

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

Springfield, Ohio

Wednesday, January 23, 2019

7:00 P.M.

City Forum, City Hall

Meeting Minutes

(Summary format)

Chairperson Dori Gaier called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Mathew Ryan, Mr. Mark Brown, Ms. Jeannette Anderson, Ms. Rhonda Zimmers, Mr. James Burkhardt and Ms. Dori Gaier

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Denise Williams

OTHERS PRESENT: Stephen Thompson, Planning, Zoning, and Code Administrator
Cheyenne Pinkerman, Community Development Specialist.

* * * * *

SUBJECT: Approval December 17, 2018 meeting minutes.

Ms. Gaier asked if the board had any corrections to add to the minutes.

Ms. Gaier asked the board members to voice yes if they were in favor of approving the minutes. Members voiced yes.

Ms. Gaier asked if any opposed to voice nay. Hearing none, Ms. Gaier stated the minutes stand approved.

SUBJECT: Case #19-A-01 request from 1885 W First St LLC for a conditional use for a self-storage use at 1885 W First St in a CC-2, Community Commercial District.

Ms. Gaier stated that the public hearing was now open and asked for Mr. Thompson to read the staff report.

Mr. Thompson gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to establish a self-storage facility. The building is the former Target. There will be no exterior changes to the property and the storage units will all be indoors.

ANALYSIS for Conditional Use:

In considering an application for a conditional use, the Board shall give due regard to the nature and condition of all adjacent uses and structures, and the consistency therewith of the proposed use and development. Before authorizing a use as a conditional use, the Board shall review the facts and circumstances of each proposed conditional use in terms of the following standards and shall find adequate evidence showing that the proposed conditional use at the proposed location:

- (1) Would not be hazardous, harmful, noxious, offensive or a nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood by reason of noise, smoke, odor, vibration, dust and dirt, cinders, noxious gases, glare and heat, fire and safety hazards, sewage wastes and pollution, transportation and traffic, aesthetic and psychological effects. The Board shall use and give recognition to those performance standards which are available in model codes or ordinances, or have been developed by planning, manufacturing, health, architectural and engineering organizations, and can be applied to the proposed use, to assist it in reaching a fair and objective decision;

Staff Comment: It would not.

- (2) Is in fact a conditional use as established under the provisions of this Springfield Zoning Code as eligible to be permitted in the district involved;

Staff Comment: Yes.

- (3) Will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives, or with any specific objective of this Springfield Zoning Code;

Staff Comment: Yes.

- (4) Will be designed, constructed, operated and maintained as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that the use will not change the essential character of the same area;

Staff Comment: Yes.

- (5) Will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools, or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such services;

Staff Comment: Yes.

- (6) Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community;

Staff Comment: It would not.

(7) Will have vehicular approaches to the property, which shall be so designed as not to create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares. Upon authorizing a conditional use, the Board shall impose such requirements and conditions with respect to location, construction, maintenance and operation, in addition to those expressly stipulated in this Springfield Zoning Code for the particular conditional use, as the Board may deem necessary for the protection of adjacent properties and the public interest.

Staff Comment: Yes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval of the conditional use permit.

Ms. Gaier asked if the board had any questions for Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Gaier asked if the board had any further questions. Hearing none, Ms. Gaier asked if there was anyone else that wished to speak at that time. Hearing no further discussion, Ms. Gaier asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION: Mr. Burkhardt made a motion to close the public hearing. Seconded by Ms. Zimmers. Approval by voice vote.

Ms. Gaier stated that the public hearing was now closed and asked for a motion to approve Case #19-A-01.

MOTION: Motion by Ms. Anderson to approve Case #19-A-01 Request from 1885 W First St LLC for a conditional use for a self-storage use at 1885 W First St in a CC-2, Community Commercial District. Seconded by Mr. Ryan.

Hearing no further discussion or questions, the Board determined the following findings of facts:

1. It is a good use of a vacant building.
2. It is a good fit for the area.
3. There are no objections from surrounding neighbors

YAYS: Mr. Ryan, Mr. Brown, Mr. Burkhardt, Ms. Anderson, Ms. Zimmers, and Ms. Gaier.
Nays: None.

Motion Approved 6 to 0

SUBJECT: Case #19-A-02 & #19-A-03 Request from GPD Group for variances from Chapter 1136.09(g) & 1136.09(m) to allow for a cell tower of 195 feet tall and within the required setback from a property line at 635 Leffel Lane in a Township I-1, Light Industrial District.

