

**VILLAGE OF CHAGRIN FALLS
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
November 28, 2017**

Members present: Fricke, Holdren, Freshman-Johnson, Kraemer, Maersch
Also present: Markowitz, Jamieson, Himes, Edwards

SWEARING OF WITNESSES

All were sworn in.

**TODD GOLDSTEIN, 49 WEST WASHINGTON STREET - REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE
TO SECTION 1125.04(f)(1),(2),&(5), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS:
ACCESSORY STRUCTURES, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 932-03-004.**

Mr. Maersch said Todd is a client of mine so I have to recuse myself on the Goldstein Matter.

Todd Goldstein said we are applying for a side yard variance for a generator. The generator has been there since the construction of the home that was completed two years ago. I believe the reason we are going through the process is because if we would have had the generator in our original plan we wouldn't actually be seeking a variance today. I think Harry can attest to that. We did have it in our original plan but after understanding what the danger of having the property flood if the power goes out we ultimately decided to, before construction was done, put the generator there and then someone came and measured the distance it was from the house and ultimately lead us to be here today to apply for a variance so we can have it.

Mr. Fricke said I missed something you said at the very outset, if you would have included this in your original plan we wouldn't be here. Mr. Himes said it would have been included in the original side yard variance if it has been part of the original plan. The setback from the alley is 10' so they ended up with a 6', 3" setback. Had the generator been in the plan obviously we would have incorporated it into the variance request. Mr. Fricke said the setback should have been 10' and yours was 6.3'. Mr. Goldstein said yes, and the reason for that is because the alley is considered a street not a typical side yard. It shouldn't be considered as a street but it is and the city looked at it as a street so we had to get a variance from 10' to 6.3' and at the time, if we would have known we needed a generator, we would have included that as a part of the variance process that we went through, which took us more than two years.

Mr. Fricke said so what is the actual amount now that you need? Mr. Jamieson said according to the application the generator is located approximately 4' from the lot line and the main building variance is 6.3' so the setback requirement is one area needing or requesting a variance also the requirement to screen the generator from view and the final requirement for the direction of the exhaust. Mr. Fricke said help me understand, there is currently no screening I assume; this just runs

out onto cement? Mrs. Goldstein said it goes into our landscaping essentially, which is mulch. It is 2' from the house, which is the manufactures requirement for fire and safety reasons. Ms. Kraemer said so there is no need to screen it? Mr. Goldstein said it is actually enclosed in kind of a self-contained area. Mrs. Goldstein said there is an area of our house which goes in more from the alley so we have a stepped area of the house that is further from the alley so it is not actually visible from the street because it is set back. Mr. Goldstein said when we built the home that is where they asked us to also put the HVAC unit so it isn't visible from the street.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said I think the question is why do they need a screen from view variance? Mr. Jamieson said the requirement is screened from view with evergreen plant material or decorative fencing. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said okay, and they just don't want to do that? Mrs. Goldstein said we have evergreens there that are just not large enough. They are about half way up to the generator but they haven't grown big enough. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said Harry, we considered it not screened from view? Mr. Edwards said right now it is not screened bu that is part of the requirement for a generator. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said but you are requesting the variance to not have to do any more landscaping; just screen it? Mrs. Goldstein said oh no, we can put the landscaping in. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said that is my question. The variance here includes that you want a variance to not screen it from view. Ms. Kraemer said so that would be one variance that would be eliminated from the request. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said it just lists three parts of the code, which tells us you want three variances but you are really only going for the setback is what we are asking.

