

CITY OF PORTAGE ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

Minutes of Meeting – April 11, 2016

The City of Portage Zoning Board of Appeals meeting was called to order by Jeffrey Bright at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Approximately sixty people were in the audience.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Byrnes, Phillip Schaefer, Michael Robbe, Jeffrey Bright, Chadwick Learned, Lowell Seyburn, Randall Schau, Jay Eichstaedt, and Alexander Philipp.

IN ATTENDANCE: Jeff Mais, Zoning & Codes Administrator, and Charlie Bear, Assistant City Attorney.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES: Learned moved and Schau seconded a motion to approve the March 28, 2016 minutes with corrections recommended by staff. Upon voice vote, the motion was approved 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

ZBA #15-11, Christine Pelletier, 4415 Raborn Court: Bright noted the applicant submitted a request to postpone the item until the May 9, 2016 meeting. Mais stated the applicant reportedly encountered difficulties getting structural engineers to evaluate the barn's foundation and lumber.

A motion was made by Schaeffer, seconded by Seyburn to postpone the item until the May 9, 2016 meeting. Upon voice vote, motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-17, Bickford Cottage Assisted Living and Memory Care, 4707 West Milham Avenue: Bright inquired of staff if there were any updates since the item got tabled at the March 28, 2016 meeting. Mais reported the property owner of 4707 West Milham Avenue (Richard Eby) and 4721 West Milham (Michael Busche) had come to an agreement whereby some additional landscaping would be provided by the applicant, and Mr. Busche was now in support of the variance. Learned inquired if the support was due to the supplemental landscaping. Mr. Busche responded yes.

A public hearing was opened. No one spoke for or against the request and the public hearing was then closed.

A motion was made by Learned, seconded by Schau to approve a variance to retain an approximate 8,400 square-foot building addition along the west side of the existing Bickford Cottage facility to within 10-feet of the west property line where a 30-foot setback is required conditioned upon the applicant completing the supplemental landscaping as shown in plans included in the supplemental agenda, for the following reasons: there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district which include the significant grade differences along the southern portion of the site and the surrounding zoning/land use pattern; the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district in the vicinity; the right to develop a property with setbacks similar to other uses in the district; the immediate practical difficulty causing the need for the variance request was not created by the applicant; and the variance would not materially impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance. In addition, the application and supporting material, staff report, and all comments, discussion and materials presented at this hearing be incorporated in the record of this hearing and the findings of the Board, and action of the Board be final and effective immediately. Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-15; Ol' Moose BBQ, 7540 South Westnedge Avenue: Mais summarized the request for a Temporary Use Permit to operate a mobile food truck at 7540 South Westnedge Avenue from April 12 – June 5, 2016 and July 7 – October 12, 2016. Bright inquired if the applicant had anything to add. Chris Slocum responded no, except he wondered if it was possible to get a Temporary Use Permit for next year as well. Bright inquired if the Board could do that. Mais stated the Board can grant Temporary Uses for 12 month periods with up to one additional 12 month extension, and the Board could if they wanted approve the Temporary Use permit for the same date range in 2017 subject to city staff review. Seyburn inquired if portable bathrooms would be provided. Mais responded none were proposed. Learned inquired if food trucks

were subject to health inspections like brick and mortar restaurants. Mr. Slocum stated yes. Schau inquired why a Temporary Use permit was needed. Mais stated Temporary use permits are needed for uses not otherwise permitted in the district, and that food trucks were not permitted to operate in the same location for six months at a time.

A public hearing was opened. No one spoke for or against the request and the public hearing was then closed.

