

Meeting Minutes of  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
Held March 4, 2021

Members Present: Dan Gess, Clete Miller, Terrance Burke, Jack Norton, Jan Saurman, Scott Bruno

Excused: Carolyn Young

Also Present: Eric Tuck-Macalla (Building Director), Lauren Oley (Assistant to Building Director)

Audience: Craig Smotzer, John & Kittie Taylor, John Menzies, John Swidrak, Megan Donovan (Urbas)

*\*Full recording of the meeting is permanently available on the City of Bay Village website under Government/Board of Zoning Appeals/View Most Recent Agendas and Minutes/Media*

Mr. Norton called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Mr. Norton introduced the first item on the agenda, the approval of the minutes that were held February 18, 2021

**Motion** by Mr. Bruno, **Second** by Mr. Burke, to approve the minutes of the meeting held February 18, 2021 as prepared and distributed.

**Motion passed 6-0.**

Mr. Norton then explained the quorum standards and advised that if an applicant determines that they'd like their item to be heard by the full board they are welcome to do so.

John & Kittie Taylor 286 Saddler Rd.	Applicant is requesting a variance to section 1163.05(h) (1) to install a six foot fence in their back yard. The total length of the fence is 80 feet with the reinstalled fence around the pad. 10% of the perimeter of the lot is 42 ft. this would be a variance for 38 ft. or 48%.
---	--

Mr. Norton introduced the first item on the agenda as 286 Saddler Rd and opened the floor to discussion.

Mr. Burke remarked that he is concerned about setting a precedent because this is a 48% variance request which is a very significant variance request. Typically when they are looking at these possible variances for 10% rule they are talking a fraction of that.

Mr. Miller inquired if Mr. Tuck-Macalla knew the height of the fence to be replaced.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla advised that he doesn't know about the existing fence to be reinstalled. He was under the impression that it was also a six foot fence.

Ms. Taylor advised that the fence they are trying to get the variance for is a 6' fence.

Mr. Taylor added that the white picket fence on the right side of the diagram is actually a 4' fence.

Mr. Norton summarized that the requested fence is broken into 3 areas which they want to make 6'. There are two runs that are 24' and the 24' run by the side street which he assumes includes the gate.

Mr. Taylor replied that it's actually 72' total.

Mr. Norton confirmed that it is a 72' request. He also noticed that they want to have eating area which is by the side street and with a trellis on top of it. He assumes that in the trellis area they are trying to get some privacy from the side street. Along the west property line they have a neighbor's car that is parked outside of their garage and that's his normal parking place. Giving some privacy for their fireplace and seating area would be of interest.

Taylor confirmed all three statements were correct.

Mr. Norton advised that the board members have the provided drawings. He went on to say that those two areas would be 48' in area and would only require a 6' variance. And he feels those are legitimate needs from those two viewpoints. He questions the need for privacy going along the other requested side yard 24' from the neighbor to the north.

Mr. Taylor advised that is John Menzie's house, who is on this meeting, and that is 24'.

Mr. Norton remarked that this is a big ask. If that section of 24' was reduced to a 5' then the applicant would only be requesting 6' which sounds fairly reasonable under these circumstances. He has a hard time understanding why there is anything unique or objectionable about that view.

Ms. Taylor remarked that the 6', all around the property, is to make it more uniform looking and if the boards refers to the drawings, from the landscaper, it shows that it is a much more clean look with the horizontal fence around the corner of the property. She feels their property is unique since it is a corner lot. They have 3 angles of views from their backyard that are very visible. They have no privacy in their backyard because of the uniqueness of the property. They are trying to create a clean aesthetically pleasing look to their backyard as well as our neighbor's yards.

Mr. Bruno remarked that one of the things that he noted is that they have the two 24' runs coming off the northwest corner property. If the board was to grant the variance for the 6' that would be a 15% variance. He also mentioned that there are lots of corner lots in Bay Village. The fact that it is a corner lot is not necessarily unique. Typically uniqueness comes with the shape or grade or other things that happen to be a part of the property itself as it is - unimproved or how it was allotted. Lot size or shape. Being a corner lot in and of itself isn't unique. He can certainly

can understand the necessarily for privacy. He inquired if they have thought about extending their year round evergreens? That way they could grant them 6' to be used in other areas in instead of along that west property line.

