Town of Indian Trail

P.O. Box 2430
Indian Trail, North Carolina 28079
Telephone 704-821-5401
Fax 704-821-9045

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES
November 19, 2014
6:30 P.M.

Call to Order

Chair Takah began the meeting by introducing the board members, staff, and town attorney to the audience. Chair Takah then explained guideline rules for the hearing. He then called the meeting to order.

Roll Call

The following members of the governing body were present:

Board Members:	Daniel Takah, Tripp Melton, Shirley Howe, Dr. Shamir Ally, and Patrick O'Connor.
Members Present but not Voting:	Robert Thurbon.
Absent:	Tim Rogers, and Christopher Chopelas.
Staff Members:	Rox Burhans- Interim Planning Director, Kevin Icard, Senior Planner, Keith Merritt-Town Attorney, and Pam Good-Board Secretary

Approval of Minutes - September 25th (no meeting in October)

Shirley Howe made a motion to approve minutes - September 25th (no meeting in October), motion seconded by Tripp Melton.
Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Public Hearings-

Chair Takah read the fairness issues to the board members.

- *if they have any interest in the property or the application, or if they own property within a certain distance (e.g., 300 feet) of the property subject to the application;*
- *if they stand to gain or lose any financial benefit as a result of the outcome of the hearing;*
- *whether they can hear and consider the application in a fair and objective manner;*
- *if they have engaged in any ex parte communications with either proponents or opponents of the application, and, if so, they are to place on the record the substance of any such communications so that interested parties have the opportunity at the hearing to rebut the communications.*

Chair Takah proceeded to swear-in all persons, public and staff, that were speaking during the Special Use Permit case.

Staff Icard presented the SUP 2014-004 case. This is a request for a Special Use Permit (SUP) to allow a Horse Stable at 3425 Fincher Road (vacant portion of the lot) also identified as tax parcel ID 07-135-050 and to use parcel's 07-135-050C & 07-135-050F for horse riding/grazing (potentially in future). The SUP subject property consists of three separate parcels and each owner has signed the SUP application. The SUP applicants are members of the same family. This case is the result of Code Enforcement Violation #C806715 (*see attachment #4)*; operating a horse stable in the (SF-1) single family residential district without a Special Use Permit.

Staff Icard stated that the applicants' intent is to clear out certain areas. He presented a power point street view of the current property as well as surrounding areas. The applicants were working on stable but stopped worked on it until approval.

Staff Analysis-
The subject property consists of three lots totaling approximately 7.23acres in size. Parcel 07-135-050 (Lot 1 below) has an existing pasture area housing three horses. Parcel 07-135-050C (Lot 2) contains a single family residence. Parcel 07-135-050F (Lot 3 below) is vacant and is covered with trees. It is the intent of the owner to only house two horses onsite in the foreseeable future with the existing third horse currently being offered for sale. The Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) allows up to 1 horse per acre. In this instance a total of 7 horses could be located on the 7.23 acres that make up the subject property. There is currently a small structure on Lot1 below that is partially built. The owners stopped work on it upon receipt of the above noted NOV. Town permits will be required to complete the structure if the SUP is approved. If the Alsobrooks decide to build a larger barn/stable in the future it would require a Town site plan approval and compliance with the UDO and the conditions of this SUP (if approved).

Site Characteristics *Existing Conditions/Location*: The legal boundaries of this property are unique. As reflected in the map below, one of the subject parcels (Lot 1 below) is divided by Fincher Road. The proposed SUP to permit horses is only associated with the parcels located on the eastern side of Fincher Road. The portions of Lot 1 located on the western side of Fincher Road that contain the Alsobrook's house will not be used for maintaining horses and is not located in the SUP subject property. Approximately 80% of the subject property is wooded. Currently, the horses are located in the area that is cleared and circled in green below. It is the intent of the Alsobrooks to clear limited areas within the site for the horses. *Street View:* The horses are contained by a fence constructed of tree trunks by the owner. A small shelter has also been constructed in the pasture (see photo below). *Outside Regulations:* There are no specific State regulations for housing horses beyond statutes related to general animal welfare and the transporting of horses. When horses are transported they are required to have documentation that states that they have tested negative for Equine Infectious Anemia (EIA) also known as 'swamp fever' by performing the Coggins test which detects if a horse has EIA. This test is typically done on an annual basis by a licensed veterinarian. *Odor and Insects:* During staff's site visit on 10/13/14 there was a detectable odor when standing approximately ten (10') feet from the horses. When staff walked to the opposite side of Fincher Road, approximately sixty (60') feet from the fence, there was no odor detected or the presences of any insects. The owner has stated that an additive is put in the horse's food (food pellets) daily that prevent new flies from generating. The chemical is active in the manure, which helps to prevent the larvae from forming and cuts down on the intensity of the smell emitted. *Disposal of Excrement:* The manure is spread and naturally decomposes into the ground creating a natural fertilizer. By allowing for the additional grazing locations each area will be able to have grass re-grow for future use.