Ms. Gaier stated that the public hearing was now open and asked for Mr. Thompson to read the staff report.

Mr. Thompson gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting variances from Chapter 1136.09(g) and 1136.09(m) to construct a new cell tower within the required setback from property lines and to a height of 195 feet. Chapter 1136.09(g) states towers shall not exceed 190 feet in overall height. The proposed tower will exceed this limit by five feet or 2.6%

Chapter 1136.09(m) states the setback from property lines shall be the same as the height of the tower, plus 25%. The proposed tower will be setback approximately 55 feet from I-70 and 76 feet from the property line to the west. That parcel is owned by the same owner as the parcel the tower will be located. The applicant states they have worked with ODOT on sites where towers are in close proximity to state highways.

ANALYSIS for Variance:

The Board may grant a variance only where there exists a “practical difficulty” as defined by the courts in Ohio in established case law. The Ohio Supreme Court’s decision in Kisil v. City of Sandusky, (1984) 12 Ohio State 3d 30, is a land mark decision in establishing common law governing variances by distinguishing between “use” and “area variances.” Area variances involve an exception from such requirements as yard, lot, and height standards. The Supreme Court established that a practical difficulty must exist before an area variance can be granted.

Then subsequent to this case, in Duncan v. Village of Middlefield, (1986) 23 Ohio 3d 83, the Ohio Supreme Court more fully explained the practical difficulty standards. The factors to be considered and weighed in determining whether a property owner seeking a variance has encountered a practical difficulty in the use of his/her property include, but are not limited to:

1. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;

Staff Comment: Yes.

2. Whether the variance is substantial;

Staff Comment: No. The additional five feet in height accounts for 2.6% of the overall height.

3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;

Staff Comment: No.

4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of government services (e.g., water, sewer);

Staff Comment: *No.*

5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restrictions;

Staff Comment: *The owner owned the property prior to this application.*

6. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance; or

Staff Comment: *No.*

7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Staff Comment: *Yes.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for a variance from Chapter 1136.09(g) to allow for a cell tower of 195 feet tall.

1. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;

Staff Comment: *Yes.*

2. Whether the variance is substantial;

Staff Comment: *Yes. However, the same property owner owns the property to the west and the applicant is working with ODOT.*

3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;

Staff Comment: *No.*

4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of government services (e.g., water, sewer);

Staff Comment: *No.*

5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restrictions;

Staff Comment: The owner owned the property prior to this application...

6. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance; or

Staff Comment: No.

7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Staff Comment: Yes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Approval for variance from Chapter 1136.09(m) to allow for a cell tower within the required setback from a property line.

Ms. Gaier asked if the board had any questions for Mr. Thompson.

Ms. Zimmers asked if Mr. Thompson could show the property to the west on the map.

Mr. Ryan questioned if there were any other towers in the city that had a similar variance for the setback.

Mr. Thompson stated he was unaware of any other towers with the setback. Mr. Thompson explained the regulations went into effect in 2012 and the tower in question would be the first one under the new code. Mr. Thompson explained he would assume towers in the city would have a similar set back but they were put up before 2012.

Mr. Ryan questioned if the applicant had permission from the Ohio Department of Transportation to build so close to interstate 70.

Mr. Thompson stated the applicant would be able to answer the question.

Mr. Gaier asked if the board had any further questions for Mr. Thompson. Hearing none, Ms. Gaier asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Brad Locker, GPD Group, 1801 Watermark Dr. Columbus, OH 43215, explained there was no direct discussion with ODOT and in most circumstances they do not need their permission. Mr. Locker stated he printed out maps along I-70 that show two similar towers with the same setbacks. Mr. Locker stated one tower was approximately seventy feet from the parcel line and

the other was around twenty five feet. Mr. Locker explained the tower in question would be around fifty five feet from the parcel line. Mr. Locker explained that the towers may be built before 2012.

Ms. Zimmers questioned where the fence would be located.

Mr. Locker explained the fence would be around their lease area only. Mr. Locker explained it would be ninety eight feet by ninety eight feet.

Ms. Gaier asked if there were any further questions for the applicant. Hearing none, Ms. Gaier asked if there was anyone else that wished to speak. Hearing no further discussion, Ms. Gaier asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION: Ms. Zimmers made a motion to close the public hearing. Seconded by Ms. Anderson. Approval by voice vote.