Mr. Fricke said what is the issue with the exhaust direction. Mr. Himes said the code requires discharge of the exhaust to the interior of the lot so because it is basically between the house and the alley I don't think can discharge it towards their house so I assume it is discharging towards the alley. Mr. Goldstein said if you look at the unit it is a self-contained unit, there is no discharge pipe coming from it. Mr. Edwards said the exhaust is on the back side and goes to the back of the house. Mrs. Goldstein said it runs north to south in terms of it orientation and so it exhausts towards the back of our house. Mr. Fricke said so the screening that is required would not block the exhaust; the screening is only required to the west side of it? And the north? Mr. Jamieson said it doesn't specify a distance from the screening. Mr. Himes frequently when we say screen from view it is from the right-of-way but in this case it simply says screen from view. Mr. Jamieson said you can have a distance or a buffer to allow ventilation around the unit. The landscaping doesn't have to be right up against it.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said let me clarify, they are only asking for the one variance? You just listed the three parts of the code that are affected by generators and that is why this is in the office use only section on the application? The application is confusing to us, that is why we are asking. Mr. Himes said because no screening is shown on the drawing so we assume that the applicant is not installing screening. It wasn't proposed so we noted it as a code requirement. Mr. Goldstein said our neighbor closest to us is a good 10' from the generator.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said I want to go back to the requirements of this generator to make sure we have on record because we kind of glossed over it in the beginning. I was here when you had the

original variance and so I recall this house was a tear down because of the flooding issues at this lot and we had a lot of discussions about the swaling and how to grade that property and so you continue to have issues. If you don't have electricity I am guessing the sump pump doesn't work and you are going to have flooding issues. Your property, from a reasonable accommodation, is that you need this in case there are power outages for any extensive period of time and your sump pump won't work in storms you have issues with the maintenance and care of your house. Okay, so this has been there for two years working and helping during times of no electricity? Mrs. Goldstein said no, it has not been working yet. We've been very lucky to this point and actually we were very concerned when we had that huge storm about a month ago when Aurora was out of power for a week. If that would have been us we would have been in huge trouble because our sump pump continued to work because we only lost power for about fifteen minutes. Had we lived in Aurora and had this house and this lot our basement would have been in terrible condition. That sump pump was working continuously for days after that storm. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said okay, you want to plug it in and use it so you need the variance to do that.

Mr. Holdren said where is the air conditioning unit? Is that right there too? Mrs. Goldstein said they are right next to it and they were on our original plan. Mr. Holdren said is the generator any closer to the alley/road than the air conditioning unit? Mrs. Goldstein said maybe by 3" at most.

Mr. Fricke said did you look at having this anywhere else on the property? Is the east side totally full with other things? Mrs. Goldstein said we did consider having it on the east side but the issue with the east side is that we are slightly closer to the property line on that side. We have the same side yard setback situation on that side as well. The primary issue on the east side is that that is where our water drainage is. The way our house is graded our back yard slopes to the east and there are drains on the east side of our yard and that is where the swale is. If we were to put it there it would maybe ruin the generator; that is where the water drains. That is why we decided ultimately to put it on the west side of the house. We have this setback situation so we would be here no matter what side of the house it was on.

Beth D'onfro, 55 West Washington Street, said I don't think the generator actually needs screening because it is just a big gray box. Why don't they have to screen the air conditioning unit and all kinds of other pipes and outlets. I question the noise of the generator and the exhaust. Mr. Fricke said I recall a discussion of the air conditioning units being in that area where we gave a variance. I am trying to think back what the variance was for and whether the air conditioning because it seems like that would have been something that we discussed at the time the variance was granted to the alley side. I just remember there being a discussion on screening and I don't remember there being discussion of the air conditioning unit even being in the alley way. Mr. Himes said I don't recall it either. I think there is some screening requirement for air conditioning units but as far as height and other things there is no requirement in the code to screen down spouts or things like that. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said the code is written specifically about generators and there is no code specifically requiring screening for air conditioners. Mr. Goldstein said we actually installed a significant amount of bushes along the alley and the idea is that over time they will grow and provide screening for that whole side of the house. Mrs. Goldstein said the generator is in the same spot

where it has been for two year; it is not moving any closer. It is an emergency only basis generator. It will only be on if our power goes out so that our basement doesn't flood. If we were in a situation like Aurora was a month ago it could run for three, four, or five days. We are hoping that that doesn't happen. We haven't even turned it on yet. Ms. Kraemer said so you don't know what the noise level is. Mr. Markowitz said you are supposed to test it once a week. Mrs. Goldstein said they tested it. It was connected and then disconnected. Mr. Goldstein said and also that is the reason behind the enclosed casing that it is in to muffle it.

