asking for a significant increase in the occupancy for 1020 S. Washington by developing 1006, he feels that all the properties should offer additional architectural features and suggested postponing the cases to allow the applicant to provide updated renderings for all the properties.

Commissioner Kulick commended the developer on the proposed upgrades to 1020 S. Washington, and questioned whether combining the lots into one would provide enough land area to get the applicant the density he is requesting. Staff responded that the applicant did submit an alternate plan with an apartment style building for 1008/1010 S. Washington; however, further noted that the recent developments at 221 Clayton, 1028 Douglas, and the proposed development at 1003 Douglas, all in the same general area, are rooming dwellings. Staff commented that if the Board wishes to consider the apartment style building the applicant may provide revised information.

Staff spoke of the M-2 redevelopment guidelines that the ZBA and Planning Commission have been working on, noting that when looking at proposed increases in occupancy, we are looking for reductions in the non-conformities. Staff noted that if the proposed redevelopments don't meet the non-conformity provisions, then the Board would need to decide if there is any practical difficulty in developing to Ordinance standards under traditional variance requests.

Commissioner Kulick noted that by eliminating 1006 from the land calculations at 1020, they would actually be increasing the non-conformity.

Commissioner Palm noted that it will be difficult to approve an increase in occupancy with no decrease non-conformity.

Chairman White opened the Public Hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Motion by Kulick, support by Quast to postpone Cases ZBA-19-2012, ZBA-20-2012 and ZBA-21-2012 to allow the applicant to prepare revised elevation drawings.

Motion approved.

E. ZBA-22-2012 1216 Upton.

Staff introduced Case ZBA-22-2012 submitted by Connie Marshall of 1216 Upton. Staff reported that Mrs. Marshall currently operates a group daycare home for up to 12 children at

this address under a Special Use Permit (SUP) granted by the Planning Commission. Staff reported that the owner wishes to make alterations to the home to enclose the garage for additional living space and is therefore, seeking a variance from the parking requirements for a group daycare.

Staff reported that the Planning Commission's approval was contingent upon compliance with section 154.051(C)(4)(f) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires group day care homes to provide a minimum of three hard-surfaced, off-street parking spaces, with not more than two of the required spaces provided in the required front yard setback and not more than one of the required spaces blocking another parking space.

Staff reported that the garage is currently used to meet these parking requirements. The variance will allow the applicant to utilize the existing driveway and maintain the play area east of the garage, which is also required as part of the SUP.

Staff shared a site plan with the Board, noting the limited setback of the home to Upton Street, which places two of the required parking spaces within the required front yard setback. Staff also noted that because there are no sidewalks along this block, a third space may be considered within the right-of way. Staff also noted that on-street parking is available during the hours of operation.

Staff reported that if additional parking is needed in the future, the applicant may need to consider reducing the outdoor play area to add parking, which may require a separate variance.

Chairman White asked if the city had any plans to put a sidewalk along this street. Staff commented that there were no plans at this time.

Connie Marshall, applicant, addressed the Board. Mrs. Marshall noted that the reason they wish to enclose the garage is to create more indoor space for the daycare and also living area for the family. Mrs. Marshall stated that although she is licensed for 12 children, she currently has 7 family and generally there is only one-two vehicles dropping off or picking up children at the same time and there is not a big need for parking.

Chairman White asked if she had any help during the day and if they required a parking space. Mrs. Marshall responded that she did have help during the day; however, they were dropped off and picked up and did not take up any of the available parking spaces.

Commissioner Berkshire asked about the likelihood of having 12 children. Mrs. Marshall responded that she does have 12 children right now, but from 7 families; however, acknowledged that there was the possibility of that changing in the future and having 12 families. Mrs. Marshall also noted that the cars that park for drop offs and pickups are generally only there for 5-10 minutes.

Chairman White commented that there is adequate street parking in front of the home. He further commented that adding hard surfaced parking would cut down on the land area and limits the applicant's options.

Commissioner Palm commented that she had noticed the home was for sale. Mrs. Marshall confirmed that the house was for sale - it was put on the market after they submitted the variance request. Mrs. Marshall stated that in the event that the home doesn't sell, they would like to have the option to enclose the garage.