A motion was made by Learned, seconded by Robbe, to approve a Temporary Use Permit to operate a mobile food truck at 7540 South Westnedge Avenue from April 12 – June 5, 2016 and July 7 – October 12, 2016 subject to the following conditions: 1) The operation of the Ol' Moose BBQ be limited to April 12 – June 5, 2016 and July 7 – October 12, 2016 and for the same date ranges in 2017 subject to city staff review; 2) the food trailer be licensed by the Kalamazoo County Department of Health and Community Services; 3) food trailer tables and off-street parking set-up be consistent with the submitted site sketch; 4) hours of operation be limited to 11:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Monday through Sunday; 5) the site be kept free from trash and refuse; 7) temporary signage be limited to one sign not exceeding 40 square feet; and 8) there be no sound amplifying equipment with the exception of a portable generator which must meet the requirements of Chapter 24, Article 4 (Noise). Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-16, Meyer Wood Products, 7518 South Westnedge Avenue: Mais summarized the request for a Temporary Use Permit to allow outdoor wood product and accessory building sales from April 29 – October 29, 2016 and April 29 – October 29, 2017. Roy Meyer was present to answer questions. Bright stated he thought it was better the property be used to sell wood products than let it sit vacant while the property was for sale. Seyburn inquired if there had been any problems connected with operation of the Temporary Use during the last two years. Mais stated no.

A public hearing was opened. No one spoke for or against the request and the public hearing was then closed.

A motion was made by Seyburn, seconded by Learned to grant a Temporary Use Permit to allow outdoor wood product and accessory building sales from April 29 – October 29, 2016 and April 29 – October 29, 2017 with the following conditions: 1) placement of all inventory meet minimum B-3 district setback (30-foot front, 10-foot side, 20-foot rear) 2) that the permit be subject to administrative review and approval in 2017, and 3) the site must be regularly monitored and maintained by the applicant. Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-19, Lynn Van Pelt, 4580 Caribou Street: Mais summarized the request to construct a 12-foot by 14-foot three season porch 28 feet from the south (rear) property line where a minimum 40-foot setback is required. Lynn Van Pelt admitted she did not consider construction of a three season porch when the house was originally constructed but when the idea arose recently, she did not think it would be an issue as there were other houses in the neighborhood that had three season rear porches. Schau inquired if the applicant had considered conforming alternatives. Ms. Van Pelt stated she had, but putting the porch on the north side of the house was undesirable as it would get no sun, and a retractable awning in the rear yard would not protect lawn furniture very well. Robbe noted the Board has fairly consistently denied variance requests for accessory buildings simply because applicants wanted to build them and had run out of space to do so. Learned stated he struggled with how to get around this not being a self-created hardship, as there appeared to be adequate space on the lot to accommodate a three season porch if they had pursued a different house design in 2007 when it was originally constructed. Ms. Van Pelt stated the hardship was being on a corner lot, and that was not her fault. Ms. Van Pelt stated they also had mature vegetation along their south property line which should help minimize impacts on the neighbors to the south. Seyburn stated with regard to conforming original designs, garages are not usually placed behind the dwelling on corner lots, and that the larger dimensions required of corner lots place an additional burden on their owners.

A public hearing was opened. No one spoke for or against the request and the public hearing was then closed.

Seyburn stated he was sympathetic to people with corner lots, and thought placing a garage in the rear yard so as to leave adequate space for a three season porch, while perhaps conforming, would impact the neighbors more than the proposed three season porch. Learned stated he was concerned with creating an undesirable precedent, as buyers should know the drawbacks associated with corner lots when they purchase them. Robbe stated the house was functional without a three season porch and noted they had conforming alternatives. A motion was made by Seyburn, seconded by Bright to grant a variance to construct a 12-foot by 14-foot three season porch 28 feet from the south (rear) property line where a minimum 40-foot setback is required for the following reasons: there are exceptional circumstances which include that the property is a corner lot and the only reasonable place to located a screened in porch is on the south side of the dwelling; the variance is necessary for the preservation of a substantial property right, the right to develop the property in manner similar to other properties in the vicinity; the immediate practical difficulty causing the need for the variance was not created by the applicant; the variance will not be detrimental to adjacent property and the surrounding neighborhood; and the variance will not materially impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance. Upon roll call vote: Philipp-No, Learned-No, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-No, Schau-No, Schaefer-Yes. The motion failed 3-4.