Appraiser's Report

As part of the Town's requirements for an SUP, the applicant is required to submit an impact study to determine whether or not there will be a substantial negative impact on neighboring property values as a result

of the proposed use. The applicant has submitted a report as part of their application prepared by Morrison Appraisal, Inc. The report's findings state that the proposed use of the site for keeping horses will not substantially injure the value of the abutting or adjoining properties. The report was initially dated October 3, 2014. After the initial submittal the applicant wanted to expand the scope of the Special Use Permit to address all properties under family ownership. The appraiser submitted a revised Impact Study with the updated parcels. The expanded document was submitted on November 3, 2014 stating there was no negative impact on the adjacent properties.

Plan Consistency This property is part of the Austin Village Plan, as shown on the Indian Trail Comprehensive Plan and is designated for future medium density residential uses. The area itself is currently low density and consists of larger lot single family homes. Based on analysis of this use, staff is of the opinion that the proposed use is in harmony with the surrounding area based on the following goals:

- **Land Use and Housing Goal No. 1**:*Promote a mix of different types of land uses within each village, and avoidpotential land use conflicts between neighboring properties and surrounding municipalities.*
- **Quality of Life Goal No. 2***: Provide and support cultural amenities that preserve and expand the town's heritage.*

The use of the subject property for the keeping of horses helps to maintain Indian Trail's rural/agricultural heritage in a way that is compatible with adjacent residential properties. The proposal will comply with all applicable requirements of the UDO and any supplementary SUP conditions, which include limits on the number of horses permitted on a property and will minimize any potential land use conflicts.

Required Findings Under **UDO Section 360.080**, the Board of Adjustment, when considering whether to approve an application for a special use permit, shall review and evaluate the following:

1. **Whether the application is complete.** Staff is of the opinion that the application for SUP2014-004 is complete.
2. **The Board will consider whether the application complies with all of the applicable requirements of this ordinance.** If an SUP approval is granted by the Board, it is staff's opinion that the proposal will comply will all applicable UDO requirements. The applicant has indicated they will comply with the requirement limiting horses to no more than one animal per acre of land.

3. **If the Board of Adjustment concludes that all such requirements are met, it will issue the permit unless it adopts a motion to deny the application for one or more of the reasons set forth in UDO Section 360.030. Such a motion will propose specific findings, based upon the evidence submitted, justifying such a conclusion.** Under **UDO Section 360.030**, the Board of Adjustment must make these required considerations of public health, safety, and welfare. The Board of Adjustment's authority in the review of this Special Use Permit application is broad and the Board may approve with conditions if it concludes, based upon the information submitted at the hearing, that the proposed development will:

    1. **Not materially endanger the public health or safety; and**
    2. **Not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property; and**
    3. **Be in harmony with the area in which it is to be located; and**
    4. **Be in general conformity with the Town of Indian Trail Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans.** If one of these findings cannot be made, then the Board must move to deny the special use permit request, stating for the record why the Board has decided to do so.

Recommendation If the Board is of the opinion that the above required findings can be made to approve the project, staff recommends the site be subject to the following conditions, along with the Board's approval of the special use permit:

1. No signage is allowed on the exterior of the site; and
2. The applicant will comply with all applicable sections of the UDO including UDO Section 7110 that limits the number of horses to no more than one animal per acre of land; and
3. A Town permit will be obtained for the existing horse barn/structure within 14-days of SUP approval. Town permits will be obtained by the applicant for any future improvements to the site (i.e. removal of trees, fences, new structures, etc.). Any required permits from applicable outside agencies shall also be obtained; and
4. Any areas cleared in the future for corralling grazing, and/or trails will maintain a minimum undisturbed area of twenty five (25') feet from any property line or public right of way. Staff Icard concluded his presentation and allowed questions from the board.