Commissioner Fokens asked if the fenced play area was also a requirement for the day care. Mrs. Marshall indicated it was a requirement of both the State and city.

Staff reported that the only correspondence was a letter of opposition submitted anonymously. Commissioner Palm commented that she has difficulty giving a lot of credence to anonymous letters.

Chairman White opened the Public Hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Board Discussion:

Commissioner Kulick spoke of his experience of living across from a daycare and acknowledged that there were rarely more than two cars at a time. He questioned whether the applicant could push the fence located to the right of the driveway back and move the fence in the backyard to gain what they would lose.

Chairman White asked what would happen if the property sold. Staff noted that the variance goes with the property; however, if the new owner did not run a daycare operation, the SUP would be null and void after a year.

Chairman White noted that the neighboring properties all have similar parking configurations and the only reason the applicant is here is because of the daycare requirements. He further commented that there appears to be adequate street parking available and does not see a problem with granting the request.

Commissioner Kulick commented that one of the goals of the Master Plan is to have sidewalks in all residential areas; and it is not unreasonable to assume that at some point sidewalks will be installed

Staff commented that if the sidewalks are installed, the applicant needs to be aware that the sidewalks cannot be blocked.

Commissioner Berkshire asked if it would be against City Ordinance to extend the hard surface parking to the right and move the fence. Chairman White noted that it would still be in the required front yard setback and would still require a variance.

Commissioner Quast referred to the six criteria for granting a variance, noting that the lot is elongated and shallow and that others in the neighborhood have the same configuration. It was also noted that there would be no drastic change in the traffic.

Board discussion ensued on how the Ordinance defines a front yard. Staff noted that corner lots typically have two front yards.

Commissioner Fokens questioned whether the applicant could put a curb cut off Maxwell Street. Staff stated that they could if they wanted. Chairman White questioned whether that would be more of a detriment to the neighborhood.

Motion by Palm, support by Quast to approve the variance request submitted by Connie Marshall to permit parking in the required front yard and to allow additional parking to occur on the street or on the hard-surfaced driveway within the right of way, on the basis that short term parking is available on the street during the daycare's hours of operation and based on the uniqueness of the lot and the proximity of the home to Upton Street.

Motion approved 4:2.

F. ZBA-23-2012 - 306 Andre

Staff introduced case ZBA-23-2012 submitted by Sharon Tilmann, who is seeking a variance to reduce the required side yard setback to construct an open carport within the required 6 1/2 foot setback. Staff noted that the use is a permitted use in the R-3 zoning district. The property is surrounded by R-3 residential properties and the future land use is designated as urban residential.

Staff noted that the lot is a non-conforming lot in the R-3 zoning district and is nearly 1/2 the size of the required lot for the district. The applicant is proposing to use the existing driveway to preserve the limited backyard area and mature tree that is located there. The proposed construction is for an open carport extending to one foot from the property line.

Staff shared photos of the property with an illustration of the proposed carport.

Commissioner Kulick asked how much of an architectural projection is allowed to extend within the side setback. Staff stated that architectural projections are allowed to extend one foot into the setback.

Staff reported that the building code would require fire rated construction for within a 3 ft. setback to the property line. Because of the open structure, building codes would allow it to be one foot from the property line; however, to avoid having to meet additional fire code requirements at the eaves, the applicant may wish to pull the carport back to 18" from the property line.

Sharon Tilmann, owner and applicant, addressed the Board. Ms. Tilmann stated she purchased the home 26 years ago and had worked hard to preserve the craftsman style. Ms. Tilmann stated that she has renovated the home inside and out and the only thing lacking is a place to park her vehicle under cover, and she would therefore like to have a carport. Ms. Tilmann stated she would like to use the existing concrete and prefers an open carport to maintain an open, airy feel and not block visibility. Ms Tilmann reported that she spoke with

her neighbors and they have been very supportive. She commented that she is trying to do the best she can with what she has and asked the Board to consider her limited area.

Chairman White asked if Ms. Tilmann would be able to meet the 18" setback from the property line. Ms. Tilmann stated she could and noted that she did not know until she saw the report that this could be an issue in regards to fire codes.

