

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS  
CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBER  
JUNE 14, 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 (arrived 7:33pm), Masood, Rich, Seelye, Stevens and Vergun

Members Absent: None

Others Present: Attorney Morita and Zoning Division Representative McGuire

**SITE VISIT JUNE 12, 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 Barringer, support by Vergun, to approve the agenda as published.

**MOTION CARRIED 6-0 (Lindquist arrived 7:33pm).**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

- A. ZBA CASE: 6-16-5588
- LOCATION: 29224 Independence
- PARCEL I.D.: 23-36-157-009
- REQUEST: A variance from the restriction of storage of recreational equipment or trailers over 6 feet in height in an RA-4 Zoning District to be located in the rear yard only, in order to store a recreational vehicle exceeding 6 feet in height in an exterior side yard or front yard.
- CODE SECTION: 34-5.7
- APPLICANT/OWNER: Joseph L. Harrison

Utilizing overhead slides, Zoning Representative McGuire described the location of the property, showed an overhead view of the property, schematic of the property indicating the proposed trailer storage area and photos of the property and trailer. She noted that on the application the applicant asked for a front yard variance on Independence, however the front yard of this home is on Wheeler, not Independence and regardless where the front yard is located the zoning ordinance prohibits having an RV in an exterior side yard or front yard and the setbacks are the same. She indicated on the schematic provided by the applicant where the RV could legally be placed on the property.

Joe Harrison, 29224 Independence, explained that he really does not have a backyard and he would prefer to keep the RV on his property. He stated that 15-20 of his neighbors have signed a letter in support of having the vehicle on his property.

Chair Seelye stated that two of the requirements for granting a variance are if there is a unique circumstance of the property and that the problem is not self-created and he asked the applicant to address those items. Mr. Harrison responded that he just wants to keep the RV on his property rather than store it somewhere where it could be damaged and he cannot keep it in the backyard because of his dogs.

Member Lindquist asked if the applicant has given consideration to putting it in the farthest rear corner of his yard, which is a permitted location. Mr. Harrison responded yes, but it is fenced off and there is a shed there so it would be a tremendous amount of work to get the RV back there.

Member Lindquist explained that the Board's primary consideration is the zoning regulation, so if there is a suitable location on the property where the vehicle can be stored, they have to take that into consideration.

Member Barringer noted that where the rear yard starts directly behind the house, the southeast corner of the home, the applicant could turn the trailer 90 degrees and park it between the shed and the back of the house and be compliant with the ordinance.

Member Masood questioned the dimensions of the trailer. Mr. Harrison responded that it was 33.4 feet long and 10 feet high.

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 1 returned mailer.

**MOTION** by Rich, support by Barringer, in the matter of ZBA Case 6-16-5588, to DENY the petitioner's request for a variance from the restriction of storage of recreational equipment or trailers over 6 feet in height in an RA-4 Zoning District to be located in the rear yard only, in order to store a recreational vehicle exceeding 6 feet in height in an exterior side yard or front yard; because the petitioner did not demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case; specifically the petitioner's plight is not due to the unique circumstances of the property, while the property has a small backyard and it may be inconvenient certainly there is a location where the vehicle could be parked on the premises. The problem is self-created, given the fact that the owner of the property chose to purchase a property with an exterior side yard and purchase the trailer and the RV, the problem has to be considered self-created.

**MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

- B. ZBA CASE: 6-16-5590
- LOCATION: 29490 Grayfield
- PARCEL I.D.: 23-26-430-015
- REQUEST: In order to erect a 6-foot fence in an exterior side yard in an RA-4 zoning district, a 25 foot variance is requested from the requirement that fences over 3 feet tall are not permitted within a required 25-foot exterior side yard setback.
- CODE SECTION: 34-5.12

APPLICANT/OWNER: Charles F. and Karen L. Collins

Utilizing overhead slides, Zoning Representative McGuire described the location of the property, showed an overhead view of the property, a drawing of where the fence is located and photos of the property and fence. She noted that the applicant submitted an application for a fence permit and that permit was denied.