Member Melton asked what is the acreage of the area where the green circle was located on the power point. Staff Icard answered that it was approximately 1 acre.

Member O'Connor asked if the applicant chooses to add more horses in the future, up to 7, they won't have to get approval. Staff Icard agreed. Member O'Connor asked if the applicant must go before the tree board for tree removal. Staff Icard answered that it is not required with residential properties. He also added that in the draft conditions, if the applicant wants to clear some land, they will submit a site plan and Staff will work with them to advice the best plan of action. Member O'Connor asked about the barn structure.
Staff Icard replied that the structure would be handled on an administrative level.

Member Howe asked about the tests performed on horses in transit and what tests are run if they are not travelling. Staff Icard advised to ask the question to the applicant when they come forward to speak.

Member Ally asked why there is a draft condition of no signage. Staff Icard stated because of residential areas surrounding it.

The applicant, Tracy Alsobrooks, of 3507 Fincher Road came to the podium.
She stated the vet had been to the property to perform the needed test on the horse she is trying to sell. She provided written proof that the test was performed to each of the board members. Mrs. Alsobrooks described the horses as pets kept on the fenced in lot that was stage one of the progress that she wants to do with the property.

The building is temporary and when they received the notice, they stopped building. A street light is inside the pasture for extra security. The horses are handled, worked with, tended to every day. The fence is in good condition. The majority of the presented area will be for the horses. Mrs. Alsobrooks stated that they won't clear all the trees, as they are a natural protection for them when outside. The fencing planned for the future, will be a combination of natural wood and barbless wire; 3 to 4 levels high.
She also stated that she didn't realize a special use permit was required to put the horses on their property.
Member Howe asked if the applicant has any intentions of adding or boarding horses in the future.
Mrs. Alsobrooks answered no.

Clarence Alsobrooks Jr. of 3507 Fincher Rd. stepped forward to speak. The property is his family's land and the horses add beauty to the area. He stated that they wouldn't exceed the required maximum of 7 horses. He also mentioned that he did ask permission of area neighbors. He has no intention of selling land, as it is family land. He doesn't want to develop it.

Member Melton asked if it was recreational decision rather than business.
Mr. Alsobrooks answered that is correct.

Member Ally asked what hardship will this create for the applicants' family if the request is not approved.
Mr. Alsobrooks answered that they want to keep the horses close to family. The family is very attached to the horses. Also, people who drive by will lose the view.

Chair Takah asked Staff if all neighbors officially notified about this SUP.
Staff Icard replied that all property owners within 400 ft of all three properties were notified.

Chair Takah closed the public portion of the hearing. He read the three conditions for approval of a special use permit application approval.

1. Whether the application is complete.
Member Melton made a motion that the application was complete. Seconded by Member Ally. Vote was unanimous.
2. Whether the application that complies with all applicable ordinances.
Motion to approve by Ally, seconded by O'Connor. Vote was unanimous.
3. Does the ordinance comply with all the applicable requirements of this ordinance.
Motion to approve by Ally, subject to the draft conditions as presented by staff, seconded by Melton. Vote was unanimous.

Findings of Fact-
The board spent time writing Findings of Fact on the provided worksheets.
#1. Not materially endanger the public health or safety; and
Member Howe stated that the horses are fenced in a safe place, have the necessary veterinarian checkups, and using a chemical in the manure to eliminate vermin. She made a motion this meets requirement#1. Seconded by Ally. Vote was unanimous.

#2. Not substantially injure the value of adjoining or abutting property; and

Member Melton stated that due to the impact study done by Morrison Appraisal, made a motion that #2 is true. Seconded by Shirley Howe. Vote was unanimous.

#3. Be in harmony in the area to which it is located; and
Member Ally made a motion that it was, and that neighbors concurred that horses were a positive addition. Seconded by Melton. Vote was unanimous.

#4. Be in general conformity with the Town's Comprehensive Plan and other adopted plans.
Chair Takah made the motion to agree that it is in conformity but stated with four conditions that Staff presented. Seconded by Melton. Vote was unanimous.