Ms. Gaier stated that the public hearing was now closed and asked for a motion to approve Case #19-A-02.

MOTION: Motion by Mr. Burkhardt to approve Case # 19-A-02 request from GPD Group for variances from Chapter 1136.09(g) & 1136.09(m) to allow for a cell tower of 195 feet tall and within the required setback from a property line at 635 Leffel Lane in a Township I-1, Light Industrial District. Seconded by Ms. Anderson.

Hearing no further discussion or questions, the Board determined the following findings of facts:

1. It fits well in the area.
2. It is a minimal variance.
3. It will result in better reception for the surrounding area.

VOTE:

YAYS: Mr. Ryan, Mr. Brown, Mr. Burkhardt, Ms. Anderson, Ms. Zimmers and Ms. Gaier

NAYS: None.

Motion Approved 6 to 0

MOTION: Ms. Zimmers made a motion to close the public hearing. Seconded by Ms. Anderson. Approval by voice vote.

Ms. Gaier stated that the public hearing was now closed and asked for a motion to approve Case #19-A-03.

MOTION: Motion by Ms. Zimmers to approve Case # 19-A-03 request from GPD Group for variances from Chapter 1136.09(g) & 1136.09(m) to allow for a cell tower of 195 feet tall and

within the required setback from a property line at 635 Leffel Lane in a Township I-1, Light Industrial District. Seconded by Ms. Anderson.

Hearing no further discussion or questions, the Board determined the following findings of facts:

1. It is a good use of the land.
2. There are no objections.
3. It will result in better reception for the surrounding area.

VOTE:

YAYS: Mr. Ryan, Mr. Brown, Mr. Burkhardt, Ms. Anderson, Ms. Zimmers and Ms. Gaier

NAYS: None.

Motion Approved 6 to 0

SUBJECT: Case #19-A-04 Request from Douglas Carpenter for a conditional use for a community center use at 241 S Plum St. in a CN-2, UPOD, Neighborhood Commercial District, Unified Plan Overlay District.

Ms. Gaier stated that the public hearing was now open and asked for Mr. Thompson to read the staff report.

Mr. Thompson gave the staff report.

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit to establish a community center use. The applicant states he wants to start an orphanage to house children and have a community center to counsel parents.

The CN-2 district does not permit any kind of use for which an orphanage can fit into. Counseling parents can be considered a community center use. The current house would require an architect or engineer to submit building plans for commercial use. The extent to which renovations would be needed are unknown. Any new structure built on the vacant lot would require the same and be subject to the standards of the Unified Plan Overlay district. Building plans have not been submitted.

ANALYSIS for Conditional Use:

In considering an application for a conditional use, the Board shall give due regard to the nature and condition of all adjacent uses and structures, and the consistency therewith of the proposed use and development. Before authorizing a use as a conditional use, the Board shall review the facts and circumstances of each proposed conditional use in terms of the following standards and shall find adequate evidence showing that the proposed conditional use at the proposed location:

- (1) Would not be hazardous, harmful, noxious, offensive or a nuisance to the surrounding neighborhood by reason of noise, smoke, odor, vibration, dust and dirt, cinders, noxious gases, glare and heat, fire and safety hazards, sewage wastes and pollution, transportation and traffic, aesthetic and psychological effects. The Board shall use and give recognition to those performance standards which are available in model codes or ordinances, or have been developed by planning, manufacturing, health, architectural and engineering organizations, and can be applied to the proposed use, to assist it in reaching a fair and objective decision;

Staff Comment: *It would not.*

- (2) Is in fact a conditional use as established under the provisions of this Springfield Zoning Code as eligible to be permitted in the district involved;

Staff Comment: *A community center is a conditional use.*

- (3) Will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives, or with any specific objective of this Springfield Zoning Code;

Staff Comment: *Unknown.*

- (4) Will be designed, constructed, operated and maintained as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that the use will not change the essential character of the same area;

Staff Comment: *Unknown.*

- (5) Will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools, or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such services;

Staff Comment: *Yes.*

- (6) Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community;

Staff Comment: *It will not.*

- (7) Will have vehicular approaches to the property, which shall be so designed as not to create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares. Upon authorizing a conditional use, the Board shall impose such requirements and conditions with respect to location, construction, maintenance and operation, in addition to those expressly stipulated in this Springfield Zoning Code for the particular conditional use, as the Board may deem necessary for the protection of adjacent properties and the public interest.

