

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBER  
JANUARY 12, 2016**

**CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

Chair Seelye called the meeting to order at 7:30p.m. and made standard introductory remarks explaining the formal procedure, courtesies and right of appeal.

**ROLL CALL**

The Recording Secretary called the roll.

Members present: Barringer, Lindquist, Masood, Rich, Seelye, Stevens and Vergun

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Attorney Morita and Zoning Division Supervisor Randt

**SITE VISIT JANUARY 10, 2016**

Chair Seelye noted when the Zoning Board of Appeals members visited the site.

The Sunday site visit begins at 9:00a.m. at City Hall. It is an advertised open, public meeting under the Open Meetings Act, is only for informational purposes; the Board members abstain from any action, hearing testimony, or any deliberations.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION** by Stevens, support by Rich, to approve the agenda as published.

**MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. ZBA CASE: 1-16-5584  
LOCATION: 29830 W. Twelve Mile  
PARCEL I.D.: 23-11-453-001  
REQUEST: In order to replace a 4 foot high poured concrete wall with a 6 foot high vinyl fence for a distance of 120 feet in an RC-2 zoning district, a variance from the requirement that a 6 foot high wall be provided abutting residential districts.  
CODE SECTION: 34-5.15  
APPLICANT: Amanda Gruzin for Inverrary Condominiums  
OWNER: Inverrary Condominium Association

Utilizing overhead slides, Zoning Supervisor Randt described the location of the property, showed an overhead view of the property, location of the concrete wall, photos of the condition of the existing concrete wall, along with a site plan and photos of the proposed vinyl fence provided by the applicant. He noted that this issue came to the Zoning Division through a complaint.

Amanda Gruzin, representative of Inverrary Condominium Association, explained that the reason for their request for a variance is based on a long term solution, when looking at the photos, it can be seen that they have a perimeter boundary wall approximately 1,300 lineal feet long and financially they could save

approximately \$200,000 to \$300,000 if they were to get a variance to use vinyl fencing. She stated that cost to put in a poured wall is very expensive as they would have to remove quite a few carports and the logistics would be difficult on the project.

Chair Seelye commented that one of the issues the Board has, in relation to the criteria of granting a variance is that this is totally self-created by lack of maintenance of the wall.

Ms. Gruzin mentioned that in reading Mr. Zarr's, owner of 27970 Rollcrest, communication with the Board, he states that he has been fighting with this issue since 2006, but she has no verification of that being a claim. She explained that the association, prior to her arrival, attempted to resolve the issue by installing tiebacks which have not solved the problem and they are aware that the footer is failing; self-created, yes, however, they did try to mitigate.

Member Lindquist asked Ms. Gruzin to repeat what the estimated savings would be utilizing a vinyl fence. Ms. Gruzin responded that a rough estimate of the original request, which is a 120 feet of the fence, it is about \$25,000 and if they are able to install vinyl fence, they are looking at savings upwards of about \$200,000 over the term of 10-15 years as other sections of the wall fail, so they are looking at quite a bit of money.

Member Lindquist questioned if the proponent anticipates replacing all sections of the wall. Ms. Gruzin responded that they would all be replaced in the event of their future failure.

Member Rich noted that this was a 4 foot concrete wall and he believes that the ordinance calls for a 6 foot wall. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that the ordinance has changed throughout the years, at one time it was a 4 foot regulation but now it is 6 foot, however, the Board could allow the replacement of the 4 foot wall and they would be in compliance.

Member Vergun asked, for clarification, if what they are potentially approving would be the ability for the proponent to use vinyl instead of replacing with concrete. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that was correct.

Chair Seelye asked if the proponent was allowed to put up a 4 foot wall because they are grandfathered. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that was correct.

Member Rich questioned, since what was advertised was a request for a variance of the vinyl fence for 120 feet, if the Board's decision would have no bearing on replacing the rest of the wall and the applicant would have to come back before the Board to have any other portions of the wall changed. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that was correct.

Attorney Morita noted that the Board may want to clarify where the 120 feet of wall is located.

Ms. Gruzin noted that the 120 foot wall is adjacent to 27970 Rollcrest, the failing length of the wall is about 78 feet but they have requested to include the entire property width.