The request for SUP2014-004 was approved.

VAR2014-003 Moore Lot 22 Frontier Circle Front Setback - Patsy Moore the property owner of Lot 22 on Frontier Circle (Parcel 07-117-055) is requesting a variance for relief from the front setback requirement for the construction of a single family residence.

Chair Takah re-opened the public hearing for the second case.
The seven signed-in speakers and presenting staff were sworn in.

Staff Icard presented power point of site summary of case VAR2014-003.
This request is for relief of the forty foot front setback associated with Section 510.040 of the UDO, which provides regulations for lot size, density and setback standards within the Town.
510.040 Lot Size, Density, Setback and Height Table The front setback for the SF-1 District is consistent with the approved Moore's Park subdivision when it was initially created. One difference is that the SF-1 District allows for a fifteen (15') foot side setback verses a twenty (20') foot side setback that is required in the Moore's Park subdivision.
Plan Consistency The subject property is located within the Old Monroe Village Plan of the Comprehensive Plan, which is a Suburban Mix Village. This project is consistent with Comprehensive Plan goal 2.3.2 Land Use and Housing.
Land Use and Housing No. 3*: Improve existing Indian Trail neighborhoods to create strong and vibrant communities.*
The construction of a new single-family home on an infill lot within an established Indian Trail neighborhood will increase investment in the neighborhood and help contribute to its overall viability.

Required Findings Under UDO Chapter 380, the Board of Adjustment, when considering whether to approve an application for a variance request, shall review and evaluate the following:

1. **Whether the permit is in the Town's Jurisdiction according to the table of permissible uses:**
   The subject property is within the Town's jurisdiction to regulate single-family residential uses and its accessory uses.
2. **Whether the application is complete.**
   Staff is of the opinion that the application for VAR2014-003 is complete.
3. **The Board will consider whether the application complies with all of the applicable requirements of this ordinance.**
   The facts show that VAR 2014-003 would not be in compliance with the front setback requirements set forth by the Unified Development Ordinance, however, the subject application is for a Variance to these requirements. If approved, the proposal will comply will all applicable sections of the Unified Development Ordinance.

FINDINGS OF FACT
Under UDO Section 380.020, the Board of Adjustment must make these required considerations of public health, safety, and welfare. The Board of Adjustment's authority in the review of this variance application is broad and the Board may approve with conditions if it concludes, based upon the information submitted at the hearing, that the proposed request finds that:

1. Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance. It shall not be necessary to demonstrate that, in the absence of the variance, no reasonable use can be made of the property, and

2. The hardship results from conditions that are peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography. Hardships resulting from personal circumstances, as well as hardships resulting from conditions that are common to the neighborhood or the general public, may not be the basis for granting a variance; and

3. The hardship did not result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner. The act of purchasing property with knowledge that circumstances exist that may justify the granting of a variance shall not be regarded as self-created hardship; *and*

4. The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose and intent of the ordinance, such that public safety is secured and substantial justice is achieved; *and*

5. The variance will neither result in the extension of a nonconforming situation in violation of DIVISION 1400, Nonconformities nor authorize the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.

If one of these findings cannot be made, then the Board must move to deny the variance request, stating for the record why the Board has decided to do so. If the Board is of the opinion that the above required findings can be made to approve the variance, staff recommends the site be subject to the following conditions:

1. A zoning permit is applied for including the proposed elevation of the home for review and approval; and
2. All necessary permits must be obtained from Union County Building Code Enforcement Department and any other outside agencies; and
3. Potential tree save areas along the sides and possibly at the front of the home to lessen the impact of the home being placed at a twenty-five foot setback verse a forty foot setback.

Summary

The Town has provided its analysis of this variance request in the above staff report, and now offers this into the record for the Board's consideration.

Member Howe asked if the sewer line was exposed. Staff Icard stated that it was placed there to help and was not in power point, only in the paper handout.

Member O'Connor asked if in moving back 40 ft, how close is that to the stream itself?

Staff Icard replied that the red line represented the back corner of the house.

Member O'Connor asked if they could move it up further away to avoid that.

