

**MEETING MINUTES
OF THE
GREENSBORO BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
JULY 8, 2019**

The meeting of the Greensboro Board of Adjustment was held on Monday, July 8, 2019 at 5:38 pm. in the Council Chamber Room of the Melvin Municipal Office Building. Board members present: Chair Chuck Truby, Mary Skenes, James Waddell, Vaughn Ramsey, Laura Blackstock, and Ted Oliver. City staff present: Shayna Thiel, Steve Galanti and Andrew Kelly, Assistant Attorney.

Chair Truby welcomed everyone to the meeting and advised of the policies and procedures of the Board of Adjustment. Chair Truby further explained the manner in which the Board conducts its hearings and method of appealing any ruling made by the Board. The Chair advised that each side, regardless of the number of speakers, would be allowed a total of 20 minutes to present evidence.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES (May 28, 2019)

Ms. Skenes made a motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Waddell. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsey, Oliver and Blackstock. Nays: 0).

SWEARING IN OF STAFF

Shayna Thiel and Steve Galanti were sworn for their testimony in the following cases.

CONTINUANCES/WITHDRAWALS

There were no continuances or withdrawals.

OLD BUSINESS

1. Variance

a. BOA-19-20: 410 SUNSET DRIVE. Marc L. Isaacson, on behalf of Greensboro Country Club, requests a variance to provide less than the minimum required parking. **(APPROVED)**

Ms. Thiel stated in BOA-19-20, Marc L. Isaacson on behalf of Greensboro Country Club requests a variance to provide less than the minimum required parking. The existing facility and proposed improvements will result in the provision of 209 parking spaces when 352 parking spaces are required.

Evidence from the applicant included Exhibits A through D. Supporting documentation from staff included Exhibits 1 through 9. Land Development Ordinance reference is Section 30-11-5: parking ratios.

Background and site information: The subject property is located on the north side of Sunset Drive in the Irving Park neighborhood and is zoned R-3. Tax records indicate the properties contain approximately 99.12 acres. Based on information provided, the Greensboro Country Club will provide 209 parking spaces. Proposed improvements would require an additional 143 spaces, bringing the total required parking to 352 spaces. On 7/23/2007, the Board of Adjustment granted a parking variance allowing 34 spaces less than the minimum required associated with a fitness center renovation and expansion. Currently the applicant proposes improvements to the existing country club facilities requiring compliance with current parking requirements. The applicant indicates the seasonal nature of the pool facilities and existing topography of the property limit the need and ability to provide additional parking spaces. The applicant stated providing the required parking would decrease the appeal of the country club and impede the function of the existing golf course. The applicant is seeking a variance to allow the reduced number of parking spaces.

Ms. Thiel provided the land use and zoning for this property and surrounding properties.

Chuck Truby asked the applicant to come to the podium and provide their name and address.

Marc Isaacson, 804 Green Valley Road, Greensboro. Mr. Isaacson stated he represents Greensboro County Club and presented materials to the Board for their review. He provided the background of the Greensboro Country Club and advised of expansions and facilities that have been built over many years. Currently, the facilities include a clubhouse, swimming pool, tennis courts, golf course, and a fitness center. This is a private club where many of the nearby property owners are members. The club proposes to expand the clubhouse, replace the aging swimming pool and add to the existing family activity center. These changes are being implemented in response to member expectations of how they want their county club to operate and to address long overdue maintenance and repair needs. Mr. Isaacson stated the hardship is a result of parking requirements triggered by the expansion of the club. He referred to applicant exhibits included with the application that had an error related to parking spaces and proposed parking lot, which has been deleted. He advised that the net number of parking spaces needed is 143 and that is the number of spaces requested for the variance.