Mike Corkran, 108 West Washington Street, said we have one at our house that is almost exactly the same size and it is only for emergency purposes. One time a week for about five minutes a test comes on and that is the only time it is running. Mr. Fricke said can you speak to how loud it is? Mr. Corkran said I don't even notice it and it is right at our back door. It makes some noise, it is not quiet it is an engine. It is inside a housing that muffles the sound. Mr. Fricke said and what about the exhaust? Have you ever noticed it? Mr. Corkran said we have landscaping right near it and the exhaust goes right on the landscaping. It has never damaged any of the landscaping. Mrs. Goldstein said when we bought it we wanted to make sure that what we were getting was not an issue for our house or anybody else's house.

Moved by Mrs. Freshman-Johnson, seconded by Ms. Kraemer on behalf of the Goldsteins, 49 West Washington Street, requesting a variance to Section 1125.04(f)(1) for a side yard setback variance to allow the placement of a generator approximately 3', 9" from the property line. The requirement for this side yard is actually 10' because it is an alley/road and therefore the setback is larger than a normal side yard setback. The placement of the generator requires a 6' variance from the side. The property requires a generator due to water issues contained on this lot that have been dealt with through the demolition of a previous house and the current building and landscaping efforts of the new house. However, keeping the house away from water damage and having a generator to run a sump pump is essential for the maintenance long-term of this house. The variance is substantial in the sense of percentage, however this house is uniquely situated on an alley way and not directly next door to a neighbor although it is 14' away from the nearest neighbor. The essential character of the neighborhood is not substantially altered, the unit is tucked into a niche into where the house goes in. You can not see it from the street, you can only see it from the side. It is well encased in an updated modern unit. It will not adversely affect any governmental services. The property owner did purchase this understanding the knowledge of the zoning restrictions and have sought out previous variances and if they had determined at the time they needed this generator they would have included it in the original variance but they have decided that is well worth the investment and have come back for the variance now. The owners have debated on putting the unit in other places around the house but after discussions with the builder the other side of the house where it could be placed would have the same issue and would require a side yard setback as well so there is no reasonable other place on the property to locate this type of unit. The location of the generator is at the least obtrusive place on the site. They have planted landscaping and are willing to landscape additional if needed for more shielding to appease any neighbors and the city and for all those reasons they would like this variance.

Freshman-Johnson: Aye.

Fricke: I would vote aye for the reasons in the motion. I also believe that the generator is still further away from the building that was replaced from the road so I find that compelling as well. I vote aye.

Holdren: I too vote aye for the reasons stated. I would also like to point out it is inline with the current A/C unit which were allowed previously so it is not any further to the side.

Kraemer: I also would vote aye. I think it substantially meets the Duncan Factors that we are required to apply. I wasn't around for the discussion related to the variances required for the building of the house itself, but I think clearly this was something that would have been part of that variance request had it been identified at that time as something that was critical to the maintenance of the home. I also think that per the discussion with other neighbors there should be some look at additional screening especially since you are not requesting it that you be relieved from the screening requirement for the generator and maybe some of that screening could be moved sort of selectively to some other things so I vote aye.

Mr. Fricke said this action will be final within fifteen days unless appealed to Council by a petition of three or more Council members.

RICH AND LISA VAROS, 111 WALNUT STREET - REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 1125.03(e)&(h), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: MAIN BUILDINGS, AND SECTION 1125.04(a)(1)&(a)(3), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: ACCESSORY STRUCTURES, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 932-05-045.

Mr. Jamieson said they are applying for permission to construct a side addition to an existing garage that does not conform to the requirements for size of garages. The code states that whenever you add on to an existing structure like that garage that the entire structure be brought up to code requirements. They need a variance to that as well as the addition to the back of the house. They are adding on a mud room to the back of the property. The four variance sections involved are the maximum lot coverage, the rear yard setback, the garage interior dimensions existing and new, and then the garage side and rear setback.