Ms. Taylor replied that she understands what Mr. Bruno is saying and that is why they put the existing arborvitaes there. They'd still need a variance across the back of the yard along the west side because what they are allotted is only 10'. They would still need a variance for 24' on that backside.

The board and applicant went on to discuss the directional layout of the proposed 6' fencing as it relates to potentially extending their arborvitaes.

Mr. Bruno advised that the board often works with applicants on a transition panel that gradually slopes down to 4' for aesthetic purposes while keeping in the spirit of the code and the applicant in compliance.

The board and applicant then discussed the limitations of adding arborvitaes due to the shade of the existing large trees on the property.

Mr. Norton advised that the applicant is allowed 42' in total based on the 10% perimeter line and the applicant is asking for more than that. If they took two 24' runs then they'd have 48' and they'd need a 6' variance which, as Mr. Bruno mentioned, is within a reasonable range. They could take that 48', assuming it was granted, and they could use it where they want it. They may want it along the side street and they may want the other 24' on the west side, or they may want it between their home and Mr. Menzies's home. He went on to say he doesn't believe the board is going to go along with all of those 24' areas.

Mr. Taylor advised that the preferred fences would be the south side and the west side and their neighbor, Mr. Menzies, could potentially get a variance for his side.

Mr. Bruno remarked that his neighbor's circumstances would need to be reviewed on their own, but the board has recommended that in the past for neighbors that are amicable.

Mr. Menzies advised that his only concern was that he would like to maintain the 4' fence to his south and their north. It is a wood fence with a blue stain - which does wear out after a while. He would like to maintain it, but if a fence is right up against it how would he squeeze in and maintain it?

Mr. Norton clarified that if another section of 6' was along the line between Mr. Menzies and the Taylors that fence would have to be physically on his property. So since he already has a 4' blue fence it would replace that. Stating that they can't put two fences in the same spot.

Mr. Menzies remarked that the neighbors behind him have a fence, to their backyard on his west side, and there is a section which is approximately 3' wide where you can go through. They made their fences on that side with a section about 8-12' high so animals could get underneath it and not get caught underneath it. He was a little concerned about that. He doesn't see why they can't have a section in between the two fences. He has no problems with that, but he needs enough distance to do it. If they're going to replace his fence who's going to maintain it?

Ms. Taylor replied that the person who owns the fence would maintain it.

Mr. Norton advised that it gets a little bit dicey.

Mr. Gess added if one property owner's fence is fully on their property there is nothing that would prohibit a neighbor from putting their fence inches away - as long as it's on their property. Unfortunately you'd end with an impassable section or gap between them. An establishment of one fence doesn't take priority over the other. Each person has a right to go up to that property line. Unless there was a cooperating informal agreement nothing would prevent one fence from being in immediate proximity of the other.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Taylor advised that he agrees with Mr. Menzies that two fences back to back doesn't make sense.

Mr. Menzies remarked that the compromise is that they make one fence. The Taylor side would be their color and his side would be his color. If Mr. Taylor is building their fence it's their expense, but he'd take care of the north side of the fence since it effects his property. He doesn't care about the height of the fence.

Mr. Taylor advised that he thinks that is a good option.

Mr. Burke inquired if the applicant was getting the tone of how the board feels regarding the variance request and their ability to tinker around the edges. They have given the applicant some options and length of linear feet that they are willing to consider based on the configuration of their property and what is allowed under the 10% rule.

Mr. Taylor confirmed that they understand. If they talk to Mr. Menzies and come to an agreement - do they have to resubmit for the west and south side?

Mr. Norton clarified that they are talking about privacy screening. If the request was for an additional 6', as it sort of seems is where they are heading, that might be viewed favorably. If it is for 30', or anything substantially more than that, then it may not work. They've got some different variables here. They can take the same style of fence and make it 4'4". Tonight the applicant may want to consider changing their request to a 6' variance request and see if the board is comfortable with that. At least they'll have that in their pocket and they can redesign around that fact. That would give them 48' total to work with and then you can determine what works best for both neighbors.

Mr. Taylor confirmed that they would like to do that this evening.

Mr. Burke clarified, for the record, that the applicant is going to amend their request down to a variance request for 6' for 24' along the south side and 24' along the west side.

Mr. Norton commented that they could even make it looser as far as total length as opposed to sides. That way it gives the applicant flexibility with the screen location.

