

CITY OF ST. CLAIR
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS SPECIAL MEETING
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2022
ST. CLAIR CITY HALL
547 N. CARNEY, ST. CLAIR

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Jim Bier – 7:01 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Chairman: Jim Bier Vice Chair: Doug Glassford
Secretary: Joann Westrick Member: Doug Vernier
Member: Ralph Gizowski Member: Diane Ives
Member: Burton Brooks

ABSENT: Doug Glassford – excused absence, Ralph Gizowski

AUDIENCE: Michelle May, Paige May, Anthony Schulte, Thomas Sayers, Carol Emrich, Adam Klemmer

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: *Doug Vernier made a motion to approve the agenda as presented for September 21, 2022, supported by Joann Westrick. All in favor, none opposed.*

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: *Diane Ives made a motion to approve the minutes as amended for April 20, 2022, supported by Burton Brooks. All in favor, none opposed*

CORRESPONDENCE: None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None

Jim Bier – Before we open the public hearing could we get Dee to give a quick review?

Dee Boulier – Eddy Elementary school currently zoned Adaptive Re-use in an R-1 residential district which is being repurposed as a mixed-use building. Due to the repurposing of the building, they are required to add additional parking spaces. The site plan, along with the parking spaces have been approved by the Planning Commission using a 15' greenbelt landscaping buffer. The applicant cannot do a 15' landscape buffer without losing parking.

I recommended to Eddy Development to come before Zoning Board of Appeals requesting a variance of 7.5 feet. If you were to deny them this request, the parking on the south side of the gymnasium would be lost. This variance is for that area only using landscaping buffer of arborvitae and ornamental grass.

Jim Bier – Thank you Dee and with that I would entertain a motion to open the public hearing.

Doug Vernier made a motion to open the public hearing, supported by Burton Brooks. All in favor none opposed.

PUBLIC HEARING: Eddy Development, LLC – Rob Drewek
301 N. Ninth Street
74-07-053-0026-000
Section 5.6.3 Landscape Buffer

Jim Bier – Would the petitioner please approach the microphone and state you name and address.

Rob Drewek – Eddy Development 301 N 9th Street. Dee explained pretty much what we are hoping to accomplish here tonight. With the residence along the south end of the property line there is one maybe two fences already in place so the planning commission recommended a 15' greenbelt. After we went through and looked at the additional footage of greenbelt, we would lose parking spaces which would throw off our parking calculations. In all honesty we would end up with a 15' area where weeds would grow. As an alternative we had the engineer pencil in the minimum space required to put in the arborvitae greenbelt at 7.5 feet. This accomplishes the same thing without the addition of another 7.5 feet of woodchips to maintain.

As part of the original site plan, we didn't want to see another fence. Some areas could be three fences deep or back-to-back fencing. This seemed to be a better alternative.

Jim Bier – Are the existing fences on the property line?

Rob Drewek – They are on the residents' properties.

Jim Bier – As far as you know they would be allowed to either keep the existing fences or take them down if that is what they want to do?

Rob Drewek – Yes, some are privacy fences and some are chain-link fences.

Jim Bier – Thank you. We may have questions for you as we move forward. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to say anything? This is your opportunity to ask for more clarification or to ask questions to Rob. Please approach the microphone and give us your name and address.

Michell May – 926 Thornapple. I am one of the houses that backs right up to the Eddy property on the south side. I am one who has a dual fence. I do not own the chain link fence; I think that was established when the school district put those up. I do have a wood privacy fence that is on my property line. Just for clarification, when you are talking about a green belt, is that 7 ½ feet from the chain link fence?

Rob Drewek – It would be 7 ½ feet from the property line. We would put in a mound and place the arborvitae on top of it. It would be approximately 8 feet from the grade of the parking lot.

Michelle May – Your current zoning requires 15 feet; you are asking to reduce it to 7 ½ feet to provide for additional parking, correct?

Rob Drewek – Yes, because of the way that the school was built, it was built really tight to the property lines. The asphalt that is currently there is in our parking lot calculations. If we were to make the green belt fifteen feet, we would lose a lot of those parking spots if not all of the parking spots on the south side of the gymnasium and we would end up with 15 feet of wood chip space that we would have to maintain so that is the reason for the variance; number 1 to satisfy our parking requirements and number 2 to minimize the amount of space of a 15-foot planter box. If we had more space on each side, we could get away with the 15 feet but because of the foot print of the building and how it is spread out we cannot accomplish the parking requirements.