Staff Comment: Yes.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Denial of the conditional use permit.

Ms. Gaier asked if the board had any questions for Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Ryan questioned if the conditional use is acceptable, why was the city recommending denial.

Mr. Thompson explained there were several concerns from the chief building official about the condition of the structure and concerns from neighbors in the area.

Ms. Zimmers questioned if there were any other type of facilities like the one in question, in residential areas.

Mr. Thompson explained there were a couple that had similar uses.

Ms. Anderson questioned if the home for orphans would be considered completely different from a community center.

Mr. Thompson stated it would be different from Ms. Anderson's case because her structure was a commercial structure. Mr. Thompson explained any type of assembly use where people can assemble is consider a community center under the building code. Mr. Thompson explained there were substantial renovations needed to be up to code.

Ms. Zimmers questioned if any plans had been submitted.

Mr. Thompson stated there were no plans submitted. Mr. Thompson explained staff was unsure how extensive the work would need to be to bring the structure up to code.

Ms. Gaier questioned if the board was approving a community center and outreach and not an orphanage.

Mr. Thomson state that was correct. Mr. Thompson explained the applicant wanted to apply for that but orphanages or any type of use like that was not permitted in the district. Mr. Thompson explained community center would be the only possible conditional use permitted.

Ms. Zimmers questioned if residents would be staying there or if they would just go there for counseling.

Mr. Thompson stated that was correct, the structure could not be used for any kind of dwelling and no one would be permitted to stay there that was not a permanent resident of the house.

Mr. Gaier asked if the board had any further questions for Mr. Thompson. Hearing none, Ms.

Gaier asked if the applicant would like to speak.

Douglas Carpenter, 241 South Plum St. Springfield, OH, explained he had another lot that he would like to build a new house on. Mr. Carpenter explained he was trying to get things started so they do not go back to aborting children. Mr. Carpenter explained there had been five others opened. Mr. Carpenter explained he understood the house was not in good condition but could be fixed up. Mr. Carpenter stated he wanted to build a new house to put the orphans in eventually. Mr. Carpenter explained he had to start small. Mr. Carpenter explained he had been working with Wright Pat Credit Union to build a place similar to Walt Disney Land. Mr. Carpenter explained he had been trying to get funding from different companies to help pay for it. Mr. Carpenter explained he wanted to keep kids out of trouble and give parents an opportunity. Mr. Carpenter explained he was interested in purchasing land on the outside of town to build something similar to Walt Disney Land. Mr. Carpenter stated in time they would have everything they needed to save the babies from being aborted. Mr. Carpenter stated if the city had houses everywhere and they could be fixed up. Mr. Carpenter stated his house could be the counseling center.

Mr. Ryan stated in the business plan it said the target market would be minors age zero to 18.

Mr. Carpenter stated the children are collected from the guardians at the age of newborn and older to protect them. Mr. Carpenter stated the hospital helps as well.

Mr. Ryan explained the application did not state that the residence would be used to house people and asked if that was correct.

Mr. Carpenter stated the residence would be used to help people and they would get donations to do the other stuff.

Ms. Anderson questioned if the community center would be open full time and asked what the hours would be.

Mr. Carpenter stated that was correct. Mr. Carpenter stated the residence would help kids get on the right track. Mr. Carpenter explained that he wanted to get donations to build the structure on the other lot and open the park. Mr. Carpenter explained that he wanted to get people together as a community to help take the kids back from the drugs lords and bad people. Mr. Carpenter explained he wanted to also help the other kids to live and grow up to be adopted and make the right choices instead of abortion. Mr. Carpenter explained the girls that want to keep their babies could go to the youth center and work. Mr. Carpenter explained the girls that do not want to keep their babies would be taken care of at the orphanage and eventually be adopted out. Mr. Carpenter explained the hospital takes care of them and then John takes them to the orphanage to be taken care of and adopted out.

Ms. Zimmers asked who John was.

Mr. Carpenter stated John was his lawyer and his name was Mr. John Jurgens. Mr. Carpenter

explained John did all the legal papers for him to make sure everything works out and stops abortion. Mr. Carpenter stated the president signed for it.

Ms. Zimmers asked if there would be counselors on site.

Mr. Carpenter stated they would have counselors and insurance would be available. Mr. Carpenter explained he talked with a lot of people that were willing to help and he was not joking.