Member Barringer questioned if the proponent were allowed to replace the concrete wall with another concrete wall at 4 feet in height, would that change the price structure. Ms. Gruzin responded that the estimates they received are for replacing the wall at their current height, which is 4 feet.

Member Barringer asked if a 4 foot concrete wall would cost approximately \$25,000. Ms. Gruzin responded that was correct.

Member Lindquist asked if a 120 foot length, 6 foot high vinyl fence would cost \$10,000. Ms. Gruzin responded that the material is roughly about \$5,000 and removal and reinstallation of the carport ranges from \$5,000 to \$6,000. She noted that in some areas there is no need to remove the carport as the walls are exposed.

Member Lindquist asked the proponent to summarize the cost to replace the 120 foot wall with concrete versus a 6 foot vinyl fence. Ms. Gruzin responded that concrete is about \$25,000 and vinyl ranges from \$8,200 to \$8,500 depending on the project timing, how many sections they will need and the cost to take the wall out and the carport down.

Secretary Stevens questioned if the existing carport was a requirement or if they could they be removed. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that he did not know if the carport was a site plan requirement.

Attorney Morita commented that she did not believe that the carport was part of the original site plan that it was added later and in terms of whether or not there is a portion of the ordinance that requires carports, they would have to check into that.

Chair Seelye opened the public hearing.

Matthew Pyles, 28083 David St. commented that his concerns with replacing sections of the concrete wall with vinyl fence is that a large portion of his property backs up to the condominiums and he already has excessive trash and noise to deal with and vinyl will increase all that. He noted that he is cleaning up trash every week due to the location of the condominium dumpster and because it is not properly maintained or secured.

Seeing that there were no further comments, Chair Seelye closed the public hearing.

Chair Seelye asked Secretary Stevens if there was an affidavit of mailing. Secretary Stevens said there was an affidavit and there were two returned.

Chair Seelye brought the matter back to the Board.

Member Rich mentioned that the Board received an email from Mr. Zarr who had a couple of issues, one of which was with water runoff. He stated that during the site visit he noticed a curb in front of the wall and questioned if the Engineering Division needed to do any sort of analysis to make sure that there is appropriate drainage. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that in back of the condominiums there is a pond that is part of the rouge water shed and as far as drainage, he would have to refer to Engineering to determine if there are any issues.

Member Rich asked Ms. Gruzin if the proposed vinyl fence is opaque so that no light can go through. Ms. Gruzin responded that was correct; there will be small seams where the panels meet but there are small vinyl strips that can be placed in those locations.

Member Lindquist asked if Ms. Gruzin was representing the condominium association. Ms. Gruzin responded that was correct as she works for The Highlander Group and they manage and oversee the community.

Secretary Stevens asked how far north the wall goes from the proposed 120 feet. Ms. Gruzin responded that the wall ends roughly at the property line between 28000 and 28006 Rollcrest and there is a natural hedge where the topography builds up and ultimately the wall is built into the ground, there is no hard end to the wall. She noted that when taking the average width of the lots, the wall would be approximately another 120 feet.

Member Barringer noted that when he was researching the case, he consulted a materials Engineer and it was his contention that one of the reasons that cities require that retaining walls be concrete is to hold back large amounts of water, and a vinyl fence would not hold water back.

Secretary Stevens commented that the vinyl fence, nor the concrete wall, is intended to hold back drainage, typically these walls are there for noise and light, not necessarily for drainage. It is his opinion that part of the reason the wall is failing is because the foundation and soils are soft. He noted that in many cases these types of walls have to have drainage behind them to take water away from the wall.

Ms. Gruzin commented that in hopes of eliminating some of the water penetration at the base of the wall, they are working to arrange a gutter system on the back of the carport and possibly underground drains with pipes to remove water from the wall, which should also substantially dry up Mr. Zarr's backyard.

Secretary Stevens questioned the resident that spoke and how a 4 foot poured wall versus a 6 foot vinyl fence would relate to trash impact. Mr. Pyles responded that the vinyl fence will not go all the way to the ground like the poured concrete wall so there will be a gap for additional trash, leaves and brush to get underneath. He noted that he also found a dead deer carcass in his backyard that was thrown over the fence.