Chuck Collins, 29490 Grayfield, explained that they are requesting a variance for their fence and he had no idea they were not in compliance as the house has been in his wife's family since it was built, 50 plus years ago, a fence has been there forever. He noted that when they purchased the home from his wife's mother there was a chain-link fence in the same location as this new fence. He stated that when they put a pool in the yard they wanted to make sure it was safe so they choose to change the chain-link fence to a 6 foot stockade fence and at that time the City said they needed letters from the neighbors, which they submitted, and now the City cannot find those letters. He stated that they have only ever replaced one fence with another in the same exact location and this time they put up a vinyl fence so they will never have to worry about maintenance. He explained that they have invested a lot of money in this house over the years and all they try to do is make it attractive to look nice in the neighborhood and they have spent many hours working on the gardens and landscaping along the fence lines. He noted that no one has ever said anything about the fence not being in compliance for all these years so they just kept replacing it and in order to comply, they would have to destroy the pool and everything they have worked so hard on and they would consider that tragedy.

Zoning Representative McGuire informed the applicant that the pool would not have to be destroyed because an above ground pool is its own fence and the City would not make the applicant take it down.

Mr. Collins stated that he is not comfortable with that as he wants children to be safe. He explained that they have many grandchildren and now great grandchildren and there are a lot of kids in the neighborhood and the last thing he ever wants to have to live with is a child drowning in his pool.

Chair Seelye questioned if the vinyl fence was the same height as the one they replaced. Mr. Collins responded that it was and what he does not understand is when they put the 6 foot stockade fence up years ago all the City asked for were letters from the neighbors, which they gave them, and now the City cannot find those letters, but he does not believe that is their fault.

Member Lindquist asked when the stockade fence installed, the fence most recent to the current fence.

Karen Collins, 29490 Grayfield, explained that pool is 20 years old and the fencing went up at the same time and they had to get permission from the neighbors since they went from chain-link to the 6 foot stockade for privacy.

Member Lindquist asked how tall the chain-link fence was and when it was installed. Mrs. Collins responded that it was installed at least 53 years ago and it was a normal size fence.

Member Lindquist questioned that if the applicants were required by the City to get letters from the neighbors stating if they were in support of the replacement of the chain-link fence with the stockade fence 20 years ago, did this case ever come before the Board. Zoning Representative McGuire responded no.

Chair Seelye asked if it was ever a requirement for homeowners to get letters from all the neighbors to put up a fence. Zoning Representative McGuire responded that she was not here at that time and she cannot address that.

Attorney Morita stated that staff has looked for the letters and also the application which they do not have so they do not know what was requested, what the letters stated. She noted that they did not come before the Board for a variance, which they would have needed for a 6 foot fence at that time, therefore, without the request and letters, they do not know what was approved or not approved but they do know that they do not have a variance.

Attorney Morita reminded the Board to keep in mind that even if they were to consider the last fence to be legally non-conforming, the entire fence was removed so a variance is needed in order to replace it. She stated that something else the Board should consider when looking at this case is that a portion of the fence is in the right-of-way and this Board cannot authorize placement of a fence in the right-of-way, therefore, if the Board is considering granting the variance, there are conditions that her office would like to be noted to address the right-of-way issue.

Chair Seelye asked if there was any record of a case at this residence 20 years ago. Zoning Representative McGuire responded that there was not and she asked the applicants as well and they stated that they have not come before the Board.

Member Rich asked if there is a permitting process required for the construction of fences. Zoning Representative McGuire responded that the fence permit is part of the Board's packet.

Attorney Morita stated she finds it difficult to believe that City staff approved the placement of a fence in the right-of-way.

Member Rich asked if there was any indication that the right-of-way has changed. Attorney Morita responded no.

Mr. Collins stated that had they known they were doing something wrong they may have changed their mind but for 20 plus years there has been a 6 foot fence around their yard.