ZBA #15-20, Matt Nieuwenhuis, 3221 West Milham Avenue: Mais summarized the request to reconstruct a historic accessory building that is: a) 27.5 feet in height where a maximum 14-foot building height is permitted; b) is 2,600 square feet in area and exceeds the ground floor living area by 1,456 square feet; and c) exceeds 20 percent of the required rear yard by 600 square feet. Mr. Nieuwenhuis stated the barn design had already been approved by the Historic District Commission (HDC) and that the large structure was needed to store cars, contractor equipment, tools, and scaffolding. Robbe inquired how long the applicant had owned the property and noted it was currently in disrepair. Mr. Nieuwenhuis responded he has owned it for 13 years and the barn was already in disrepair when he purchased the property. Learned inquired if the applicant thought 60 days was a reasonable time to deconstruct the barn. The applicant stated 120 days was more realistic. Seyburn noted storage of contractor's equipment is not permitted in residential accessory buildings. The Board discussed various sizes of barns that might be functional and still maintain consistency with the HDC's approval. Learned stated he thought the barn should be reconstructed to conforming dimensions. Schau inquired what the smallest barn the applicant could get by with. Mr. Nieuwenhuis stated 24-foot by 50-foot (1,200 square feet). Schau inquired how tall would that make the barn (from grade to mid-roof). Mr. Nieuwenhuis stated 18 feet.

A public hearing was opened. A letter of opposition from Ellen Holt, 3310 West Milham Avenue was read. There being no further comment, the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Schau, seconded by Robbe, to grant a variance to reconstruct a historic accessory building that is a) up to 1,200 square feet in area, which will accommodate a 24-foot by 50-foot building, and b) up to 18 feet in height where a maximum 14-foot building height is permitted, conditioned upon completing deconstruction of the barn within 120 days, for the following reasons: there are exceptional circumstances which include the size being the minimum necessary to address the lack of accessory storage space, the historic character and size of the existing barn; the variance is necessary for the preservation of a substantial property right, the right replace the historic barn that will be dismantled; the immediate practical difficulty causing the need for the variance was not created by the applicant; the variance will not be detrimental to adjacent property and the surrounding neighborhood; and the variance will not materially impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance. In addition, the application and supporting material, staff report, and all comments, discussion and materials presented at this hearing be incorporated in the record of this hearing and the findings of the Board, and action of the Board be final and effective immediately Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-22, Jimmie's BBQ, 5331 South Sprinkle Road: Mais summarized the request for a Temporary Use Permit to operate an outdoor barbecue grill at 5331 South Sprinkle Road from April 25 – October 25, 2016.

Jimmie Harvey was present to answer questions. Bright inquired if Perry Harley Davidson was okay with his customers using their bathroom. Mr. Harvey stated yes. Robbe inquired if the area where the proposed Temporary Use would be setting up would be using required parking spaces for Perry Harley Davidson. Mais stated no, surplus parking was available even with the Temporary Use in place.

A public hearing was opened. No one spoke for or against the request and the public hearing was then closed.

A motion was made by Schau, seconded by Robbe, to grant a Temporary Use Permit to operate an outdoor barbecue grill at 5331 South Sprinkle Road from April 25 – October 25, 2016 with the following conditions: 1) the Temporary use be permitted from April 25 – October, 25, 2017 subject to city staff review; 2) the outdoor barbeque be licensed by the Kalamazoo County Department of Health and Community Services; 3) table (under tent), pedestrian barrier, and tent set-up be consistent with the submitted site sketch; 4) hours of operation be limited to 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. Tuesday through Saturday; 5) the site be kept free from trash and refuse; 6) temporary signage be limited to one sign not exceeding 40 square feet (and not the two non-permitted flags shown in the application); 7) no sound amplifying equipment be permitted. Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-23, John Krasinkiewicz, on behalf of Comerica Bank, 7941 South Westnedge Avenue: Mais summarized the request to construct a vestibule 25 feet from the west (front) property line where a minimum 30-foot setback is required. John Krasinkiewicz and Leonard Murz were available to answer questions. Learned noted the applicant did not have to construct the tower/vestibule and could simply leave the building like it is. Mr. Krasinkiewicz stated they propose to do both interior and exterior modifications and the interior layout could not be made any tighter while maintaining both visual lines for security and ADA compliance. Seyburn inquired if the building was currently in full compliance with ADA requirements. Mr. Krasinkiewicz said no.