**Motion by Mr. Burke, Second by Mr. Bruno**, that the property located at 286 Saddler Rd. be granted a variance of 6' from the maximum allowable 6' privacy fence 10% parameter as shown in section 1163.05 (h1) for the installation of a fence the exact location of which in the backyard to be determined.

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Yeas – Bruno, Gess, Miller, Burke, Norton, Saurman**

**Nays -**

**Excused - Young**

**Motion Passed 6-0**

John Swidrak on behalf of Craig & Lindsay Smotzer 27430 Donald Ave.	John Swidrak, architect for Craig and Lindsay Smotzer, is requesting a variance to section 1153.02- Minimum Front yard (building lines). The building line as established by the existing house is nonconforming and is 36 ft. from the building line. The required building line is 42 ft. from the right of way. The new building line would be 30 ft. for a requested variance of 12 ft. or 29%.
--	---

Mr. Norton introduced the second item on the agenda as 27430 Donald Avenue. He then inquired, of Mr. Tuck-Macalla, if there was a variance granted for the existing home.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla confirmed that there was no variance granted for the original home. It was just built non-conforming. Probably before the setback was established because it looks like the rest of the homes on that street are closer than the 42' to the right of way.

Mr. Bruno remarked that all the setbacks seem to be consistently in line on that section of Donald. He advised that he wants to point out, right away, from his perspective there is a uniqueness character of the lot – as it exists – considering that Cahoon Creek is behind all of these properties on the north. He also wants to point out that there is a cluster home group of homes over there that is the neighborhood. It is interesting to him that these houses on the northwest and west side of Donald, as is curves, over time they have to consider erosion. This is a unique situation from the building line considerations. They do have to have some discussions. First of all, it is existing within that line already and based on the new construction property behind these homes is almost non-existent based on the grade of house and the property as it exists. He offers to the other board members for comments, but has some sympathy for these owners.

Mr. Burke advised that he agrees that the room for expansion is very limited given how the lot falls off the back.

Mr. Bruno added that he mentioned the cluster homes, in particular, because the properties there are graded – rather there is a grade that hides the cluster home aspect and the character to that neighborhood. This is bordering on a mixed use commercial retail zone within the City and there

are valued residential properties on Donald. To maintain residential use on these properties seems to be viable and giving consideration to the challenges that exists behind these properties.

Mr. Burke inquired if the proposed structure would extend into the setback furthest at the front of the proposed garage? And that would be an additional, at most, 6'4"?"

Mr. Tuck-Macalla confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Norton inquired, of Mr. Swidrak, if the stairs that are behind the garage go up to the second floor?

Mr. Swidrak confirmed that from the garage there will be stairs up into the main living floor area, but there is also a staircase that does get up to a loft area above the garage.

Mr. Norton inquired if that will be a new set of steps?

Mr. Swidrak confirmed that there will. That whole garage and master suite addition would all be new. The existing garage would be torn down and a new garage put on there. He appreciates Mr. Bruno's comments about erosion. Building a two story walk out basement type structure on that property in the back works out fantastic, but it becomes an issue when you're dealing with slab on grade and garage parking. That is why they are trying to keep it as forward as they can and obviously not going to the extreme - not any closer than the 30'.

Mr. Norton clarified that the reason he's asking is if you take the walk in closet, the laundry area, and the pantry and reduce those by/push them west 2-3' so that the garage, in effect could move, west 2-3'. It would seem that would still work with the master bedroom complex and still work with the pantry (albeit maybe slightly littler) and closet and laundry area. He can see this as an ideal layout the way it's designed, but given the fact that they are trying to minimize the amount of penetration into the building line - that may be able to be reworked by a couple feet. The applicant can still have the offset for the porch and they could reduce the porch from 8' to 6', which the board has found to be the minimum porch as far as having seating, etc. His point being that the applicant can reduce their request by a couple of feet.