Member Vergun stated that in regards to the right-of-way, they may have different opinions as to the amount in the right-of-way the fence is in as it could be anywhere from 3 feet to 7 feet, but in any event it is more than zero. He asked if the fence would still be useful to the applicant if it was moved out of the right-of-way. Mr. Collins responded that they would end up destroying their landscaping which they invested a huge amount of time and money on and he does not feel they are encroaching on the right-of-way, they are at their property line as it has been their understanding for 50 years that their fence is on the property line.

Mrs. Collins stated that the area in question is their backyard not the side yard and she does not understand why there was not an issue before with the wooden fence.

Member Masood asked if it was a 3 foot fence, would a variance still be required. Zoning Representative McGuire responded that for what the Board has authority to grant, a variance would not be required but a 3 foot fence also could not be in the right-of-way.

Member Masood asked if the Board were to grant the variance there would still be an issue of the right-of-way. Attorney Morita responded that was correct, and the way the Board can handle that is by conditioning any granting on the following: if the fence is in the right-of-way the property owner must get permission from the Department of Public Services to allow the fence to remain there and the granting of the variance should not be considered permission from the Board or the City to place a fence in the right-of-way.

Attorney Morita explained that there is a dispute between the City and the property owners as to where the property line is and where the right-of-way line is and the City based on GIS mapping, indicated on a map, which is included in the packet, where the property line is and the City's surveyors have confirmed that location to be pretty accurate.

Member Masood explained that his issue is that even if they were to grant the variance, the fence is still in the right-of-way.

Discussion was held regarding adjourning the case until the right-of-way issue is addressed and the discrepancy between the City and the property owners on the location of the property line is resolved.

Mr. Collins submitted a photo to the Board which shows the fence in place many years ago and asked why this is an issue now.

Member Stevens commented that it is not the Board's purview of what goes within the right-of-way or not so it should be a moot issue and that is why the Attorney is recommending that whether or not to allow a fence in the right-of-way is a process through Public Services and has nothing to do with this body granting a variance request from a setback to a property line.

Attorney Morita explained that Member Stevens is accurate, it is not up to this Board to decide whether it is in the right-of-way or not, it is up to the Department of Public Services, so if the Board is inclined to grant the variance requested to the property line, knowing there is a dispute over the property line, then it is up to the applicant to work that out with the City based on the conditions proposed.

Member Stevens asked if the Board were to grant a variance to allow a zero setback, is there a way to have an agreement with the applicant that states if the City needs to do something within the right-of-way and the fence needs to be torn down or is damaged, it is the sole responsibility of the property owner and not of the City. Attorney Morita responded yes, the Board can condition the variance on entering into an agreement, approved by the City Attorney's office, that provides should the applicant be permitted to place a fence at the lot line and should the City need to remove the fence or damaged the fence in anyway whatsoever for any purpose, that the cost to repair or replace would be the sole responsibility of the property owner.

Member Lindquist asked, if the opinion from the Engineering Division is accurate and the current fence is 7 feet into the right-of-way and the fence has to come towards the house away from the street 7 feet, would the applicants plan change, would they keep the same fence around the remainder of the property or would they abandon the fence entirely. Mr. Collins responded that they would be very upset if the fence had to be moved or removed.

Mrs. Collins stated that if the fence has to be moved back 7 feet then the spruces that line Tulane will have to be moved back as well and their whole landscaping and backyard would have to be redone.

Chair Seelye opened the public portion of the meeting.

Mike Collins, 22061 Tredwell, commented that the applicant has done a wonderful job with the house, the landscaping and the fence and in his mind what they are doing improves the property value including the tax base that supports this City and he understands that there are rules which we need to abide by but there also needs to be some logical flexibility.

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

Secretary Stevens confirmed there was an affidavit of mailing on file with 1 returned mailer.

Member Stevens asked if there were any other issues relative to the fence in its location over the last 40 years. Zoning Representative McGuire responded that she is not aware of any issues.