Michelle May – That area has never been parking before so you can imagine how I am not pleased with having that a parking lot with cars passing through. That used to be a play ground for the Eddy building so I would be opposed to shortening that and having more traffic back there because that abuts right up to my property line.

Jim Bier – Thank you. Is there anyone else?

Anthony Schulte – 951 Thornapple. I am a new resident. I live on the opposite side, but in my opinion, no one should decrease that zone. Once we decrease it for this gentleman, we would have to decrease it for future gentlemen or ladies or contracts or businesses. I think 15 feet is a good gap if we have to put in a building, a structure, a parking lot let's not butt too close to our residences. They took out the playground that I can tell and I think they can just go farther back on that playground. I have a bad knee and I walk in the back of the parking lot. I disagree with that and think it should be 15 feet.

Jim Bier – Thank you. Anyone else?

Carol Emrich – 957 Thornapple. My question is, in the back a lot of new parking is being put in there now, correct? My question is that because it is already torn up for parking in the back, if the variance doesn't go through, could you just put more parking in the back? With the new parking already going in the back, could more parking be added back there instead of encroaching next to the property line of the area we are discussing? I haven't seen the drawings so I don't know how much parking is required and how much they may lose.

Jim Bier – Come on up and take a look at the parking that is going to be going in and then Dee can address your question.

Dee Boulier – Without that parking, they would lose 15 to 17 spaces. By losing that many spaces they would be short on the calculations required for the size of the building. There is no other place to put additional parking in there.

Jim Bier – Her question was, could they push further to the west with parking.

Dee Boulier – I don't believe they can. I think they are pretty close to their property line now. Where Solis field is, is now a separate property because that has been split or is in the process. The ordinance calls for 15 feet, the planning commission has to go by what the ordinance states. This board can grant a yes or no on the variance. A 15-foot buffer will not work to get all of the parking spaces that are required based on the square footage of the building.

Carol Emrich – I guess I wouldn't like to see this variance granted.

Tom Sayers – 952 Thornapple. Part of the problem is that we don't what is going to be happening behind the houses. It was going to be senior housing and now I am guessing that they found all of the fiber optics in the building and decided to create a business environment. Even with the 15-foot variance I thought that there was a spot for 70 parking spots, so with the loss of 15 spots would that cut it down from 70 to 55?

Dee Boulier – The definitely wouldn't have enough parking spaces; 124 spots are required for the whole building. They will have parking in the front, sides and rear of the building.

Tom Sayers – Ok. I don't know if they had to get approval to switch from senior housing to business.

Dee Boulier – No, this building was approved for Adaptive Reuse. So this is a permitted use.

Tom Sayers – I just get confused on the time lines. I know it is a business and my opinion really doesn't matter. If it mattered, I would have bought it somehow.

Paige May – 926 Thornapple. I just wanted to clarify, is it the way the building is being used that it needs that many parking spaces?

Dee Boulier – What we used, because it was so hard to tell what may end up being there, was the same calculation that we used for the Plaza. Our ordinance will tell us for certain things you have to have so many parking spaces per usable floor area or total square footage. The calculation we used was 3 ½ spaces per each 1000 square foot of building which is how we ended up with the 124 spaces required. That seems to work out, and has worked out for the mall. With this being a mixed use building we took the 3 ½ spaces for each 1000 square foot of the building.

Paige May – Is that the typical formula that would be used for that type of space?

Dee Boulier – I would probably use that on any Adaptive Re-use building we have because of the fact that it is the simplest. We don't really know what they plan to do with the building. There are a ton of different uses that can be done in adaptive re-use.

Paige May – You said that you used the same formula that you used for the mall and the mall not as near as close to residents as this building is.

Dee Boulier – If I were to measure it the other way, I would probably be within maybe 10 spaces of what we would be requiring.

Paige May – Ok, so 10 spaces when we are talking about 18, that make a big difference to us. I do plan to continue my residence there and I know I would not like to see the reduced variance in years to come. And I don't think that a building that is now being used in a different way should fall back on the residents to have to make that allowance for what they are doing now.

Adam Klemmer – 920 Thornapple. With all of those spots, is that for all of the businesses that they may add on down the road or will they have to add more down the road? Will this cover all businesses that may go in there?