Mr. Isaacson asked that the amended exhibits become part of the variance application. He discussed the club's property in regards to the topography and character of the area and stated it was important for the Board to understand and appreciate that this is a very old neighborhood, a very old property, a very old facility and that much of the charm and character are because the homes back up or face the existing golf course. Mr. Isaacson referenced an overlay map that showed the current facilities, parking spaces, buildings and the entrance to the country club. A landscape plan was also provided that showed the area along Sunset Drive and along the entrance into the club property and indicated where overflow parking would be. Renderings were provided to the Board depicting the entrance improvements. Mr. Isaacson referenced minutes from a 2007 Board of Adjustment meeting where a parking variance was previously approved for the country club. Mr. Isaacson stated that letters were sent to all of the property owners listed on the notification list regarding the variance. There have been meetings with neighbors in the area, and there was no opposition to the variance request to his knowledge. He felt that the overwhelming opinion of the neighbors favors the request as it will allow the club's property to operate as is. Mr. Isaacson addressed the hardships that may result in not allowing the variance and stated no new use will be made of the property.

Chair Truby inquired if there were questions for the applicant. Mr. Oliver asked how many overflow spaces will be located at Sunset. Mr. Isaacson responded parking will be on an as needed basis; maybe 40 or so spaces. Mr. Oliver asked if there were plans to expand membership. Mr. Isaacson responded the membership number will stay the same, as there is no plan or intent to expand. Mr. Waddell stated it appeared that the size of the family activity center will be significantly increased and asked if the intent was to make it some type of event center. Mr. Isaacson responded that the kitchen and grill area will be expanded to accommodate people dining at the facility. Mr. Ramsey clarified that there would no paving of the overflow area and that only landscaping enhancements are being proposed. Mr. Isaacson responded that was correct that the club will have enhanced landscaping at the front. There will be someone directing overflow parking and will have golf cart shuttles during large events. The overflow parking will be used for special events only. Ms. Skenes asked if this is the same area currently being used for overflow parking. Mr. Isaacson responded that was correct as the intent is to leave everything the same to enhance the natural beauty of the property.

Chair Truby inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the request. No one came forward. Chair Truby inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition. No one came forward. Chair Truby requested a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Ramsey so moved, seconded by Mr. Waddell. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0).

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Truby stated he has been to the Greensboro Country Club for events and has parked in the area discussed. He feels that the Country Club has plenty of parking and to force parking spaces appears silly to him and as an engineer, paving to make the area compliant with Greensboro requirements would be unattractive. He supports of this variance.

Mr. Oliver moved that in case BOA-19-20, 410 Sunset Drive, based on the stated findings of fact, the Zoning Enforcement Officer be overruled and the variance granted, based on the following:

1. If the applicant complies with the provisions of the ordinance, unnecessary hardship will result to the property by applying strict application of the ordinance because creating more parking spaces will reduce

the appeal of the private club. Many of the needed spaces are seasonal use only and there is a finite number of members.

2. The hardship of which the applicant complains results from conditions that are peculiar to the property and unique circumstances related to the applicant's property because there is limited viable space for the required number of spaces the ordinance requires. Inconvenience will be borne by club members who choose to be members of the club.

3. The hardship is not the result of the applicant's own actions because the property is landlocked with a limited amount of land available to expand.

4. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance and preserves its spirit and assures public safety, welfare and substantial justice because the club was built and developed prior to any zoning or other ordinances were in place.

Seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0).

NEW BUSINESS

1. Variance

a. BOA-19-22: 1400 SHERROD-WATLINGTON CIRCLE. John and Barbara Waller request a variance to allow an existing house and proposed deck addition to encroach 13 feet into a required 30-foot setback and will be 17-feet from the rear property line. **(APPROVED)**

Ms. Thiel stated in BOA-19-22, 1400 Sherrod-Watlington, John and Barbara Waller request a variance to allow an existing house and proposed deck addition to encroach 13 feet into a required 30 foot rear setback. The house and deck addition will be 17 feet from the rear property line.

Evidence from the applicants included Exhibits A through C. Supporting documentation from staff included Exhibits 1 through 7. Land Development Ordinance reference is Section 30-7-32, Table 7-1. R-3: minimum rear setback is 30 feet.