George Clemens, architect, said this is a small house that has been really dilapidated. Rich and Lisa Varos live next door and purchased this house in order to improve it. It was the house with the front porch kind of falling in. Their long-term goal was to make this an ownership house, not a rental house. It is quite a small and lower house, it doesn't have a big upstairs. We are not trying to knock it down and we are not trying to significantly make it bigger. We are trying to accommodate enough in the floor plan to meet the needs of a younger family and bring it up to line with houses on Olive

Street or surrounding streets with smaller houses. And so we are proposing a fairly small master suite on the first floor, an open area, and then I think those pictures show an open porch on the back of the house. So we are trying to replace the open porch, which does not actually count for as lot coverage so we are taking something that doesn't count towards lot coverage and we are doing something a little bit bigger but it does count towards lot coverage. So we are increasing the lot coverage. That room is critical because it allow for a couple of bedrooms upstairs, a tiny stackable laundry, a powder downstairs, and once you try and combine those things in the floor plan we really couldn't get a first floor master in this small structure. I think that really is essential square footage for making an ownership house.

Mr. Maersch said so I am looking now at the site plan, which is on the front cover, so you are taking an existing garage as exists 1' off the property line to the north and 1' off the property line to the east. So it is existing nonconforming with 1124.03(a)(3) because its only a foot. You are not increasing that nonconformity, you are adding a bump-out addition. Mr. Clemens said the interior side of the lot but since we are altering a structure that is existing nonconforming we need a variance to allow the alterations. We are also putting a gable roof on it to make a small gable structure that looks a little more like the house but that is part of the alteration. That is probably part of what you are looking at. Mr. Maersch said you are putting the bump-out addition but even with that addition it doesn't bring it into conformity with the 20 by 19. Mr. Clemens said there is an actual reason for that. It is less than 3.5' from the house as it exists.

Mr. Maersch said so you are enclosing the porch in the back, are you increasing the nonconformity by closing the porch? Mr. Clemens said yes and we are making it a slight bit bigger. Mr. Maersch said how much further east are you going? Mr. Clemens said a foot and a half. So now the house itself is about 23' from the rear lot line so the back of the main house is into the rear setback. The porch was at about 16' or 17' from the rear lot line and now we are at 15.4' so the ultimate variance request would be 14.6' from the 30' rear setback. The context of this is that that space is really needed on the first floor. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said what is the bump-out for the garage for? Mr. Clemens said storage. We are sticking with the one-car garage and just try to improve the structure a little bit.

Mr. Clemens said we are in pretty much the same lot coverage which was 1,077 square feet (that is the residence not the garage) and we are adding 116 square feet that is that total mud room addition. Our total lot coverage is 1,193 square feet and 30.78%. Mr. Maersch said what is the square footage of the house? Mr. Clemens said 1,193 square feet downstairs and 775 square feet upstairs.

Mr. Fricke said what is the current lot coverage percentage, do you know? Mr. Clemens said it is 28%. Mr. Fricke said we rarely have this happen where you are actually seeking less. The code has a minimum interior dimension for a garage and you are going less than that so you need a variance to go smaller than what the code says. Mr. Fricke said there is no way to bring it up to code by making it larger. Mr. Clemens said no, and if we attached it then we would have setback and lot coverage issues.