Public portion

Patsy Moore of 111 Frontier Circle. Moore Park was developed in the mid-70s, and governed by the county at that time. Each builder picked their home spot. She has a prospective buyer who wants to build home on lot 22 and is requesting a variance for it. Lot 21 was taken by union county and ran a sewage line in it. She would give that to the potential buyer to add to lot 22 for a wider frontage. She spoke about the stream in the area and shouldn't be a concern. She requested that 15 feet variance would help the potential buyer to be able to build on the property.

Joe Campbell at 111 Frontier Circle yielded his time.

Victoria Mackey at 140 Frontier, Lot 36 came forward to speak and distributed photos of the neighborhood. She stated that 80% of people of Moore's Park signed petition are not in favor of a variance. (attachment 2). 6 families of the 27 homes did not sign the petition, 2 of which are property owners with lots for sale.
She also stated that homes in the pictures are not built close to the road. Ms. Mackey was ok with building a house on that lot, it is just not very desirable lot because of the steep embankment and has been for sale for ome time. She talked about the stream that does get large at times and does not feel that the setback should be changed from 40 feet to 25 feet in order for the lot to be able to be sold. She stated that Ms. Moore helped develop the perimeters that the rest of the neighborhood had to abide by. Ms. Mackey stated four commons

themes emerged when speaking with neighbors.

1. They liked the way the neighborhood looked and want a congruent neighborhood
2. If a variance is granted to this lot, it sets a precedent for other variances in the future.
3. If we have to live by the perimeters that the applicant set, then she needs to abide by them, too.
4. If the buyer wants to buy the lot, let them bear the extra expenses of building on the lot or let the seller discount the property so the buyer is willing to take it as is.

Member Melton asked Ms. Mackey when you bought land from the Moores, were you told you had to have 40 foot setback. Ms. Mackey answered that they were told conditions of building there. It was like an informal HOA. Member Melton asked if there was anything in writing? Attorney Merritt answered that the setbacks were in place as set by the Town.

Attorney cautioned board about witness can only testify about their own home value, not anyone else.

Karen Smith, of 116 Frontier Circle purchased lot 35 as the first lot of Moore's Park. She stated she is not against the sale of the property but doesn't support the variance because of concern how it would affect property values, neighborhood aesthetics, and approving this variance will set a precedence for someone in the future to get a variance if they have a perceived hardship. Ms. Smith doesn't see that a house can't be built. Covenants and restrictions were put in place. Even with the expired covenant, the integrity has remained in the neighborhood in Moore's Park. She would like that to continue.

Andy Moore of 4900 Pioneer Ln. There is a covenant of restrictions that was renewed in 2001 for an additional 20 years. He didn't see the variance as a detriment or loss of property value. He feels she is entitled to it and that 15 feet is just a "free throw".

Chair Takah questioned him why the potential buyer didn't buy the property then come to the board and ask for variance. Mr. Moore answered that he didn't know but that Patsy had a right to sell.

Member Melton asked Patsy Moore if she has a buyer? Mr. Andy Moore answered that a representative of the buyer was there at the meeting.

Member Howe asked how many lots are left to sell. Mr. Moore answered that less than 5 lots are available by the Moore family.

Russell Wing of 6701 Creft Circle in Lake Park. He was representing the buyer who presently lives in Savannah. Mr. Wing stated that the 40 ft setback is definitely at the floodplan. To put the foundation there is very expensive to do and to get a home mortgage in the future, you can't get a loan if any of the home is in a flood plane. The reason the potential buyer didn't come in, he was of the understanding the setback was 25 foot. When they found out it was 40 foot, they asked the seller to obtain a variance before the due diligence period was up. He doesn't feel it will affect the property value of the neighborhood.

Member Melton does buyer already have building plans. Will the buyer's plans go forward if variance isn't granted. Mr.Wing stated that the buyer will be out.

Member Melton asked how large of a house; will it fit in the neighborhood.
Mr. Wing answered yes it will at least be the minimum size of the covenant in effect and looking at the home they are selling it will be a really nice home.
Member Melton asked if a person had to build a home without the variance, would they be able to build a

home large enough to meet the requirements of the neighborhood. Mr. Wing answered that the flood plane is the problem. You could build big, tall house but wouldn't have a backyard.