Background and site information: The subject property is located at the western end of Sherrod-Watlington Circle, west of Kilpatrick-White Road, and is zoned R-3. Tax records indicate the lot contains approximately 54,450 square feet. The house was constructed in 1987. The existing house includes an existing second story deck and is considered to be a nonconforming structure as it encroaches 13 feet into the required 30 foot rear setback. The applicants propose to remove the existing deck, which encroaches 9 feet into the rear setback, and rebuild a new one with the same dimensions and footprint as the current deck. The removal of the existing deck results in the loss of the nonconforming status and the replacement of the deck would be required to meet all dimensional standards unless the Board of Adjustment grants a variance. The applicants request a variance of 13 feet to ensure all portions of the house meet the required rear setback.

Ms. Thiel provided the land use and zoning for this property and surrounding properties. There are no applicable overlays or plans.

Chuck Truby asked the applicants to come to the podium and provide their name and address.

John and Barbara Waller, 1400 Sherrod-Watlington Circle, Greensboro. Ms. Waller stated they have lived in this house since 1998 and would like to improve the deck as it is completely debilitated. They want the deck to be replaced and everything to be compliant. They were annexed into the city 10 plus years ago and were previously in the county. These are safety concerns and only want a new deck that will be safe.

Chair Truby asked if there were any questions for the applicants. No questions. Chair Truby inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in favor of the application. No one came forward. Chair Truby inquired if there was anyone wishing to speak in opposition. No one came forward. Chair Truby requested a motion to close the public

hearing. Mr. Waddell so moved, seconded by Mr. Ramsey. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0)

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Truby expressed how sorry the Board was that the applicants had to seek approval come and pay the fee.

Mr. Waddell moved that in case BOA-19-22, 1400 Sherrod-Watlington Circle, based on the findings of fact, the Zoning Enforcement Officer be overruled and the variance granted based on the following:

1. If the applicant complies with the provisions of the ordinance, unnecessary hardship will result to the property by applying strict application of the ordinance because plans to make changes to the existing structure would not be able to proceed. The home was originally constructed in 1987.
2. The hardship of which the applicant complains results from conditions that are peculiar to the property and unique circumstances related to the applicant's property because the home sits on a cul de sac and has a unique terrain design and topography.
3. The hardship is not the result of the applicant's own actions because the residence was purchased in 1998 prior to annexation. The home was built in 1987 without any prior modifications.
4. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance and preserves its spirit and assures public safety, welfare, and substantial justice because the homeowners were not aware of any setback violations. Completion of the proposed project will improve safety, access for public vehicles, and improve property value.

Seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0).

b. BOA-19-23: 5708 GREENVIEW DRIVE. Roger Pyatt, on behalf of Roger Pyatt Living Trust requests two variances. (1) To allow a proposed porch addition to encroach 14 feet into a required 58-foot front setback and will be 44 feet from the front property line. (2) To allow and 720 square foot detached garage be separated by 5 feet from other structures on the when at least 10 is required. **(APPROVED)**

Ms. Thiel stated in BOA-19-23, Roger Pyatt, on behalf of Roger Pyatt Living Trust, requests two variances. (1) To allow a proposed porch addition to encroach 14 feet into a required 58 foot front setback and the house will be 44 feet from the front property line. (2) To allow an existing 720 square foot detached garage to be separated by 5 feet from other structures on the lot when at least 10 feet is required.

Evidence from the applicant included Exhibits A and B. Supporting documentation from staff included Exhibits 1 through 8. Land Development Ordinance references are Section 30-7-1.4: street setback computations and Section 30-8-11(E)(2): accessory structures larger than 600 square feet must be separated by at least 10 feet from other structures on the lot.