Ms. Tilmann commented that she has never been to a ZBA meeting before and that she appreciates the minute detail that the Board deals with.

Chairman White opened the public hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Staff noted that we had received letters of support from several of the neighbors. In addition, the Department of Fire Safety had no objections.

Commissioner Kulick commented that the applicant has very minimal choices, and noted that any other option would likely require a variance as well.

Commissioner Quast noted that the lot is exceptional due to its size; the request is not detrimental to the surrounding properties, nor is it a request that is general and recurrent in nature. She further commented that she feels this is necessary for the applicant to enjoy her property and feels that the request meets the criteria for granting the variance.

Commissioner Kulick suggested requiring the applicant maintain 18" to the property line. Staff clarified that the building code allows the construction within 1'; however it requires a different fire rating, which is more costly, and suggested that the applicant's contractor may want to meet with staff prior to submitting a building permit.

Motion by Kulick, support by Berkshire to approve the variance request to construct a carport within the required side yard based on the applicant providing adequate information to show a practical difficulty and undue hardship, and the limited options based on the small lot size, with the contingency that the carport never be enclosed but remain an open sided structure.

Motion approved.

F. ZBA-24-2012 - 122/124 N. Kinney.

Staff introduced case ZBA-24-2012 submitted by Lawrence Leemaster, requesting a variance from the required number of parking spaces for a duplex, along with a request for a slight variance in the required greenbelt.

Staff reported the property is located on the corner of Kinney and Mosher and is zoned OS-1. The applicant sold the property a while back on a land contract and recently got it back. He is looking to reinstate the property into the Housing Licensing program.

Staff reported that one of the parking spaces is currently located in the city right of way. The applicant is proposing to remove that space and partially re-establish the greenbelt, leaving 2 spaces for each unit and two areas the applicant has identified for future parking spaces if the need increases.

Staff noted that the proposed use as a duplex is permitted in the district and is regulated under a Special Use permit, which will be required through Planning Commission approval.

Staff reported that although duplexes are required by Ordinance to provide 6 hard-surfaced parking spaces, the owner has 25 years of experience with the property and believes four spaces are sufficient. The property has a one-bedroom apartment upstairs.

Lawrence Leemaster, owner of the property and applicant, addressed the Board, stating he has owned the property since 1977. The property has always had a one-bedroom apartment in the upper level and for 22 years he conducted an accounting business out of the lower level. The property was licensed as a duplex/office up until the time it was sold on a land contract in 2010. Mr. Leemaster stated he received the property back within a year; however when he tried to return it to the rental program, he found that it had lost the duplex status.

Mr. Leemaster reported that he then met with staff and discovered that one of the existing parking spaces was located in the required greenbelt. He will remove that space and reestablish 8 1/2 feet of the required 10' green space. Mr. Leemaster stated that there are two parking spaces in the garage and two more existing hard-surfaced parking spaces and he does not feel there is a need for additional parking. Mr. Leemaster stated that there is a one-bedroom apartment upstairs and downstairs is a 1-2 bedroom apartment. Rudoni's is located to the east and General Agency to the west.

Commissioner Quast asked if Mr. Leemaster planned on keeping the property or selling it. Mr. Leemaster indicated that he wasn't sure at this time.

Chairman White opened the Public Hearing. There being no one who wished to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Staff noted that the only correspondence received was from the Fire Department noting that updates may be required as part of the Housing Licensing process.

Commissioner Kulick commented that the one bedroom apartment, although in the past has been traditionally rented to one person, it could be rented to a couple with two cars. He continued that it is not unreasonable to expect 4 cars for the two apartments. Commissioner Kulick questioned what would happen if there were guests staying, and indicated that he would be willing to approve the request if the applicant installed the extra parking space to the south of the garage.

Staff reminded the Board of the Ordinance language that permits them to grant a parking variance as follows, noting that it refers to the number of automobiles parked on an average day:

PARKING VARIANCE - Where it can be demonstrated that the maximum number of required parking spaces would exceed the maximum number of automobiles parking on the premises during an average day, the Zoning Board of Appeals may approve a site plan with fewer spaces provided:

(A) The parking area accommodates 1½ cars for each employee.