A public hearing was opened. No one spoke for or against the request and the public hearing was then closed.

Learned stated wanting the tower branding did not constitute a practical difficulty. Robbe noted the Board had approved a similar request for Moe's Grill. Mr. Murz stated the proposed changes are not just for branding and cosmetic reasons. The ATM will be removed from its current location in the lobby for security reasons and relocated to a drive-thru lane, also the grade change near the existing entrance presents additional challenges with regard to providing access from the parking lot that is ADA compliant, which the proposed design will address. A motion was made by Robbe, seconded by Learned, to grant a variance to construct a vestibule 25 feet from the west (front) property line where a minimum 30-foot setback is required for the following reasons: there are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applying to the property that do not apply generally to other properties in the same zoning district which include the security and regulatory requirements; the variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right similar to that possessed by other properties in the same zoning district in the vicinity; the right to develop a property in compliance with ADA requirements; the immediate practical difficulty causing the need for the variance request was not created by the applicant; and the variance would not materially impair the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance. In addition, the application and supporting material, staff report, and all comments, discussion and materials presented at this hearing be incorporated in the record of this hearing and the findings of the Board, and action of the Board be final and effective immediately. Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-14, Jevin Weyenberg, 8314 Portage Road: Mais summarized the request for: a) a favorable interpretation that a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange is permitted at 8314 Portage Road; or b) a use variance to operate a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange at 8314 Portage Road. Mr. Weyenberg stated that when the state passed the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act (MMMA) in 2008 he assumed citizens would have reasonable means to obtain it and doing so through a Home Occupation was not in his opinion reasonable. Mr. Weyenberg shared a video promoting the purported benefits of medical marihuana. Following the video, Learned stated he appreciated the sentiments expressed but wanted to give