Background and site information: The subject lot is located on the north side of Greenview Drive, west of Friendswood Drive and is zoned R-3. Tax records indicate the lot contains approximately 20,038 square feet and the house was constructed in 1964. The existing house is considered a nonconforming structure as it encroaches into the required 58 foot front setback. Any enlargement of a nonconforming structure must conform to the dimensional requirements of the zoning district unless the Board of Adjustment grants a variance. The applicant proposes to construct a porch addition at the front of the existing house that will encroach 14 feet into the required 58 foot front setback and be 44 feet from the front property line. The Land Development Ordinance allows an open air/covered porch addition to encroach up to 10 feet into a required setback. Since the existing house already encroaches into this setback, the proposed porch addition will encroach more than the allowed 10 feet and a variance is required for approval. An existing 720 square foot detached garage on the lot is 5 feet from the existing house and 5 feet from the existing storage building when at least 10 feet is required. The applicant also seeks a variance to address this nonconformity and allow the detached garage to remain.

Ms. Thiel provided the land use and zoning for this property and surrounding properties. There are no applicable overlays or plans.

Roger Pyatt, 5708 Greenview Drive, Greensboro. Mr. Pyatt stated he has lived at this house since 1973. He has always wanted a front porch to enjoy with his spouse in his later years. He requests approval for the porch to be built.

Chair Truby asked if there were any questions for the applicant. Mr. Ramsey asked if the nonconforming garage was built the same time as the house. Mr. Pyatt stated he didn't know as it was there when he purchased the house. Ms. Skenes asked if he would speak about the garage since he has already told them about the porch. Mr. Pyatt advised the garage was there when he purchased the house. Ms. Skenes stated that she assumed this issue came up in conjunction with the porch. With the new ordinances, he is attempting to address everything at the same time. Mr. Ramsey asked if there was a curve in the road. Mr. Pyatt responded that Greenview Drive turns slightly toward the south. Mr. Ramsey asked if that affected part of the setback. Mr. Pyatt responded he didn't think so but did not know for sure.

Chair Truby asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. No one came forward. Chair Truby asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition. No one came forward. Chair Truby requested a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Waddell so moved, seconded by Ms. Skenes. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0)

BOARD DISCUSSION

Chair Truby stated this is another case that the house itself is in the new setback and the garage has been there forever. He did not blame Mr. Pyatt for wanting to clean up the nonconformities. Ms. Skenes stated her guess was this house was not in the City of Greensboro when it was built. Mr. Pyatt responded it was annexed about 1978.

Mr. Ramsey moved that in case BOA-19-23, 5708 Greenview Drive, based on the stated findings of fact, the Zoning Enforcement Officer be overruled and the variances granted based on the of the following:

1. If the applicant complies with the provisions of the ordinance, unnecessary hardship will result to the property by applying strict application of the ordinance because the house was built 54 years ago before the adoption of applicable regulatory ordinances. The owner would not be able to fully enjoy the use of the front porch of the house and the garage has been in the same location for the past 54 years and compliance would require its destruction.
2. The hardship of which the applicant complains results from conditions that are peculiar to the property and unique circumstances related to the applicant's property because the house itself was built 54 years before adoption of the ordinance in question.
3. The hardship is not the result of the applicant's own action because the house was built before the adoption of the ordinance. The owner acquired the property in 1973.
4. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance and preserves its spirit and assures public safety, welfare, and substantial justice because addition of the porch and ratification of the garage location are in harmony with the neighborhood and will increase the value of the owner's property.

Seconded by Mr. Waddell. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0).

c. BOA-19-25: 1200 Hill Street. Graham Moore, on behalf of Natalie Alexander, requests two variances. (1) To allow a proposed accessory dwelling to encroach 18.6 feet into a required 20-foot rear setback and will be 1.4 feet from the rear property line. (2) To allow the heated floor area of a proposed accessory dwelling to be 324 square feet when at least 400 square feet is required. **(APPROVED)**

Ms. Thiel stated in BOA-19-25, 1200 Hill Street, Graham Moore, on behalf of Natalie Alexander, requests two variances. (1) To allow a proposed accessory dwelling to encroach 18.6 feet into a required 20 foot rear setback

and will be 1.4 feet from the rear property line. (2) To allow the heated floor area of a proposed accessory dwelling to be 324 square feet when at least 400 square feet is required.