Lewis Branch of 110 Frontier Circle and said he has walked the lot and determined it unbuildable. To maintain the 40 foot setback, you'd be building in a creek. Moving the house 25 feet forward you won't have any parking space and will have to park in the road. The lot beside me is for sale but creek has, at times, come up to Pioneer Ln which is 5 feet high or more.

Patsy Moore stated they paid engineers to reengineer and do the sewer line.
She also added that 4 lots are left to sell that are connected to the sewage line.

Joey Gambell of 4321 Briarclift Dr. is representing Ms. Moore as a selling agent. Trees are a natural buffer. This is not affecting the aesthetics of neighborhood.

Staff Icard added an item from the power point to be read into the minutes.
If the Board is of the opinion that the above required findings can be made to approve the variance, staff recommends the site be subject to the following conditions:

1. A zoning permit is applied for including the proposed elevation of the home for review and approval; and
2. All necessary permits must be obtained from Union County Building Code Enforcement Department and any other outside agencies; and
3. Potential tree save areas along the sides and possibly at the front of the home to lessen the impact of the home being placed at a twenty-five foot setback verse a forty foot setback.

Chair Takah closed the public portion of the hearing. He reminded the board that with a variance, the board must have four fifths to approve.

Variance requirements:
1. Is the property in the Town's jurisdiction.
Member Howe made the motion to approve, seconded by Melton, vote was unanimous.
2. Is the application complete.
Member Ally made the motion to approve, seconded by Howe, vote was unanimous.

Several moments of silence followed while board wrote their Findings of Facts worksheets.
Findings of Fact
1. ***Unnecessary hardship would result from the strict application of the ordinance; and***
Motion by Ally for the reason of interest of those buying and wanting to build. Seconded by Melton. Vote was unanimous.

2. ***Hardship results from conditions peculiar to the property, such as location, size, or topography; and***
Motion by Melton for the reason of the extreme slope in the back.
Seconded by Ally. Vote was unanimous.

3. *Hardship was not as result from actions taken by the applicant or the property owner.*
Motion by Ally that it was the natural condition of the topography.
Seconded by Melton. Vote was unanimous.

4. ***The requested variance is consistent with the spirit, purpose, and intent of the ordinance, such that***

public safety is secured and substantial justice is achieved; and
Motion by Melton that it is in with spirit of the ordinance and public safety is not a concern.
Seconded by Ally. Ayes- Melton, Ally, O'Connor Nayes- Takah, Howe

5. ***The variance will neither result in the extension of a nonconforming situation in violation of Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) Division 1400 nor authorize the initiation of a nonconforming use of land.***
Motion by Ally, seconded by O'Connor. Vote was unanimous.

Board returned to Variance Requirement Condition #3 to vote.
Does the application comply with all the applicable requirements of this ordinance?
Motion in the affirmative by Ally, Seconded by Melton. Vote was unanimous.

Attorney Merritt stated the results were inconsistent and the board will need to re-vote.

Board then needed to re-discuss Finding of Fact #4 as two of the board members voted no and it was inconsistent with the vote of Variance Condition #3 vote.
Chair Takah felt it was inconsistent with the spirit, purpose and intent of the ordinance. Member Howe felt she couldn't ignore the amount of people that signed the petition and have investment around this property. She felt the land could be used but not with such a big house.
Member Melton stated that there is no HOA and there are a variety of setbacks in the neighborhood. It was his opinion that they would be able to build a larger house with the variance and more in compliance in what is presently in the neighborhood.

Staff Burhans asked if a submitted petition can be considered if the persons aren't in attendance.

Mr. Merritt answered that no one objected to the admission of it so the board can take that under consideratic

Member Ally stated he based his decision on the expertise of staff's recommendation.

Staff Burhans clarified that staff does not provide a recommendation, pro or con, on variance cases. Staff strictly provides facts. If the board decides to approve, staff suggest potential conditions for them to consider.

Attorney Merritt added that Staff is required to present the cases. They don't have choices whether or not they are brought before the board for consideration.

The re-vote on Variance Requirement #3. Whether the application complies with all the applicable requirements. With respect to the previous motion that was made the re-vote was:
Ally, Melton, O'Connor- ayes. Takah, Howe- opposed.

Because the vote requires four fifths, the variance was denied.

Adjournment- the meeting adjourned at 8:50PM

Chairman: Daniel Takah

Secretary: Pamela L Sood