Zoning Supervisor Randt asked if the proponent has tried to repair the existing wall. Ms. Gruzin responded that at this time it would be absolutely frivolous to try to repair the wall as the footing is failing and they attempted to repair with tiebacks but those have not worked. She noted that there is no repairing this wall.

Secretary Stevens asked Ms. Gruzin, in hearing the comments from the resident on the fence not going to the ground and concerns with trash, is there something that can be done to mitigate that. Ms. Gruzin responded that there will be a slight opening of about 2-3 inches under the fence line but she could look into possibly putting railroad ties on the bottom or large boulders to create a barrier. She noted that the community dumpster is enclosed and gated and they do their best to make sure residents throw their trash in the dumpster but they may have a little bit of flyaway. She noted that this is the first that she has heard of any deer carcass being tossed over the wall.

Zoning Supervisor Randt asked how many bids the proponent received for the concrete wall. Ms. Gruzin responded that they received three different bids.

**MOTION** by Masood, support by Barringer, in the matter of ZBA Case 1-16-5584, to DENY the petitioner's request for a variance from the requirement that a 6 foot high wall be provided abutting residential districts, because the petitioner did not demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case and they do not show that:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the petitioner from using the property.

2. That granting the variance would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as other properties in the district.
3. The petitioner's plight is due to the unique circumstances of the property.
4. The problem is not self-created. It is caused by the lack of upkeep and maintenance and he has an issue with the character of the fence being partially vinyl and concrete.

**MOTION CARRIED 5-2 (Lindquist and Vergun opposed)**

B. ZBA CASE: 1-16-5585  
LOCATION: 33133 Hopecrest  
PARCEL I.D.: 23-22-351-007  
REQUEST: In order to build a 1,020 square foot detached garage 14.50 feet high in addition to an existing 506 square foot garage in an RA-1 zoning district, the following variances are required: (1) A 683 square foot variance to the maximum 1,250 foot allowable square foot for all combined floor area of accessory buildings and uses; (2) A 0.50 foot height variance to the 14 foot height limit for detached accessory structures.  
CODE SECTION: 34-5.1.2.C; 34-5.1.2.D  
APPLICANT: Leonard Keith Hannah  
OWNER: Linda E. Hannah

Utilizing overhead slides, Zoning Supervisor Randt described the location of the property, showed an overhead view of the property, along with a site plan and renderings of the proposed detached garage provided by the applicant. He noted that the applicant fulfills all setback requirements and has approval from the Homeowner's Association.

Leonard Keith Hannah, 33133 Hopecrest, read from the letter he submitted to the Board that he works for General Motors Racing and has worked in the auto industry for over 30 years and automobiles are part of his hobbies and interests and being a car enthusiast he owns a hobby vehicle that he has built which is located in a detached garage at his previous residence in Mt. Clemens. He moved to Farmington Hills in July 2014 after getting married and his home is located on an odd-shaped parcel of land on a cul-de-sac among 3 other homes.

Chair Seelye indicated that the Board had received Mr. Hannah's letter and asked if Mr. Hannah had anything different to add. Mr. Hannah responded he did not.

Chair Seelye commented that the proponent is asking to build another 4+ car garage and has an existing 2 car garage, therefore, there will be a 6-7 car garage area in a neighborhood where it will look out of place. Mr. Hannah indicated that where the proposed garage will be located you would hardly be able to tell it is there. He added that they have subdivision approval for an addition to the house so the square footage of the home will be increased. He stated that the equipment he has in Mt. Clemens will fill the proposed garage.

Chair Seelye commented that the proponent does have a unique circumstance to the property; however, he does not know how the Board can get over the criteria that this is not self-created.

Mr. Hannah stated that how the property is situated is not self-created and they cannot locate the proposed garage behind the existing garage or house because of the way it is laid out.

Chair Seelye stated that it does not matter where the garage is located it is still over the square footage allowed on the property and that is the issue.

Secretary Stevens noted that the applicant mentioned they had plans for an addition to the home and questioned the square footage of the addition. Mr. Hannah responded that it was approximately 300 square feet.

Secretary Stevens asked, in terms of the variance on the height, if there was an ability to come down ½ a foot. Paul Schiller, 27105 Hass, Signature Remodel, stated that the garage can be lowered, he will just have to create a new truss system but it can be done.