Mr. Swidrak advised that he'd rather not go that direction just yet. They went through different options to keep the garage where it is at and bump out just the porch. As Mr. Norton pointed out there were some plans moved regarding the entrance so they don't come right into the living room. There are some good flow patterns in terms of making it work with the space of the existing house. The reason for bringing it out is because the garage got deeper than the existing garage. Part of the reason for that is the size of garage that is there now doesn't have enough depth to house a bike, lawn mower, two cars, etc. They can only have one parked in there and the other parked in the driveway or the street. When they were trying to get more depth out of that garage to be able to have some storage so they don't have to have one car out of the garage all the time. Further towards the northeast end of the street there are a lot of garages in the back. Mr. Swidrak appreciates that, but as you come into this area - where the back of the lots drop off, they can't get a driveway back there without dropping down. It would be a pretty expensive situation there. That is part of the reason they wanted to keep the garage deep enough to make their flow work. The other thing, with the front porch, the 6' front porches is good for a couple

people sitting and facing out. It doesn't really encourage community and gathering and what porches were intended to do. Hopefully this summer we will be back to that and neighborhoods can get back to normal a little bit. That 8' allows us to do some seating back and forth. If neighbors came over then you could have two couples facing each other. That is why they went with 8' as their minimum porch - he was actually pushing for 10'. That is the jist of their rationale. They did look at different options and if the variance doesn't get approved there are other routes to go.

Mr. Burke remarked that in comparing the footprint of the proposed vs. the existing garage the amount that the proposed garage goes forward is 2' correct?

Mr. Swidrak confirmed that the existing garage is 20' and they are gaining a little bit of space there. There is a laundry tub in the back and the stairs will encroach on any parking area in the back.

Mr. Miller remarked that it looks more significant than 2' if you take a look at the windows where the kitchen sink is. It looks more like 4-6'?

Mr. Burke remarked that he sees what Mr. Miller is saying. He was trying to get an idea of how much forward that is in order to determine what they are talking about as the setback. If that is the most forward part of the structure.

Mr. Gess advised that he thinks that is what Mr. Norton was referencing earlier. The front bedroom is existing and remains in its current spot. The garage used to be in line with that front bedroom. The garage depth relative to itself increased 2', but the front of the garage moved forward 6'-4". It grew 2' and shifted 4'.

Mr. Burke inquired, the above being said, how far is that to the right of way?

Mr. Swidrak replied its 6' difference than what is there now.

Mr. Burke so if the frontage is at 36' now it will go down to 30'.

Mr. Bruno replied that would be correct.

Mr. Swidrak remarked that it's on the radius so technically there is a difference on the north and south side of the garage.

Mr. Norton remarked that this whole street has an unusual character in that it's a blend between commercial and residential and it's a very short street. It starts at one end with a major thoroughfare and commercial building and ends the same way. The nature of the construction along there, particularly because of the curved nature of the street, it's a little hard to get a perspective when you're driving it as to the depth of the houses away from the building line. He doesn't think this is going to stand out as anything unusual because of that character. It wouldn't be too surprising if overtime as many of these houses, which are on the small side, get renovated that this sort of becomes the norm along that one stretch of street.

Mr. Miller remarked that he has a question for Mr. Tuck-Macalla. This property seems to taper over from the back of the home to the front of the home. Are there any side yard setback issues

with the garage moving ahead? Right now the drawing shows that there is a 5' setback from the south property line, but if the garage moves forward into that tapering trapezoid then it is less than 5'.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla advised that he didn't catch that to calculate it earlier. He does believe that it would be encroaching on that side yard setback. He doesn't have a detailed site plan to calculate.

Mr. Swidrak advised that his site plan was taken off of the county information as well. They don't have a full blown survey on it. If it is tapered with the county information versus a survey.

Mr. Miller inquired if Mr. Swidrak could describe for him the walkout condition currently of the existing structure.

Mr. Swidrak replied that on the back side of the house there is a basement that goes down on the north side of the garage and that garage wall which walks out to a patio and down into the backyard. He advised that google earth 3D is helpful to show how it is now.

Mr. Bruno advised that he went by the property to the north and from the west side of the creek and at this time of year he could see very clearly what Mr. Swidrak just described.

Mr. Miller remarked that he is just trying to imagine what additional excavation would be required. If they are pushing back into that drop off area and they've probably extended the back of the home a good 10-12' feet.

Mr. Swidrak replied that it's basically 16' from the back edge of the home itself with the basement. The backside of the garage, which isn't a walkout, you can kind of see how the existing foundation is there. It's in pretty bad shape. They are trying to push that towards the east and get away from the slope. That 4' push to the east.