(B) (1) An open landscaped area meeting the required area for parking is reserved if an increase in parking needs occurs in the future.

(2) The site plan approval reducing the number of required parking spaces shall be valid only for the use for which the variance was granted. An occupancy permit for a new use shall not be issued until a new site plan is approved.

Commissioner Berkshire asked for confirmation on the maximum occupancy. Staff clarified that each dwelling unit would be licensed as a single-family unit and would have no more than two unrelated people.

Commissioner Berkshire asked if the spaces identified as options for future parking needs were at staff's suggestion or the applicants. Staff responded that the applicant had offered them.

Motion by Kulick, support by Palm to approve the variance request to reduce the parking for a duplex at 122-124 N. Kinney from 6 to 5, with the fifth space to be added just south of the existing garage as noted on the site plan. In addition, grant a variance to reduce the greenbelt to 8.5 feet where 10 feet is required along Mosher Street.

Motion approved.

The Board based their approval on the history of the property noting that the occupancy is limited to no more than two unrelated in each unit.

Staff commented that the Planning Commission will be reviewing this case and will determine the criteria for the SUP. The Fire Department will assure the units are up to code during the licensing process.

VII. Old Business:

A. ZBA-02-2012 1002 Douglas.

Staff provided some background on this case, reminding the Board that they had approved a request in May to permit the redevelopment of this property with an increase in occupancy for two additional tenants for a total occupancy of 11. At the time, the Board deliberated on whether the project met the review standards adopted by the Planning Commission and ZBA to allow two additional tenants and after much discussion, eventually approved the request, based on the number of non-conformities that would be eliminated.

When the case was presented to the Planning Commission for the SUP, the Planning Commission also deliberated on whether the request warranted two additional tenants.

Although the PC acknowledged the elimination of several non-conformities, they approved the SUP with modifications for only 10 occupants.

Staff reported that since that time, staff met with the Planning Commission in a work session to revise the language in the review standards to help clarify when granting an increase of two additional occupants is warranted.

In the meantime, the applicant has contracted with an Architect, who has assisted him in revising the elevations to reflect some of the concerns raised by the Boards. Staff shared the revised elevations, noting that the site plan and conditions for rendering a finding on a non-conforming use have not changed. Staff further stated that the ZBA is being asked to grant approval on the changes in the elevations that were linked to their prior approval before the case goes back to the Planning Commission.

Joe Olivieri, applicant for this case addressed the Board.

Chairman White commended Mr. Olivieri for working with the city through this lengthy process.

Commissioner Kulick commented that he is very impressed with the revisions and the substantial upgrades to the building elevations.

Motion by Kulick, support by Quast to approve the revised renderings and commend the applicant for his creativity.

Motion approved.

Chairman White commented that although he is not completely happy with how we got here, he feels the result is what we are looking for. He also noted that he is glad the applicant showed the flexibility to keep moving forward with this request.

Commissioner Quast also commended the applicant for this project, commenting that this development will be something the community can be proud of.

B. M-2 Redevelopment Procedures

Staff asked the Board to review the updated draft of the M2 Redevelopment Procedures and be prepared to comment on the document at the December meeting. Staff suggested we may schedule a brief work session following the December meeting for this purpose.

VII. New Business

None

VIII. Other Business

A. December Meeting - Staff reported that we have one case that has been submitted for

the December meeting, which is a request to reinstate a non-conforming use.

Staff also noted that the postponed Washington Street cases may be back as well, depending on whether the applicant gets the new renderings submitted.

Staff reminded the Board that the December meeting was moved up a week due to the Christmas holiday, noting that it is scheduled for December 19th.

B. Proposed 2013 Schedule

Staff noted that the schedule for 2013 was included in packets, and noted that the December meeting for 2013 was moved up a week.

C. New Board Member:

Chairman White welcomed our new ZBA Member, Steven Berkshire.

IX. Adjournment

Motion by Kulick, support by Palm to adjourn.

Motion approved.

Meeting adjourned 9:35 p.m.

bam