Moved by Mr. Maersch, seconded by Ms. Kramer to approve the variance request for 111 Walnut Street. The applicants are seeking four variances, three enlargements and one to not meet the minimum requirements of our code. 111 Walnut Street is a R1-50 residential district. In that district Section 1125.03(e) requires a maximum lot coverage of 24% for the dwelling unit. As the residence currently exists it is at 28% and the applicant is seeking a variance to go to 31%. The variance request therefore is 7% for 1125.03(e). The applicant seeks a variance for Section 1125.03(h) in an R1-50 district the required rear yard setback is 30' and the applicant has proposed a rear yard setback of 15'. The variance request for Section 1125.03(h) is for 15'. The applicant seeks a variance request for Section 1125.04(a)(3) in the R1-50 district it requires a 3' setback from the accessory structure in the rear yard and the applicant is seeking a variance of 2' on each side. The applicant seeks a variance for Section 1125.04(a)(1) in the R1-50 district it requires an accessory structure to be a minimum of 20' by 19' interior dimension and the applicant is seeking a variance for, as proposed, an 18', 5" by 15', 3" accessory structure so the variance would be for 2', 7" by 3', 9". With respect to the Duncan Factors the property will yield a reasonable return and there will be beneficial use of the property without the variance. The variance is substantial in some instances. The reality of the situation is with respect to Section 1125.03(e), lot coverage. The existing structure is 28% already on what has been described as an undersized lot in this area. In fact, the applicant put up a plan showing the neighboring lots and how this lot for some reason seems to have gotten the short end of the stick as the rear lot line of this lot is significantly closer to Walnut Street as the rest of the neighboring properties. As the property currently exists it is 28% and they want to go to 31%, which is a difference of only 3% from the structure as it currently exists. The variance of the rear yard setback is also substantial, 15' on a 30' rear yard setback. The property as it currently exists has a 16' rear yard setback and the applicant is increasing the nonconformity by 1'. With the testimony here tonight and the pictures that were circulated show that the applicant is merely enclosing and slightly enlarging a rear porch that exists that doesn't currently count as part of the rear yard because it is a not enclosed structure but as proposed will become part of the rear yard so even though the variance is substantial the nonconformity is being increased by only 1' in that direction. With respect to accessory structures under Section 1125.04 the variance to keep the accessory structure smaller than our requirement I feel has been justified by the existing conditions on the lot which have the existing garage close enough to the house to prevent the garage from being enlarged. With respect to the 3' setback requirement for the accessory structure at the rear and side lot the applicant is merely renovating or remodeling the existing structure so they are not increasing the nonconformity. The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered nor would adjoining properties suffer substantial detriment. Neighbors were notified and no one came here to oppose the variance request. I feel that the testimony tonight with respect to the existing structures on the lot and their positioning and the size of the lot shows that I think the applicant actually did a nice job in fitting in the structures that are required to make this house saleable at some point and I think that the character of the neighborhood will be improved if we grant this variance. The variance will not adversely affect the delivery of governmental service. The property owner says that they did not purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction. The property owner's predicament could feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance. We have testimony tonight that the applicant is merely enclosing a porch that is currently existing and also just renovating a garage that currently exists and is nonconforming. I find that the spirit and intent behind the zoning

requirement would be observed and substantial justice be done by granting this variance. With respect to the accessory structure the applicant is merely working with the structure as it exists and providing a slight addition but not enough of an addition to bring it up to code. I feel that because the applicant is enclosing the back porch and increasing the nonconformity only 1' that the spirit and intent of the zoning requirement would also be observed if we grant this variance. The variance is not based on circumstances that are self-created or exist as a result of actions of the property owner. For those reasons, I move that we approve the variance requests for 111 Walnut Street.

Fricke: I vote aye for all the reasons of the motion.

Holdren: I vote aye for all the reasons stated.

Kraemer: I vote aye as well. I think with respect to the substantial nature of the variance, I think because of the existing property and the small amount of increase in the variance request for the enclosing of the porch and the construction of the garage and the very unique nature of this property. While the numbers are substantial it will be in conformity with the existing structures on the street and I think it is a very impressive way of trying to renovate a property that had substantially deteriorated without really altering the character of the neighborhood in any substantial way.

Maersch: I vote aye. I do note as I did in the motion that the variances are substantial but when you look at the existing conditions on the property and the fact that the nonconformity will not be increased. That for me weighs in favor of voting aye.

Freshman-Johnson: I vote aye. I would also like to mention that there has been no neighbor impact. First of all, the owners live next door and second of all none of the neighbors or anybody is opposing the nonconformity for this property.

Mr. Fricke said this action will be final within fifteen days unless appealed to Council by a petition of three or more Council members.

MICHAEL AND KATHY CORKRAN, 108 WEST WASHINGTON STREET - REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 1125.03(c), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: MAIN BUILDINGS, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 932-02-005.

Mr. Jamieson said the applicant is applying for a lot split to split off part of the parcel of their property that is on the other side of the river. It is an unaccessible, unuseable piece of property. In order to do a lot split there is a requirement for street frontage, which the back part of this parcel does not have.

Mr. Himes said this originated when Mr. Corkran requested to donate it to the village and between

the Mayor and Mr. Corkran they worked out an understanding so they are proceeding with the variance to split it off and donate it to the village.