Mr. Burke referenced the riparian setback issues that they had with a different property in relation to a creek and inquired if there would be any riparian issues with this property?

Mr. Tuck-Macalla replied that there would not be. The riparian is way down the hill.

Mr. Gess remarked that he is understanding that the backyard is going to cause a lot of these homes to consider renovations going forward. He is understanding the uniqueness of that. He is curious, and questioning, because he's looking at google earth and it looks like the plane of the garage is nearly about the same as the plane/in line with the neighbor to the south. The applicant is proposing to go roughly 6.5' forward of their current garage. He is trying to get a perspective of that. It seems like that, relative to the two properties, the houses are close together on that side and 6' seems like a big dramatic change. He understands that there certainly could be some variances in the houses, and there may will be over time, but this seems like a significant adjustment/step in the face of the house of neighbor to neighbor. He thinks a variance should be considered, but he wonders if 2-4' might be more reasonable when considering the other properties.

Mr. Burke remarked that he would concur with those comments.

Mr. Swidrak replied that part of what they looked at, on that side, was how the house is situated. They have a similar situation where the garage is and the driveway is on the left side of the house. The idea of being able to get the cars out of the driveway was something that they were interested in. If a car is parked in front of the driveway another 18'. The goal is to get that out of the view so they're not staring at the side of the car and you can now potentially look down the street. Considering that their view, and main access, was on the other side that was part of the reason they were at a comfort level. He isn't sure if the neighbor would like to chime in, but that was their thought process in proceeding with it.

Ms. Urbas advised that she is the other neighbor to the other side – not who Mr. Swidrak was referring to. They are here to listen because they anticipate being in the same boat at some point. It's less about concern regarding the specifics of the applicants project and more long-term for their neighborhood and potentially themselves since they're in the similar situation.

Mr. Bruno reminded the board of his comments in the beginning of this discussion. Considering that this particular property is facing the Bay Village Project. As they start to encroach on the building line it's not as if they're approaching a residential property, in this particular case, and their neighbor to their south and north per se. Maybe a little bit of a different issue as they get closer to the bend as it curves towards the north east as you enter Donald from the south and you have residential properties across the street. In his opinion, based on where this property is positioned and given the uniqueness, he is less concerned with the building line setback.

Mr. Miller remarked that he thinks the request is significant. He doesn't think it's too much out of character for the street scape in general as Mr. Bruno mentioned in regards to the commercial properties.

Mr. Saurman advised that he completely agrees with what Mr. Bruno said earlier in regards to this being a very unique property with the drop off. There isn't going to be much building out back. The only option for building and expanding is to come up front. He noted that this would be a bit bumped up from the house to the south, but he doesn't think it's a huge difference. He feels there is an inability to much without a variance. He doesn't have a problem with it. He agrees with the comments that someday along there may need to move up and he'd be curious, he doesn't know if anyone has the answer, how much erosion has been occurring over the last 10-30 years.

Mr. Norton replied that it certainly is something that is ongoing. Over time if they go back 50-100 years one could imagine that there was a lot more backyard than is there now.

Mr. Gess advised that he is torn. There is a uniqueness and a justification for a variance, but he is struggling with the 6', but he is listening and taking it all in.

Mr. Miller advised that he'd like to come back to the discussion about the 8' deep porch. He can appreciate that it is community based. He is often the one that strongly advocates for deeper porches, but there are limitations to that arguments. In this case, it is lending to the garage moving forward and pragmatically the connections of the porch roof to the gable of the garage portion. He thinks if the master bedroom/garage rectangle slid back 2' and the porch slid back 2'

he would be very comfortable with that. He thinks a 6' deep porch is ample. He himself has a 5' one, and he does have to step around people to get from one side to another, but there are railings and you can lean up against them. You're also going to have circulation to the front door which is staying in the same spot. He wonders if they couldn't move the rectangle of the garage and master bedroom back in a whole shift. If he could be convinced that some of the existing walls to remain are driving the geometry and position of things he would listen to that.