Member Lindquist commented that Mr. Hannah works for GM Racing and intends to bring vehicles to the proposed garage and asked if this was part of his job. Mr. Hannah responded no, he owns the vehicles and equipment and this is his hobby.

Linda Hannah, 33133 Hopecrest, stated that they did not bring any information on the proposed addition to the home but the square footage could be close to 400 square feet as they are building a master bedroom.

Member Lindquist asked why the proposed garage needs to be this size. Mr. Hannah responded that it was to accommodate all of his equipment along with a 28 foot trailer and he thought that the trailer sitting outside on the property would be an eye sore.

Member Lindquist asked Mr. Hannah if he intended to store equipment used to construct and work on vehicles as well as a trailer inside the proposed garage. Mr. Hannah responded that was correct although he is not constructing anything, just maintaining.

Member Lindquist asked where the equipment and trailer are being stored currently. Mr. Hannah responded that it is being stored in Mt. Clemens in a detached garage on his rental property, however, he plans on selling that home.

Member Masood commented that the proponent intends to expand the current footprint of the home but currently the home is 1,686 square feet and total structures, if the variance is approved, would be 1,526 square feet, therefore the 2 garages would be almost as large as the house and he has a concern with that. He stated that he would be happy to reconsider after the renovations to the home have been done because then the 50% of the home footprint will be closer to the totals of the garages.

Mr. Hannah commented that he was going to have the addition put on first but because of the timing of the rental property in Mt. Clemens being put for sale, they had to go this route first.

Member Rich asked if the garage will have a second level for storage or just one level and if there will be utilities. Mr. Hannah responded that there will be just the ground for storage and very minimal utilities to maintain his vehicle.

Member Rich asked what type of equipment would be used. Mr. Hannah responded that he has a drill press, cutoff saws, and welders.

Member Rich asked if the garage will be heated or if there will be plumbing. Mr. Hannah responded no, there will only be electric.

Secretary Stevens asked if the proponent looked at expanding the existing garage. Mrs. Hannah responded that they did look into that but the way the garage is situated and how you approach it from the driveway, if they extended the existing garage the driveway would be gone and on the north side, the family room is there so that would have to be demolished.

Chair Seelye opened the public portion of the meeting. There being no public comments, Chair Seelye closed the public portion of the meeting.

Secretary Stevens confirmed there was an affidavit of mailing on file with no returned mailers.

Member Rich stated that right now it appears that the area is obscured although you can see parts of Farmington Road and some of the neighboring property; however, he has concerns because trees come down and future neighbors may have an issue. He noted that he appreciates the applicants concern for addressing the issue of having a trailer on the property but given the fact that they are saying that the large garage would not be unsightly to the neighbors because it would be shielded, the neighbors would not be able to see the trailer either. He is concerned because there is an inconsistency.

Chair Seelye mentioned that he had the same viewpoint.

Mrs. Hannah commented that they thought it would be better for neighbors to see a garage rather than a trailer and either of them would only be seen by their immediate neighbors.

**MOTION** by Masood, support by Vergun, in the matter of ZBA Case 1-16-5585, to DENY the petitioner's request for a 683 square foot variance to the maximum 1,250 foot allowable square foot for all combined floor area of accessory buildings and uses and a 0.50 foot height variance to the 14 foot height limit for detached accessory structures, because the petitioner did not demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case in that he set forth facts which do not show that:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the petitioner from using the property. The property is a residence, not a vehicle or mechanical workshop.
2. That granting the variances requested would do substantial justice to the property owners or others in the district.
3. The petitioner's plight is due to the unique circumstances of the property. He has not seen anything that shows that there are unique circumstances to the property.
4. The problem is not self-created.

**MOTION CARRIED 5-2 (Barringer and Stevens opposed)**

C. ZBA CASE: 1-16-5586  
LOCATION: 21155/21177 Halsted

PARCEL I.D.: 23-31-428-014

REQUEST: In order for a 16 x 24 square foot shed to remain in its current location, a 27.4 foot variance to the required 50 foot rear yard setback for all accessory buildings from any RA district.

CODE SECTION: 34-4.4.3.