Dee Boulier – This covers the envelope of the building.

Jim Bier – This calculation is based on the usable square footage of the building as it exists now. The configuration doesn't lend itself to building any additions. If Rob came back and wanted to add on to the building then he would have to add on parking.

Dee Boulier – Adaptive Re-use the owner cannot add on to the building.

Tom Sayers – The parking space needed to be there from the get go even if it was senior housing, correct?

Dee Boulier – There was none originally there because they did not have any approved site plan. The front of the building had adequate parking with parking to the north and front side. It was because of the two wings now being developed; it increased the amount of parking needed.

Tom Sayers – I thought they were going to put more parking in the front of the school where there is grass.

Dee Boulier – There isn't enough room for them to do that. Not without coming closer to the building.

Tom Sayers – I can't recall where I had heard it but I thought they were going to take the exiting parking in front and make it larger.

Rob Drewek – We had adequate parking for the front half of the building which allowed us to get temporary certificate of occupancy and preliminary site plan approval. We always knew that we would need to add parking for the rear of the building. This parking lot design is for phase 2 of Eddy.

The parking in the front that you are referring to is that you may have seen a sketch of herringbone in the front, that was not feasible. There was not enough room to have the two-car parking. We did look at that but from an engineering stand point it wasn't feasible.

Paige May – Earlier you had said that the amount of spaces was based on the square footage of the building. Is that because it is adaptive re-use now and no longer a school, it changes that? Is that why the number of spaces increased?

Dee Boulier – When it comes to schools, the parking is all state regulated.

Paige May – What I am asking is that when it was school, with the same square footage but it had nowhere near the amount of parking. Is that because it was a school?

Dee Boulier – Correct. Now that it is being used as a different type of building, they need more parking spaces.

Paige May – So because it is being used differently, they parking needs to be increased. Not just because of the usable square footage of the building, it is because of how it is being used.

Jim Bier – Yes, the previous use was a school and the city had no control over the parking or the site plan because it was state regulated. When it became adaptive re-use with the variety of business in there then the city and planning commission came up with the formula that Dee spoke of earlier was most applicable to the multiple uses in the building and held the developer to that requirement for the new site plan.

Paige May – Are there any other buildings in the city that are also adaptive re-use in the city that have used a different formula previously for parking.

Dee Boulier – The old middle school, that has yet to be developed, was going to use the whole rear area for parking lot and they had to add another 17 spaces along Orchard as well as using the city parking in front along Sixth Street.

Paige May – To determine the parking for that was it the same formula?

Dee Boulier – I cannot remember, the formula for that, it was 5 years ago.

Paige May – If there were a different formula used then I feel like that one could also be considered in this case.

Dee Boulier – It would be awful accurate count no matter what. If you were to figure everything calling it business; a business needs one parking per every 300 square feet of building, not usable square footage. With the gymnasium, because there is no seating in there, so I would maybe call for 8 spots. If you use the square footage formula, it may call for 20 spaces.

Anthony Schulte – I am new, like I said, to the area. I am wondering that in front of the building, he said there wasn't enough room to make more spots. If you went closer towards the building and made spots parallel, like at Buscemi's, sometimes I don't feel like walking from the bushes. He has 2 or 3 spots along the road, why couldn't you do something like that there?

If you lose that 15' variance, where are they going to pile the snow? When I lived in a condo, our snow removers would push all of the snow up to the wall of the building. If they start pushing that snow into their fences that could cause a problem. I feel they should refocus on arranging parking in the front.

Once we give someone 15' another will ask for 16 feet. I just think that 15' from a residence is a decent amount.

Rob Drewek – He had a comment about snow, one of the things you don't want to do is push snow up into the arborvitae or into a greenbelt. We are going to be pushing snow in the west portion of the parking lot. As far as the rest of the plan, I think people are losing sight of where we are at today.

We have gone through the process of approval for the parking calculations, we have an approved site plan but in order to meet the parking calculations we need to shrink up this, for lack of a better term, a wood chip area between the parking lot and the fences that are there.

In all honesty from their side of the fence there will be no difference. They will see the top of arborvitae whether or not we have 15 foot of wood chips or 7 ½ foot of wood chips. Either way, this area will be paved, I would probably have to cut off something in the school in order to get rid of the parking requirements. I am not sure where I would go with that.