**MOTION** by Stevens, support by Masood, in the matter of ZBA Case 6-16-5590, to GRANT the petitioner's request for a 25 foot variance from the requirement that fences over 3 feet tall are not permitted within a required 25-foot exterior side yard setback; because the petitioner did demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case in the fact that:

- The fence has existed, based upon testimony and some records, for almost 50 years in some fashion, whether it be chain-link or wood fencing.
- The layout of the yard and other features within the yard have all been based upon the layout that has existed for a long period of time.
- There have not been any documented issues relative to the fence in its current location.
- That granting the variance does do substantial justice, in the fact that it has been in existence for a long period without issue.
- The plight is due to the circumstances that the layout of the property is such that it has taken into account the fence in that location.

**SUBJECT** to the following conditions:

- The applicant will need to get approval through the proper process within the City for any issues relative to the right-of-way, specifically permission through the Department of Public Services for the placement of the fence in its current location
- The granting of the variance is for a zero setback and should not be considered permission by the City or the Zoning Board of Appeals to locate a fence in the right-of-way
- An agreement between the City and the property owner with language acceptable to the City Attorney that allows for the City to do work within the right-of-way and that if the fence, because it is located at a zero setback, were damaged or if it needs to be removed the replacement would be at the property owner's expense. The agreement shall be acceptable in the City Attorney's sole discretion as to what is required in order to hold the City harmless in the event of any damage or

destruction for any reason whatsoever. Exact language to be worked out within City Administration and the City Attorney.

- The variance is based upon the north/south dimensions indicated in the diagram information.
- The location of the fence must be reviewed and approved by the Traffic Engineer.

Member Vergun stated that due to the extenuating circumstances with the dispute on the right-of-way line and the fact that their decision on this case may be rendered moot, he thinks the decision should be to vote no and he plans to vote no on the motion.

Member Lindquist asked where the fence facing Tulane will sit at a zero setback.

Member Stevens explained that his motion is for a zero setback from the property line so that would put it where the property line is determined, if they get permission to put it within the right-of-way by Public Services then in theory they could leave the fence where it is at.

Member Lindquist questioned if the current fence is considered to be in the right-of-way of Tulane. Attorney Morita responded that was correct, but this Board cannot grant a variance to locate anything within the right-of-way, the most that can be granted is a zero setback and if the applicant wants anything more than that they need to speak with Public Services. She stated that because there is a dispute over where the right-of-way line is and where the property line is, she wanted the record to be clear that the granting of the variance should not be considered permission by the City or the Board to place the fence in the right-of-way.

Member Lindquist commented that the location of the allowed variance for now will be at the property line, according to the diagram presented, which is not the current footprint of the fence along Tulane but that may not be clear to the applicant.

Attorney Morita stated the variance is for a zero setback and there is a dispute over where that line is and that is the problem; the applicant says it is farther west and the City says it is farther east, the applicant believes that where their fence is located is the property line and the City disagrees, therefore, the most that can be granted is a zero setback which is why the case was written the way it was, it gives them to their property line, wherever that may be, but they still have to work with Public Services to determine where that line is and figure out if the fence can stay there. She stated that they have to figure out where the correct property line is, whether it is where the fence is or they have to reach an agreement to allow the fence to stay in the right-of-way with Public Services.

Member Lindquist stated that while the right-of-way continues to be in question, if the Board were to support the motion and the variance is granted, the last part of the fence they will be able to construct will be the Tulane Avenue facing piece and they will not be able to do that until there is a determination of where the property line is and or an agreement with the City to allow it to be in the right-of-way.

Attorney Morita commented that the applicant will have to do a few things, talk to Department of Public Services before they finish the fence and if the fence is in the right-of-way, Public Services will need to determine whether or not to allow it to stay there, if they say no the applicant will have to move the fence, if the fence is moved to the lot line, before they can finish the fence, they have to enter into an agreement with the City holding the City harmless.

Member Rich commented that in the packet there was a letter discussing the issues of visibility from the neighbor and asked if the Department of Public Services independently evaluated that for potential danger and safety. Attorney Morita responded yes, it would go to the Traffic Engineer which is part of Public Services and at a zero setback that may be something that the Board would want reviewed.

Member Lindquist commented that he intends to vote against the motion, not because he is not supportive of the solution, merely because he feels it is more prudent to adjourn this matter for a month to allow for additional information to be gathered so that the proponent has a complete solution rather than an incomplete solution, which is what they will have now until the time the City is able to make a determination.