APPLICANT: Rick Seo for Saint Andrew Kim Korean Catholic Church

OWNER: Archdiocese of Detroit, Michigan

Utilizing overhead slides, Zoning Supervisor Randt described the location of the property, showed an overhead view of the property, photos of the shed, trailer and storage inside the church building, along with a site plan and drawings showing the location of the shed provided by the applicant.

Chair Seelye commented that the proponent needed a building permit to build this shed and asked if a permit was received. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that they did not receive a building permit.

Rick Seo, 21177 Halsted, representative for St. Andrew Kim Korean Catholic Church, explained that they need a setback variance approval for the shed as they were not aware that they needed one.

Chair Seelye indicated that two of the criteria needed for granting the variance are something unique about the property, and he is not seeing anything unique, and that the problem is not self-created, and in his opinion it looks totally self-created.

Mr. Seo explained that they did not mean to break any laws, he is the volunteer in charge of maintenance and the church has needed a shed for a long time. He looked at many locations on the property and there was not any location more appropriate for the shed, therefore, he proceeded to prepare for the shed. He noted that he does not know how to answer if the problem was self-created as he is not familiar with the terminology but given the circumstances he went through since he contracted this out, he believes that there was a miscommunication.

Chair Seelye asked why a building permit was not received.

Phil Vertese, 34425 Schoolcraft, Tuff Shed, explained that his company entered this location around October 19, 2015 and Mr. Seo, prior to contracting and using their company as a subcontractor to build the structure, had already poured a 6 inch concrete slab. He noted that they went to City Hall and after discussions with Bob Bliss and a clerk from the Building Department and showing them the site plan, they did not seem to think there was an issue, however, 10-12 days later he received a call from a gentleman who had looked at the zoning situation and informed him that there was a 50 foot setback requirement.

Mr. Vertese stated that at that point he contacted Mr. Seo and told him he would probably have to apply for a variance and he also went to his dispatch person and told them to pull the job and put it on hold until further notice. He stated that unbeknownst to him and Mr. Seo, someone from his company went ahead and put the building up and he did not find out until 14 days later, at which point he assumed that Mr. Seo had got the variance. He noted that it was not till December that they were red flagged.

Mr. Vertese explained that there was a miscommunication and they beg the indulgence of the City as they did not intentionally skirt the law and an application was made for the permit but Mr. Seo apparently did not understand that they needed to go further and get a variance and his company stepped all over by putting a building up without his knowledge.

Chair Seelye asked if an application for a permit was submitted to the Building Department. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that there was an application but it was not approved.

Member Rich questioned the location of the wall in relation to the shed. Mr. Vertese indicated that the wall was 10 feet high and approximately 22 feet from the shed.

Mr. Seo commented that the property line is 10 feet behind the wall.

Member Rich commented that the property is actually on the other side of the wall and asked who maintains that area of the property. Mr. Seo responded that the homeowner's maintain that area.

Mr. Vertese commented that there is a large span of evergreens along that area that blocks the view from the residents.

Mr. Seo indicated that he has spoken to the neighbors and they have submitted written support of the shed. He mentioned that 21250 East Farm Lane asked if the church could fill the sides along the shed with trees to screen the property and he has made that promise to the neighbor, and that the house on the right has asked for arborvitaes to be planted. He noted that so far there have been no concerns from the neighbors as he went door to door and spoke to all the neighbors. He stated that he understands that the church needs to fulfill the requirements and criteria but they need the shed so badly and he will try to amend anything that was done wrong as they never meant to mislead. He added that the trailer that is parked in the parking lot is very big and has been there for years and no one from the church was stepping up to try to do something about this issue so he did and he apologizes for doing something wrong.

Member Masood questioned the cost of the shed. Mr. Seo responded that it cost \$10,000.

Member Masood commented that if the church, a non-profit organization, was to remove the shed then their loss would be \$10,000.

Member Lindquist questioned if the Board was to not grant the variance could the church pour a new foundation and relocate the shed. Mr. Seo responded that the church is in the red and that is why he poured the foundation on his own and at his expense. The church had to replace the roof and main heating unit and is currently in really bad shape financially, so if they had to remove the shed he would tear it down himself.

Member Lindquist commented that the building does not have to be destroyed, it could be relocated or taken back by Tuff Shed or possibly sold, as it is a brand new shed.