I understand that people don't want to have a lot of traffic by their homes, or whatever the case may be, but that whole process has already gone through with adaptive re-use. We went through that entire process with the city. We had a lot of positive feedback from a lot of residents that didn't want to see a vacant school in their area and wanted to see something different with it. We are really proud of the fact that we have the front half active. I invite anybody to go in there during business hours to take a look at it.

The building is doing what the adaptive re-use ordinance intended it to do. This last piece of the puzzle, and I don't want to sound trite, but it is a minor piece of the entire site plan. We actually look at it as more of a benefit to those on the south side instead of a concrete wall or another fence. One of the options that planning commission gave us was to not have a greenbelt and just put a tight fence up against the other fences that are there.

If this variance is not approved, I will be forced to go back to the site plan and put up a fence and have the parking lot go up tight to the existing fence. By doing that some areas will have fences three deep. We are trying to come up with something that is more appealing to the eye and not just another fence. In short, denying this variance request is not going to stop the fact that there is going to be a parking lot here. It is just going to look different. It's not going to look

as nice as what we have currently on the plan. We want to keep it looking nice and clean like the rest of the building.

Anthony Schulte – The only time I have ever gone into a parking lot that is totally full is when there is a concert or black Friday. We don't know if they are going to have 50 spots filled or 100 spots filled. Parking lots never fill to capacity until you have events.

Jim Bier – With your current tenants what type of usage do you anticipate this parking area to have?

Rob Drewek – That lot I anticipate will be employees of the YMCA and of the Food Pantry. The majority of the traffic in the parking is in the back. Those parking spaces are there only to fulfill our requirements. I wish they weren't there but unfortunately; we have to spend the money to have parking. You are right, nobody may ever park there but we have to meet the city standards for parking that is required for our use. We have looked at this thing over and over trying to find a way to get more spaces.

Paige May – I want to point out that most of the houses along that area already have a chain link fence and to say that a chain link fence would have to be put in. The way that things stand right now and the reason that we are here is because we believe there should be a 15-foot area there. It just seems that it is being taken away from the residents when it is already there. And there will be the privacy portion with the greenbelt added. We already understand that it will be a parking lot. People are already parking there. It's not what it used to be and it's not as nice to look at but it's already there. To lose that extra space just takes away from what is already there. I understand that things have happened with this building and that people of the community have spoken about the benefits and things like that but this area did not impact them as much as it impacts us. We are here to speak on that and I don't think it is fair to just cite how those people are saying it is a positive thing, this portion directly impacts us.

We would like to see what other options that can be explored. Are there other options that haven't been looked at to add the parking somewhere else. Is it possible with how it is being asked of us to give up the 7 ½ feet is it possible that an allowance can be made for the amount of parking that is at the building. If an allowance is being asked of us, is it possible to ask an allowance of the amount of parking?

Dee Boulter – By ordinance we cannot do it. This board has a legal right to waiver some of the required parking but I wouldn't want to do that. I doubt they will ever use all of the parking at one time. The ordinance does call for a certain amount of parking.

Like the applicant said if he doesn't put in the landscape buffer, he could put up a fence and that could go right up to the property line. Parking could come up right to the property line if he puts up the fence. The green belt will look much nicer with arborvitaes.

Jim Bier – The planning commission meeting which I attended was that option of putting up a fence or a masonry fence up especially with recognizing the fact that various residents have

existing fences right now so fence to fence didn't seem appealing to the folks on the planning commission. The landscape buffer was much more appealing to them but the reason we are here tonight in part because they were constrained to only recognize the only landscape buffer that is in the ordinance, which we have been talking about is 15-foot-wide buffer. It doesn't work conveniently with the required parking layout so that is what brought us here. The planning commission were not comfortable with any type of solid fence being added here. They say the landscape was better but they couldn't shrink it down in size.

Paige May – So you are saying that it could come right up to our property line, our side of the 7 ½ or 15 feet which ever it may be?

Dee Boulier – They wouldn't be required to have the 15 feet that would go away. That is strictly for a landscape buffer.

Paige May – Well I don't have a problem with the landscape buffer it is the width of it.

Jim Bier – The option that they could have acted on at the planning commission was a fence with zero buffer or some type of landscape buffer.