Member Rich asked if the maker of the motion be willing to add a provision that wherever the fence ultimately is, it has to be approved by the Traffic Engineer.

Roll Call Vote:

Yeas: Masood, Rich and Stevens  
Nays: Barringer, Lindquist, Seelye and Vergun  
Absent: None  
Abstentions: None

**MOTION FAILED 3-4.**

Chair Seelye suggested that the applicant have a survey done and find out where the right-of-way is and return to the Zoning Department.

C. ZBA CASE: 6-16-5591  
LOCATION: 22061 Tredwell  
PARCEL I.D.: 23-36-204-026  
REQUEST: In order to retain a shed in the side yard in an RA-4 zoning district, 2 variances are requested: (1) A 10-foot variance from the requirement that a detached accessory structure cannot be located within ten feet of a main building. (2) A variance from the requirement that a detached accessory structure may not be placed in the 5-foot required side yard setback.  
CODE SECTION: 34-5.1  
APPLICANT/OWNER: Michael Collins

Utilizing overhead slides, Zoning Representative McGuire described the location of the property, showed an overhead view of the property, a survey of the property indicating the location of the shed and photos of shed. She noted the dimensions of the shed and that there is a 10 foot required distance from the shed to the main structure.

Chair Seelye asked how the case came to the Zoning Department. Zoning Representative McGuire responded that it came in as a complaint.

Mike Collins, 22061 Tredwell Avenue, explained that he believes the complaint came from the zoning inspector and not a neighbor as the shed has been in this location for about 9 years and when it was put in, the neighbors, who still reside there, were asked whether it was an issue or not and they responded that they would rather have the shed in place than what was there before. He stated that there is landscaping that blocks the shed, it is the same color as the house so it blends in and the neighbors still do not have an

issue with it and he has several emails from neighbors stating that it does not bother them. He explained that he needs the variance as his backyard is very small, only 60 feet wide, and across the back of the yard there is a 6 foot easement due to the power lines that cross the rear of his home, therefore he cannot put the shed in the back of the yard and landscaping runs along both side so he truly has no other location to put the shed where it would not be an eye sore. He stated that the property has a single car garage and he can barely fit his vehicle in it so he keeps gas power items, like the lawnmower, weed whacker and power washer outside the garage so it is safe in the shed. He believes it is burdensome because there is not another location in the backyard, it will do justice to himself and to other property owners as it is a safety issue and will keep flammable liquids out of the garage and the plight is that he does not have a place to safely put it in a nonvisible location.

Chair Seelye asked if the neighbor's driveway was on the property line. Mr. Collins responded that he believes it is very close if not on the property line.

Zoning Representative McGuire stated that the City believes it is about 2 feet from the property line.

Chair Seelye commented that his concern is that the applicant has to walk on the neighbor's property to get to the shed, even though the neighbor does not have a problem with it now, a new neighbor may move in and have a problem.

Pamela Collins, 22061 Tredwell Avenue, explained that their property fence post is where their property line is so the shed is in fact on their property and they maintain that area.

Mr. Collins stated that there is about 2 feet out from the shed that is still their property.

Member Barringer asked if there was electricity in the shed. Mr. Collins responded that there is an extension cord ran out to it to charge his weed whacker and there is a light in there.

Member Lindquist questioned why the shed cannot be in the rear yard. Mr. Collins responded that it is because there is a 6 foot setback and the shed would have to sit in the middle of the yard and the yard is not very big and the other areas along the fence line are landscaped.

Member Lindquist commented that other than the 6 foot setback there is not anything preventing the shed to be located in the rear yard.

Mr. Collins stated that it would be an eye sore in the backyard and the landscaping covers it up where it is located.

Member Lindquist commented that the reason for having shed in the rear yard is because they are not visible from the street, the front side yard is visible from the street.

Zoning Representative McGuire informed the applicant that there was a complaint on the shed from the neighbor, not just the zoning inspector.