Mr. Corkran said when we bought the lot in 2012 we thought we were buying .75 acres and during the process of doing the survey they couldn't get the vectors to work. We found drawings in Geauga County from pre Civil War that had the actual property on it and it is actually 3.45 acres. We come from two properties in Munson Township that had acreage and we actually came here to move into something that was smaller. The previous owner had a two-year option and the expectation was that she was either going to sell it to one of the other owners around to join it with their property and it wouldn't be nonconforming because those other properties had access. That didn't happen and the option expired in 2013. There is property on the other side of the river and it extends all the way behind the Breeden's property. It extends all the way behind the Shuster's property and essentially half way through the Brown's property. The end of this property here is visible from the bridge. I think the Mayor made a comment at the last Council meeting about the impact on protecting the visible end point of the river from downtown. We've gone through all the surveying and we have all the documents ready to be able to donate. The amount we are talking about is 2.315 acres and it is being subdivided for the sole purpose of contributing to the village.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said part on the other side of the river is there one owner now on that other side? Mr. Markowitz said yes. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said so by donating it the village you are basically protecting it from being built on. Mr. Markowitz said it is also valuable to the village to have control of the river there for future preservation issues. Mr. Corkran said there is a 6' waterfall that people call the Sunshine Falls, which is part of the property.

Mr. Markowitz explained the second condition of the donation in the MOU.

Mr. Maersch said what code section relates to lot splitting? What is the variance request for? Mr. Markowitz said they are going to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission with a lot split, with a plat for approval but we have to get the variance here in order for them to be able to do the plat. Mr. Maersch said where is street frontage? Ms. Kramer said Section 1125.03(c).

Moved by Mr. Holdren, seconded by Ms. Kraemer to grant a variance for 108 West Washington Street. They are requesting a variance to Section 1125.03(c), which is street frontage. They are planning on splitting their lot and donating it to the village and for a brief moment of time they will own two lots and one of them, the larger 2.41 acres, will not have street frontage and so they are requesting a variance to allow them to have that lot in the village before they donate it to the village. Will the property yield a reasonable return without the variance? Actually it is probably the opposite; it would be better if they had it. With the variance their value of their land goes down. Is the variance substantial? No, because this is a very odd case. Will the essential character of the neighborhood be altered? No, it is currently unused land underneath the river and next to the river that will stay the same unbuildable land just owned by the Village of Chagrin Falls. Would the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services? No. Did the property owners purchase the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction? Not at first but yes, they

eventually did. Can the property owner's predicament feasibly be obviated through some other method other than the variance? No, they need the variance for the street frontage before they can split the lot and donate it. Would the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement be observed in granting the variance? Yes, it would. Is the variance based on circumstances that are self-created or exist as a result of the action of the property owner? No. We are only granting this variance with the condition that the memorandum of understanding dated June 26, 2017 be complied with by the applicant.

Holdren: Aye.

Kraemer: Aye. I think it meets the Duncan Factors. I think this was a well conceived method of dealing with the interest of a property owner and the village's interest in maintaining the character of the river and its surroundings. So I think it is a good way of solving that problem.

Maersch: I vote aye. To me the variance is substantial. It would be sort of unprecedented for us to grant the ability to split a lot into something that doesn't have frontage on a road and but for the fact that there is a contractual obligation to donate the land to the village we wouldn't be granting this variance. I find that the variance would also adversely affect the delivery of governmental services because if this lot existed it would not be able to get anything to it because there is no frontage on a road. There is contractual obligation to donate it to the village so I find that those two factors don't affect the decision to vote yes on the variance.

Freshman-Johnson: Aye.

Fricke: I vote aye as well for all the reasons stated. There can't be a more unique piece of property before us so I will vote aye.

Mr. Fricke said this action will be final within fifteen days unless appealed to Council by a petition of three or more Council members.

STUART READER, 271 HIGH STREET - REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 1125.04(a)(3), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: ACCESSORY STRUCTURES, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 931-22-004.

Moved by Mrs. Freshman-Johnson, seconded by Mr. Holdren to move the Reader application to the next meeting because there is no one here to present this case.

Holdren: Aye.

Kraemer: Aye.

Maersch: Aye.

Freshman-Johnson: Aye.

Fricke: Aye.

Mr. Fricke said we can affirmatively postpone the December 26, 2017 meeting. If the Readers are available and/or if we get other applications we will figure out a date in early January and we will still have our regularly scheduled January meeting in addition.

The meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Wade Fricke, Chairman

lgb