Paige May – I don't think us, as the residents have a problem with the landscape buffer. It's reducing the amount of footage. You said you don't want to short change their parking but you want to short change our buffer.

Jim Bier – I hear what you are saying and that is why we are here tonight. I don't know how, we as the board will respond tonight. We also want to share with you how we got here and I do appreciate the fact that you are listening to what you are hearing.

Paige May – Yes, I am and I am very receptive to the way myself and my neighbors are referred to so thank you.

Jim Bier – Thank you. Are there any more comments? If not, I would entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

Joann Westrick made a motion to close the public hearing, supported by Burton Brooks. All in favor, none opposed.

NEW BUSINESS: Eddy Development, LLC – Rob Drewek
301 N. Ninth Street
74-07-053-0026-000
Section 5.6.3 Landscape Buffer

Burton Brooks – I would just like to clarify the height of the mound that the arbs will be on. I am concerned with the people living there with headlights coming in and out. The headlights will be facing the neighbors back yard and if this goes through, I want to make sure that they are not going to see strange head lights coming and going in their back yards.

Rob Drewek – Sure, that’s the purpose of the type of vegetation with the arborvitae being solid and green. I think 8 foot high will be what the total height of the berm and the arbs on top. Just to clarify that there is only going to be one row of arborvitae whether we have 15’ or 7 ½ ‘. That extra 7 ½ feet come on our side that’s the whole purpose to keep it one screened green wall.

Diane Ives – I would like to know from the residents, would you rather have a privacy fence or a brick wall or a vinyl fence or a wood fence or would you rather have the green trees?

Jim Bier – Would anyone like to respond? I guess what you just said is that you like the idea of the buffer.

Paige May – I personally would like the trees.

Michelle May – I would prefer the trees instead of the fence.

Jim Bier – The folks on the planning commission look at the aesthetics of the entire site as well as what the ordinance does and does not allow. They looked at the proximity to your rear yards, they looked at the variety of fencing that is there right now and in their minds the concept of a solid screening fence either chain-link with inserts or solid block that was just appealing to them from any kind of aesthetic to the property side or to you as neighbors looking at it from your back yard. They felt that in those areas where parking backed up to the property line that putting a solid arborvitae wall in there in lieu of a fence would be more beneficial so they acted on that when they did their site plan approval.

Discussions continued regarding the double fencing on the properties and the landscape buffer.

Michelle May – If you don’t get the variance then will the parking go away?

Rob Drewek – I will have those spaces either way. Either with the variance of 7 ½ feet greenbelt or a fence put up. I am up against the wall now. I have to put some screening there whether it be a wall or a 7 ½ foot greenbelt. It appears that the planning commission favored a greenbelt as opposed to another fence between the two properties. As Dee has explained, the planning commission didn’t have the authority to cut that greenbelt down. Which essentially that extra 7 ½ feet encroaches onto my parking lot, it would not make any difference looking at it from the other side of the fence.

Diane Ives – That area, as you said goes to the food pantry. I am one of the chairs on the food pantry, I go there twice a week. I go in back up to the food pantry, load up and go to deliver the food. I may be there about 20 minutes; it is really in and out. Twice a week from about 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm residents come in to pick up their food so there won’t be a lot of traffic.

Rob Drewek – This side of the building we anticipate the food pantry vehicles and maybe a few employees from the YMCA. Most everybody else park in the front and on the north side. We

have a lot of parking in the back also. The YMCA is going to have 8 – 12 employees at max I think they would be parking in the back because that is where their entrance is.

Joann Westrick – If the food pantry at this point would be the only traffic in and out there shouldn't be much traffic. Are you going to make this area a flow through to the back parking? Would these just be employee parking?

Rob Drewek – No, it will not be a flow through. I think there will be a couple handicap spots but as far as employee parking it won't be designated at first. My goal would be to have just the food pantry using this area.

Jim Bier explained the Finding of Facts.

Finding of Facts

Joann Westrick – I appreciate all of the comments that were made by all of the residents. If I were there, I would have the same concerns. I live on 12th Street so not long ago we had the apartments at the end of 12th Street but at the same time I look at the planning commission approved the parking spaces located there if I don't say yes to this, what will happen, more than likely, they will go back to planning and they will just say put up a fence which will accommodate the parking spaces. I don't like the way that it would look and I appreciate the planning commission didn't just take the easy route and say put the fence up and we will be good. At this point I am in favor of the variance and how the green belt would look. I don't want to see a fence up there.