Evidence from the applicant included Exhibits A and B. Supporting documentation from staff included Exhibits 1 through 7. Land Development Ordinance references are Sections 30-8-11.2(D) and 30-8-11.2(E).

Background and site information: The subject lot is located on the east side of Hill Street, north of Northwood Street, and zoned R-5. Tax records indicate the lot contains approximately 10,019 square feet and the house was constructed in 1928. The existing 324 square foot storage building is considered a nonconforming structure as it encroaches into the required 10 foot rear setback for accessory structures taller than 15 feet. The applicant proposes to convert the storage building into an accessory dwelling in the same location without enlarging the footprint. Accessory dwellings must meet the same setbacks required for the principal dwelling. If converted into an accessory dwelling, the structure will not meet the R-5 minimum 20 foot rear setback requirement. It will remain 1.4 feet from the rear property line and 21.6 feet from the side street property line.

Ms. Thiel provided the land use and zoning for this property and surrounding properties.

In response to a question from Ms. Skenes, Mr. Galanti responded the structure would remain nonconforming and would be allowed to remain under the Land Development Ordinance if the variance is denied.

Natalie Alexander and Graham Moore, 1200 Hill Street, Greensboro. Mr. Moore stated the accessory structure was there when they bought the property, is original to the property and is made with the same brick as the main house. He believes it was used mainly for storage, and they would like to make it a useable space requiring a variance to allow for a bathroom and sewer connections. They have found reclaimed bricks from the same era and will match the building. Mr. Moore's background is in restoring historic houses and wants to keep the building as is and enhance the functionality of the building. Chair Truby asked if they have talked to their neighbors since the use of the structure is changing. Mr. Moore responded they have spoken with all of their neighbors and have received encouraging feedback, not any negative feedback. Mr. Waddell asked if only the use of the building is being changed and not the footprint. Mr. Moore responded it is a two-story building and are not adding to it. He would like to connect the two floors and add an exterior door at some point.

Chair Truby inquired for anyone else to speak in favor. Mr. Christoph Bender was sworn in.

Christoph Bender, 1205 Briarcliff Drive, Greensboro. Mr. Bender stated he lives in the area of the Country Club, which is trying to maintain the historic preservation of the buildings. He did not feel there should be two dwellings on one lot. Chair Truby stated you can have a primary dwelling and an accessory dwelling on a lot. There are rules associated with the accessory dwelling. Mr. Galanti advised there are locational and dimensional standards and that the setback and square footage are what the variances are for. Chair Truby stated the applicants can use the building as an accessory dwelling if the variance is approved. Mr. Bender wanted the Board to know what is being done with the building. He is concerned that it will be a work place. Chair Truby advised it cannot be used as a commercial use but can be used for other purposes. Mr. Bender was also concerned about signage. Mr. Galanti responded signage is not permitted. Home occupations are not allowed within an accessory dwelling unit. Mr. Bender inquired what it means to have two dwellings but not two home occupations.

Mr. Kelly responded one is commercial use and one is residential use. Home occupation means to be conducting a business out of the home. The Board of Adjustment does not grant variances as to uses and the applicants are asking the Board to consider some variances to dimensional requirements with respect to what is there. This Board does not have the power to put conditions on uses. Staff is saying to the extent that there are zoning regulations play, those are in effect at this property and other properties with respect to usage. Mr. Bender is very concerned about parking and access to his home and feels the use of this building in a certain way may limit his access. He feels regulations should be in place for the building and access. He is concerned that the applicant will build more and block access. Mr. Bender expressed his concern of houses being used for different types of things and feels the applicants need to be very clear of what the usage will be for the accessory dwelling. He is concerned about meetings being held, signs being posted, and access to parking.