the applicant the opportunity to address deficiencies in the application with specific regard to matters the Zoning Board rules on, as the Board only has authority to interpret the Zoning Ordinance, not re-write it. Mr. Weyenberg stated they have prepared an ordinance amendment and will provide it to City Council tomorrow. Seyburn stated he hoped the applicant understood that because a use variance was being requested they had to demonstrate the property could not otherwise be reasonably used for any other permitted use in the B-3 zoning district. Attorney Travis Copenhaver, speaking on behalf of Mr. Weyenberg said they understood this and while the property might be suitable for other permitted uses the reasons they were present were primarily for the purpose of the public hearing and to preserve their right of appeal. It was his client's position that the city's medical marijuana ordinance violates state statute. Seyburn stated the Board had no authority to determine whether or not the zoning code complies with state statute. Mr. Copenhaver said he understood that and the applicant's goal is to cooperate with the city in devising a new ordinance that complies with state statute, and to that end wanted the Board to table the request to allow them reasonable time to work with City Council. Robbe stated the time for doing that should have been before opening the business. Mr. Copenhaver responded their position is the city's ordinance is invalid and they are not required to obtain permission to operate. Schau stated that even if the Board agreed with the applicant's position, the Board is bound to act upon the ordinances as currently written, not how they might be re-written. Mr. Copenhaver responded if that was the case, the Board should table the item. Mr. Weyenberg was sworn in as a witness. Attorney Bear inquired if Mr. Weyenberg had employees and if so how many. Mr. Weyenberg responded he has five employees. Bear asked at any given time how many are working. Mr. Weyenberg responded approximately four. Bear asked if his employees were qualifying patients under the MMMA. Mr. Weyenberg responded yes, all have cards. Bear asked if they were also registered caregivers. Mr. Weyenberg responded yes. Bear inquired how many customers/patients they sold marijuana to on an average day. Mr. Weyenberg responded he did not know. Steve Bliss was sworn in and responded they consult with 30 to 40 patients a day. Bear inquired how they respond if someone comes in without a card. Mr. Bliss responded they set up a consultation with a caregiver and what transpires between the caregiver and patient is private. Bear inquired if there is marijuana on premises that can be transferred from caregivers to patients. Mr. Bliss stated yes and clarified the marijuana belongs to the caregiver, not the company. Bear inquired how much marijuana does a caregiver have at any given time. Mr. Bliss stated that depends on the individual caregiver and how many patients they have. Bear asked how the marijuana is stored. Mr. Bliss responded in airtight jars. Mr. Copenhaver interjected he did not understand the purpose of attorney Bear's questions. Bear stated to determine if the applicant was operating in compliance with the MMMA. Learned stated he did not think the Board was to determine whether or not they were in compliance with the MMMA. Bear responded the city is being asked by the applicant to approve a use, but the city cannot approve an illegal use, and it was therefore appropriate to ask questions to determine if the applicant is in compliance with the MMMA. Learned stated the Board should limit itself to determining whether or not the applicant meets the criteria for a use variance and that it sounded like the applicant has already conceded they do not, so the specifics of the business operations were not relevant.

A public hearing was opened. Brianna Hill stated the building at 8314 Portage Road incurs a hardship as it has attracted few tenants over the years. Mike Sims, Eric Johnson, Steve Bliss, Erin Hugett, Mark McMartin, Jacob Parker, John Rockwood and Scott Healy spoke in favor of allowing the applicant to operate at 8314 Portage Road. Minnie Tai spoke in opposition to the request. Attorney Glen Smith stated he was recently hired to represent Ms. Hill (ZBA #15-21) and while that is a separate case, the two cases were very similar in character. Mr. Smith stated Council would be considering a moratorium on the medical marijuana ordinance in the near future. Attorney Bear stated while nothing has yet been officially placed before Council, he was aware of the possibility and Council may consider this matter as soon as April 26th and could possibly impose a moratorium as soon as May 10th. Mr. Smith stated he thought ZBA #15-14 and ZBA #15-21 should both be tabled. There being no further comments the public hearing was closed.

A motion was made by Robbe, seconded by Learned, to deny a) a favorable interpretation that a medical marijuana patient-caregiver exchange is permitted at 8314 Portage Road; and b) a use variance to operate a medical marijuana patient-caregiver exchange at 8314 Portage Road for the following reasons: the condition, location or situation of the specific piece of property is not unique to that property and the zoning

district in which it is located; the building, structure or land can be reasonably used in a manner consistent with the uses allowed in the zoning district in which it is located; the use variance may alter the character of the neighborhood or the intent of the comprehensive plan, and may be a detriment to adjacent properties; the variance will materially impair the intent and purpose of this article or the district in which it is located; the immediate unnecessary hardship causing the need for the variance was created by the applicant when they opened their business at this location without permission. In addition, the application and supporting material, staff report, and all comments, discussion and materials presented at this hearing be incorporated in the record of this hearing and the findings of the Board, and action of the Board be final and effective immediately. The Board discussed the option of tabling the item but decided to call the question. Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