Doug Vernier – At this point nobody really knows what kind of traffic is going to be there. I can only say that to me the planning committee has done their best to estimate what the number of spaces should be. If they are wrong and they don't put those spaces in where are the people going to park? They may end up parking on the roads, possibly in front of your houses and I don't think that is something any of us want to see. I think the plan looks reasonable.

Diane Ives – I am going to agree with what everyone has said and I think we should go ahead with the proposal.

Burton Brooks – I also appreciate everyone's concerns that live there and I think the best alternative is the arborvitae green space as opposed to having to look at a brick wall or another fence. Personally, I wouldn't want to look at a brick wall, anything green would be better. I would also support the variance.

Jim Bier – The things that I see are along the same lines as the board members but also the whole concept of adaptive re-use suggests some flexibility. It is the instruction that planning commission has given to allow this. I have heard the positive comments in the community have said about this, not necessarily the folks that live right next door. The alternative is to have a building that sits vacant so I think it is beneficial to use the process to put businesses and other community uses into the facility. Just as the rest of the board members are saying, if it goes

back to the planning commission the likelihood of a solid fence would be installed in lieu of the landscape buffer. I am much more comfortable with how a landscape buffer will look over time and hopefully it gives a more attractive look to the residents who back up to the space.

Joann Westrick made a motion to approve the variance of 7.5 feet as shown on the site plan which would give the applicant a 7.5-foot green belt located at property 301 N Ninth Street, property #74-07-053-0026-000. Supported by Burton Brooks.

Roll Call

Jim Bier – Yes

Doug Vernier – Yes

Joann Westrick – Yes

Diane Ives – Yes

Burton Brooks – Yes

Motion carries. I do want to thank everybody who took the time to attend tonight. This may not be the outcome that you had wished for but I know you have listened to our process and listened to all of the information that was provided. Thank you for respecting our process and if you have occasion to attend another ZBA meeting that you come back and express your concerns.

Tom Sayers – Like Joann was saying that if they don't get the 7 ½ variance then they would just put up a fence on the lot line. I didn't understand that. I thought it was going to be just the 15' and now all of the sudden you are cutting it down to 7 ½ feet. I don't know if any body else viewed that as a threat. If you don't do it my way, then I will just put up a fence.

Jim Bier – We are diverging a little because we have already voted. I can sense what you are saying but I think more the sequence that happened here was it could have been constructed tight to the property line with a different type of screening but what was being considered at the planning commission meeting they expressed concerns with how that would act against the R1 properties. The folks personally didn't like it, they didn't think the fence was an appropriate solution even though in fact, it was a legitimate solution so they offered the landscape buffer. It is more of a practical reality and not by any means, the way I looked at it, a threat. They also told the developer that he could make a case that he will never use all of these parking spaces but this is the formula we settled on and this is how many spaces you will be required to have. Manage that by putting up a fence or you can put up a buffer, the buffer will only work if it could be narrower than 15 feet. He had a practical difficulty which brings it in front of ZBA. Practical difficulties are things we can consider as a variance. To me, from my back ground knowledge, that is the process that took place. Nobody is threatening to do one thing or another.

Michelle May – I agree with that. I appreciate the discussion and allowing us to speak. One other thing, I think some of Mr. Boulier's tone was a little bit disrespectful on my perspective. You were interrupting people as they were speaking.

Dee Boulier – I try to make people understand what the ordinance really says and what is required. The planning commission could not approve that site plan.

Michelle May – I totally understand that. I get it.

Jim Bier – This could be another agenda item for the future. Let's critic this meeting. I understand what you are saying but Rob has been to many meetings in the city and now I think your ears are open as well. Rob you are getting some suggestions of your demeanor and you will be asking for things as you move forward in the future. Frequently people don't walk out of these meetings getting what they want. I think you need to understand from our point of view, whether we are hearing yays or nays from the neighbors we are very appreciative that you took the time to be here because all too often we don't hear anything and that doesn't help us make our decisions any easier. Maybe we didn't agree completely with you tonight but we heard what you had to say and I want to thank you again.

Diane Ives made a motion to adjourn, supported by Joann Westrick. All in favor, none opposed.

Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.