Chair Truby advised Mr. Bender there is a Land Development Ordinance with rules and restrictions on what people can do in residentially-zoned property, and that the applicant would not be able to have meetings or use

the building as a place of business. Mr. Bender feels the Board of Adjustment is the board that can address these issues. Chair Truby responded the Board is only addressing the setback and area issues related to the structure already there. He advised Mr. Bender to contact the City of Greensboro's Zoning Enforcement if he has complaints about what the dwelling is being used for. Enforcement officers would then go to the property and determine how it is being used and determine if a violation is warranted. Mr. Bender stated something should be done now and that the applicant should submit clear intentions.

Mr. Waddell stated the Board of Adjustment can only address items related to the variances being requested at this time. Mr. Bender feels the Board is not listening to all of them. He feels that the applicant should state what he plans to do as part of the proposal. Mr. Waddell responded that the applicant has provided information related to the variances and anything items other than that are outside the Board's jurisdiction. Mr. Waddell suggested that Mr. Bender contact the City of Greensboro Zoning Enforcement to discuss his concerns not related to the variance requests. This Board can only entertain the variance requests. Mr. Waddell advised the Board can only address setbacks and square footage related to the variance. Chair Truby stated he believes the applicant has heard Mr. Bender's concerns loud and clear and understands he cannot conduct business in this accessory structure or have any signage on the structure. Ms. Skenes advised that the Zoning Commission and Enforcement Officers would address his concerns. Ms. Thiel provided Mr. Bender with contact information to address his concerns.

Margaret Bender, 1205 Briarcliff Drive, Greensboro. Ms. Bender, spouse of Christoph Bender. Ms. Bender stated she wanted the applicants to understand that she totally supports everything they are doing and thinks it will be just fine. She advised her husband has the best intentions but since he is from Germany, she does not feel he totally understands how the government works in the US. She feels that is why there is confusion about whom he should address when asking some of these questions. Ms. Bender apologized to the applicants and wanted them to know she supports them. Chair Truby stated the correct number will be provided and if this building is being used for something else, there is an option. He stated they are listening to him and understand. Chair Truby asked if there was anyone else to speak in favor of the request. No one came forward. Chair Truby asked if there was anyone to speak in opposition. No one came forward.

Chair Truby requested a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Waddell so moved, seconded by Mr. Ramsey. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0)

BOARD DISCUSSION

In response to a question by Ms. Skenes, Mr. Galanti did not believe there were any development ordinances in the 1920s. Chair Truby stated the structure is there and nothing is being changed and it will probably look better. The uses are limited and the applicants will have to abide by what the Land Development Ordinance requires.

Ms. Skenes moved that in case BOA-19-25, 1200 Hill Street, based on the stated findings of fact, the Zoning Enforcement Officer be overruled and the variance granted based on the following:

1. If the applicant complies with the provisions of the ordinance, unnecessary hardship will result to the property by applying strict application of the ordinance because the building which is original to the property would be considered nonconforming and could not be improved.
2. The hardship of which the applicant complains results from conditions that are peculiar to the property and unique circumstances related to the applicant's property because the detached garage building is original to the property.
3. The hardship is not the result of the applicant's own actions because the garage was constructed prior to the current development ordinance and most likely prior to any development ordinance.
4. The variance is in harmony with the general purpose and intent of this ordinance and preserves its spirit and assures public safety, welfare, and substantial justice because there will not be any changes to the footprint of the garage. Visually there will be no negative impact to the neighborhood.

Seconded by Mr. Waddell. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0).

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Skenes moved to nominate Chuck Truby as Chairman. Seconded by Mr. Ramsey. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Skenes, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0).

Chair Truby moved to nominate Mary Skenes as Vice Chair. Seconded by Mr. Ramsey. The Board voted 6-0 in favor of the motion. (Ayes: Truby, Waddell, Ramsay, Blackstock, and Oliver. Nays: 0).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF ABSENCES

Ms. Necas was acknowledged as an excused absence.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Truby at approximately 6:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Chuck Truby
Chair of the Board of Adjustment