Mr. Collins stated that he was unaware that it was a complaint based situation; he thought the City just inspected and found a violation. He noted that five years ago an inspector came out and asked his neighbor if she had an issue with the shed and she stated she did not.

Zoning Representative McGuire noted that part of the reason that the placement of shed is away from the main accessory structures is because when there is wiring it then becomes the main structure.

Member Lindquist commented that is the reason for an outbuilding being an outbuilding and required to be 10 feet away from the residential structure and putting the shed in the rear yard accomplishes that as long as it is not against the back of the house.

Mr. Collins stated that it is 5 feet out from the house and 5 feet in from the fence.

Mrs. Collins commented that she spoke to the Homeowners Association and they do not have a problem with the shed being on the side and because the lots are so narrow there has been variances to put sheds on the side.

Chair Seelye opened the public portion of the meeting.

Bill Smith, 22015 Tredwell, noted that he is on the Board of Directors of the Homeowners Association and explained that the shed compliments the house and the photos presented do not do it any justice, it makes it look obtrusive. He stated that he hardly noticed the shed because it blends in so well with the landscape and looks like part of the house and he has not heard any neighbors or board members ever make any negative comment on the shed. He stated that this issue had never been brought before the board in a negative way and he is very puzzled with all the attention brought to this as the shed is not obtrusive or offensive. He noted that he supports the applicant.

Member Lindquist asked if Mr. Smith was speaking on behalf of the Homeowners Association. Mr. Smith responded that he cannot say officially but he could get approval from the board.

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

Secretary Stevens confirmed there was an affidavit of mailing on file with 1 returned mailer.

Member Rich questioned how far from the fence does the landscaping extend. Mr. Collins responded between 5 and 6 feet, the house is a 1959 vintage house so a lot of the landscaping along the back has been planted since day one so it is fairly significant.

Member Lindquist asked if Mr. Taipala was the neighbor adjacent to the shed. Zoning Representative McGuire responded yes.

Member Lindquist noted that Mr. Taipala's letter states that he would retain the right to have the structure moved in the event of his moving out of the residence and there is no practical way to take that consideration into account. He noted that Mr. Taipala is attempting to reserve the right to have the shed removed on his own determination which he cannot see as being supportive of the shed staying there, it sounds as though he is just tolerant.

**MOTION** by Lindquist, support by Barringer, in the matter of ZBA Case 6-16-5591, to DENY the petitioner's request for a 10-foot variance from the requirement that a detached accessory structure cannot be located within ten feet of a main building and a variance from the requirement that a detached accessory structure may not be placed in the 5-foot required side yard setback; because the petitioner did not demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case by setting forth facts showing that:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the petitioner from using the property.
2. Granting the variance requested would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as other property owners in the district.
3. The petitioner's plight is due to any unique circumstances of the property.
4. The problem is not-self created.

Member Lindquist noted that the proponent needs to establish all four of these criteria and he is having trouble addressing any of them. He believes the location of the shed could be moved to the rear yard and be in compliance with the ordinance.

Member Rich commented that when looking at the size of the shed it is about 8 feet by 5 feet and the Board has determined that the setback is 5 feet, so putting the shed against the vegetation in the back would comply with the ordinance and if the vegetation is 5 feet plus another 5 feet for the shed and the total distance in the backyard is 60 feet that would leave 50 feet of the backyard and only for a distance of 8 feet total, so to him it does not seem like the shed would have to go in the middle of the backyard.

Member Stevens noted that he cannot grant a variance that would, in essence, require that someone uses someone else's property to access and utilize it.

Member Barringer added that there are other options in the backyard to locate the shed and he has a concern with safety as there is a reason why outbuildings are required to be 10 feet from a structure.

Member Vergun commented that he would be open to almost any location of the shed in the rear yard and he agrees with the other Boards member's comments.

**MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

**APPROVAL OF MARCH 15, 2016 MINUTES**

**MOTION** by Stevens, support by Rich, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting minutes of March 15, 2016 as submitted.

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

**PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

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

**MOTION CARRIED 7-0.**

Respectfully submitted,

James Stevens, Secretary  
Zoning Board of Appeals

/ceh