ZBA #15-21, Brianna Hill/Jonathan Rockwood, 5090 (5092) South Sprinkle Road: Mais summarized the requests for: a) a favorable interpretation that a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange is permitted at 5090 Sprinkle Road; or b) an appeal of the administrative decision not to permit a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange at 5090 Sprinkle Road; or c) a use variance to operate a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange at 5090 Sprinkle Road; or d) a Temporary Use Permit to operate a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange at 5090 Sprinkle Road. Attorney Glen Smith requested his April 11, 2016 letter to Vicki Georgeau requesting ZBA #15-21 be postponed be read into the record. The letter was read into the record. The applicant also provided Board members copies of a September 10, 2012 Michigan v Brandon McQueen, and Matthew Taylor, d/b/a/ compassionate apothecary, LLC amicus brief, a LARA Medical Marihuana Act statistical report for fiscal year 2015, and a paper titled "Health Effects Associated with Indoor Marijuana Grow Operations." Mr. Smith stated the reason he was requesting a postponement was because he had been hired only 10 days earlier and needed an opportunity to research the law concerning this case. Schau inquired if the applicant could withdraw the request and resubmit later. Bear stated if the Board made a decision to deny the request the applicant could re-apply after a year. Learned inquired if it would be possible for an applicant to file an appeal and at the time of the meeting withdraw the request and re-file and withdraw repeatedly so one could effectively stay enforcement indefinitely. After some discussion, the Board determined that would be contrary to Section 42-622(A). Mr. Smith reiterated the applicant was requesting the item be postponed to give him time to research the issue, and he could not recall any instances of the Board not postponing a request during the time he served on the Board. Robbe stated most times the Board has postponed an item it had been because the Board wanted additional information. Mr Smith stated he was requesting postponement to the next regularly scheduled meeting to fully research all issues surrounding the request.

A public hearing was opened. Mike Sims spoke in favor of postponing the item. Steve Bliss stated the Board felt they had adequate information to act on the nearly identical request, ZBA #15-14, and saw no reason why this application should get a stay of enforcement when they did not. The public hearing was then closed.

The Board discussed postponement or possibly re-opening ZBA #15-14. A motion was made by Schaefer, seconded by Learned to table ZBA #15-21. Upon roll call vote: Robbe-No, Schaefer-Yes, Phillip-No, Schau-No, Seyburn-No, Learned-Yes, Bright-Yes. The motion failed 3-4. A motion was made by Schau, seconded by Robbe to deny a) a favorable interpretation that a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange is permitted at 5090 Sprinkle Road, as the text was quite clear that it is only permitted as a home occupation; b) uphold the administrative decision not to permit a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange at 5090 Sprinkle Road; c) deny a use variance to operate a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange at 5090 Sprinkle Road, as the property can reasonably be used by other uses permitted in the district; and d) a Temporary Use Permit to operate a medical marihuana patient-caregiver exchange at 5090 Sprinkle Road, as the property can reasonably be used by other uses permitted in the district. In addition, the application and supporting material, staff report, and all comments, discussion and materials presented at this hearing be incorporated in the record of this hearing and the findings of the Board, and action of the Board be final and effective immediately. Upon roll call vote: Philipp-Yes, Learned-Yes, Seyburn-Yes, Bright-Yes, Robbe-Yes, Schau-Yes, Schaefer-Yes. The motion passed 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS: A handout from the Michigan Association of Planning containing information about how Boards should handle potential conflicts of interest was provided by staff.

STATEMENT OF CITIZENS: John Cavanaugh, friend of Jonathan Rockwood, stated he thought the medical marijuana items should have been postponed. Seyburn stated he hoped everyone understood that the Board acted in accordance with the scope of its authority in rendering its decisions, and the previous two applicants may find relief from City Council, who does have authority to change the ordinances. Robbe stated as a developer he must thoroughly investigate whether a proposal complies with all local ordinances and if not then first working with the community to change those ordinances or getting variances before opening for business, and takes exception to times when applicants do not do the same. Brianna Hill stated she had worked hand in hand with city officials such as the City Manager and the Director of Community Development who personally came on site, walked them through the process and advised them to handle things exactly the way they did.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeff Mais
Zoning & Codes Administrator