Mr. Norton commented that if the rectangle, which included the garage going all the way back to the master bedroom, was slid 2' then that could be done by a series of possibilities. The 22' depth of the garage could be reduced, the possibility of the stairs/mudroom/pantry could be shifted west, or some combination could be envisioned so that they could gain 2' along that corridor. Taking all that into consideration instead of allowing a 30' setback we'd say it has to be 32' and then leave it to the design how to buy 2' back out of this. The one impression that he had when he first studied this is that they're putting a lot of house on this lot. The lot itself is big, but the buildable lot the part you can use is really quite small. It is a nice design and he thinks it's going to work wonderfully for these folks, but there might be a little bit of compromise here to shave 2' off the request and they can go to work as to how to get that 2' off to the best advantage.

Mr. Bruno added that then the percentage of variance would be 24%.

Mr. Norton remarked that it would help the whole concept that they wrestle with as far as biting off small chunks to create a variance.

Mr. Swidrak remarked that he has done a lot of houses on Lake Rd. in Bay Village and there is a lot more house on smaller properties. He doesn't think that this is a stretch in terms of that. He does feel that with the layout and having access to the stairs that shifting the whole thing 2' you would then kind of come right in on the corner of furniture and the corner of the room. It is really why they aligned the back wall of the garage with the back wall of the kitchen which is where the existing stairs are. They were hitting the backside of that to keep the circulation. He put a 10' deep porch on his house a year and a half ago, he had a variance for both the porch and addition because it's two separate things in Westlake, and part of the reason he wanted that depth is because when you've got a bunch of little kids and you want to keep an eye on them and they want to ride bikes and be out there you want to have that neighborhood community. Having the extra space to say 'come on and sit down here and we can catch up' and that kind of thing. He knows, as Mr. Miller mentioned having to walk over people, but that may have been an inherited depth – he says if they could start fresh why not add a couple feet and do it the right way? If they do have to slide this back 2' he would really not want to cut down the porch. He would leave that at 8' and shrink the garage and Mr. Smotzer can park the truck in the driveway. The owners are listening and he has a bigger vehicle that he'd like to be able to get it inside.

Mr. Burke commented that it would be unfair to Mr. & Ms. Smotzer to ask them to redesign it tonight. Maybe given the ambivalence there may be some value in tabling this to give the applicants time to redesign. Then if they want to come back and have the board vote on it as is

they can do that or they can come up with a modification that would satisfy some of the concerns that have been expressed.

Mr. Bruno added that he believes the tone of the board is that a 2' modification of the garage, in particular, would be considered a significant modification for everyone for each members to consider. He doesn't want to speak for all, but he is in the favorable camp for even this application, but he wants to make it clear to the architect that a 2' accommodation for a modification would be significant.

Mr. Bruno understanding that you folks would certainly like move your project along. What is your thinking about tabling the application?

The board and applicant discussed possibly tabling the request.

Ms. Smotzer remarked that they are on a time crunch.

Mr. Norton suggested that it seems like the sense that they get is that a reduction of 2' in their request may have a favorable outcome. If they change their request to that and the board voted on it, assuming it was granted, and then the applicant goes back to the design table and can't get the 2' out of there and then they can come back and ask for it back. That would be a significant change. This might help with avoiding the delay.

Mr. Bruno inquired if they would like to amend their request.

Mr. Norton clarified that the request currently is a 6' request and then it would be changed to a 4' request.

Mr. Swidrak inquired if the setback includes the steps to the porch? Are the stairs considered the building line?

Mr. Tuck-Macalla advised that the stairs are not included in the building line.

Mr. Bruno advised that they are asking for a 10' variance from the code setback and a 4' variance from the as currently built setback.

Mr. Tuck-Macalla confirmed that was correct.

Mr. Gess clarified that it may actually be 6'4' not 6' even. He doesn't want them to lose that 4'. He wants to make sure that they've got it right for the motion and be careful they don't lose anything additional unnecessarily.

Board members went on to discuss the specifics of the motion.

**Motion by Mr. Burke, Second by Mr. Gess**, that the property at 27430 Donald Avenue be granted a variance from the front yard setback requirements of 1153.02. The amount of the setback variance is 10' from the code setback, but 4'4" from the setback established by the structure as currently built. This would be subject to the resubmission to the building department of drawings modifying those that are before the board currently.

**Roll Call Vote:**

**Yeas – Saurman, Bruno, Gess, Miller, Burke, Norton**

**Nays -**

**Excused - Young**

**Motion Passed 6-0**

**There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 8:44 p.m.**

---

Jack Norton, Chairman

---

Lauren Oley, Secretary