Member Lindquist asked what the value would be of the shed if it had to be removed. Mr. Vertese responded that the value would be zero, they may be able to move it a short distance on the property but they have no use for it at their factory since it was a custom order for the church.

Member Lindquist asked if Mr. Seo was to pour a new foundation that was compliant with the ordinance, would Tuff Shed step up and move the shed. Mr. Vertese responded that he was not sure if that was possible as Tuff Shed does not have the means to move buildings, they build buildings.

Member Vergun noted that calling this a shed is not the best description of the structure, it seems like this structure is much more like a small home that would have to be demolished and probably could not be moved.

Mr. Vertese commented that was probably correct and he doubts that the building could be moved as it is secured directly to the cement slab.

Member Barringer asked if other locations for the shed were considered. Mr. Seo responded that this location was the most functional and he was not aware of the setback requirements.

Mr. Vertese commented that some of the items stored in this shed are sections of staging and seating for the school and church and if they were to relocate the shed, trying to move these items a long distance across the property would be difficult in inclement weather and would require the church to have some sort of vehicle to transport the items, rather than hand carry them.

Member Rich asked if the items stored in the trailer would be stored in the shed and the trailer removed from the parking lot. Mr. Seo responded that was the plan as the trailer has been an eye sore for the church and the neighbors.

Member Rich asked if there had been any complaints filed regarding the trailer. Zoning Supervisor Randt responded that there have not been any complaints but as a zoning standpoint, they would rather have an attractive storage shed than a trailer stored in the parking lot.

Secretary Stevens asked if Mr. Seo and the neighbors have agreed on the number of arborvitaes to be planted. Mr. Seo responded that they have not agreed on the number but he plans to discuss that with them this spring along with where they would like them located.

Member Masood asked how many arborvitaes it would take to screen the shed. Mr. Seo responded for 21250 East Farm Lane it would take about 5 and about 5 on the other side. He noted that he plans to plant them between the wall next to the shed on the church property and some on the other side.

Chair Seelye opened the public portion of the meeting. There being no public comments, Chair Seelye closed the public portion of the meeting.

Secretary Stevens confirmed there was an affidavit of mailing on file with 4 returned mailers.

Member Lindquist mentioned that the Board received letters from several of the East Farm Lane neighbors stating that they have no issue with the location of shed. He stated that he is inclined to believe the proponent has discussed the shed and potential screening with the other neighbors who did not submit a letter and he believes that Mr. Seo will work in good faith to provide appropriate screening to prevent view of the shed from the adjacent homeowners.

Member Masood commented that in his view the problem is not self-created and he does not think this was intentional or malicious on the proponents side, that it was really just a mix up with the builder and the church.

**MOTION** by Stevens, support by Lindquist, in the matter of ZBA Case 1-16-5586, to GRANT the petitioner's request for a 27.4 foot variance to the required 50 foot rear yard setback for all accessory buildings from any RA district, because the petitioner did demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case.

- The building has exceeded in terms of its storage and there is a temporary trailer in the parking lot being utilized for storage.

- The shed is positioned in a location that it is behind a solid 6 foot existing wall and there is a lot of existing screening.
- The shed is in a functional place for the building and as there may be other locations on the site that may be in compliance, they would be less screened from the adjacent property owners.

**SUBJECT** to the following conditions:

- Removal of the temporary trailer being used for storage
- Planting of ten 8 foot tall Arborvitae's, five along the west side of the shed and five along the west side of the wall, to provide proper screening
- Plantings be completed no later than June 1, 2016
- The materials of the existing shed and location be as shown in the photos and as presented

**MOTION CARRIED 6-1 (Rich opposed)**

Chair Seelye indicated that there would not be a meeting in February 2016.

Attorney Morita noted that due to the March meeting being move to the third Tuesday of the month, she would not be available as she has a prior commitment.

**APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 8, 2015 MINUTES**

**MOTION** by Rich, support by Stevens, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting minutes of December 8, 2015 as submitted.

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0 (Masood abstained)**

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** by Rich, support by Stevens, to adjourn the meeting at 8:56p.m.

**MOTION CARRIED 7-0**

Respectfully submitted,

James Stevens, Secretary  
Zoning Board of Appeals

/ceh