Mr. Ryan expressed he felt what Mr. Carpenter was trying to do was commendable. Mr. Ryan stated he was confused about the property on the application.

Mr. Carpenter stated that was the only property he had.

Mr. Ryan explained that the application was for a community center and not to house children. Mr. Ryan stated from the description Mr. Carpenter was giving, he planned to house children as an orphanage.

Mr. Carpenter stated there would be no one living in the property on the application but he planned to build a new house for them to live in. Mr. Carpenter explained the property on the application would be used to help people.

Mr. Brown questioned what the hours of operation would be.

Mr. Carpenter stated the hours of operation would be from nine to five and he would get computers to help everyone.

Ms. Anderson questioned when the property would be ready for the community center.

Mr. Carpenter stated as soon as he gets the donations eh planned to fix the property up.

Ms. Zimmers questioned if there were plans drawn up for what the inside would look like and how it would be set up for counseling.

Mr. Carpenter stated he did not have plans drawn up because he was focusing on getting everything together. Mr. Carpenter stated he spent all his money on the legal papers. Mr. Douglas explained the house did not look good because his previous renters tore the property up and he was screwed over by a contractor.

Mr. Ryan asked if the property was approved as a conditional use community center, would there still be oversight from the building inspector to make sure the building is up to code to be used as a community center.

Mr. Thompson explained there was no certificate of occupancy for anything other than residential at that point. Mr. Thompson explained upon approval of the conditional use, the

applicant would have to go through the certificate of occupancy process through the building department, which includes submitting building plans, having inspections and making sure everything is up to code before anyone can use it for the conditional use.

Mr. Ryan explained part of the city's objection was the condition of the house. Mr. Ryan stated there was some oversight from the city addressing the condition. Mr. Ryan asked about the residential complaints.

Mr. Thompson explained he received complaints from property owners about the potential uses of the house.

Ms. Zimmers asked if the concerns were about traffic or noise.

Mr. Thompson explained they were strictly for the use. Mr. Thompson explained if the conditional use was approved then the applicant would have to go through the permitting process for the property to be used for anything other than residential.

Ms. Gaier questioned what information was mailed out to surrounding neighbors.

Mr. Thompson explained a three by five post card is mailed out and includes the address, the proposed use and the applicant's name.

Ms. Gaier questioned if only the community center was disclosed or was information about the orphanage disclosed as well.

Ms. Zimmers questioned if the community center could be interpreted as an after school hang out for young people.

Mr. Thompson stated that was correct.

Ms. Zimmers explained the intentions of the applicant geared more towards as community center. Ms. Zimmers stated she did not want to upset neighbors but wanted to consider if there interpretation was different from what the board was hearing at the meeting.

Mr. Ryan questioned if complete plans for the property had been submitted, would the condition of the property still be an issue for the city.

Mr. Thompson stated perhaps, depending on what the report said. Mr. Thompson explained some properties are not able to be converted depending how they were originally built. Mr. Thompson explained the property could possibly need demolished and rebuilt depending on how the house was built. Mr. Thompson explained without seeing a detailed report it was hard to say for sure what the city would recommend.

Ms. Gaier questioned if the conditional use was approved and the applicant did follow the permitting process and regulations, what could be done.

Mr. Thompson explained zoning orders through code enforcement could be issued, orders through the building department could be issued which also brings in the fire department.

Ms. Zimmers questioned the next step after approval of the conditional use.

Mr. Thompson explained approving the conditional use permit only gives the applicant permission to move forward with the permitting process. Mr. Thompson explained if building plans were submitted prior to get the conditional use application, zoning would have to deny it outright. Mr. Thompson explained once the conditional use permit had been approved, he could approve for zoning but would have to go through the permit process though building regulations.

Mr. Ryan questioned what would happen if the building department did not approve it.

Mr. Thompson stated the applicant could not occupy the structure for anything nonresidential. The conditional use would still stay in place but would not be allowed to occupy until all the building requirements were met and approved.

Ms. Zimmers questioned if anyone was living in the structure.

Mr. Carpenter stated he was living in the structure.

Ms. Zimmers questioned if the conditional use was approved to be a community center, no one would be able to reside there.

Mr. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mr. Carpenter questioned if he could live there.

Mr. Thompson explained that Mr. Carpenter could live there but no one else. Mr. Thompson stated it could not be transient housing or shelter of any kind.

Mr. Carpenter questioned if a new house could be built for the orphans so they do not go back to abortion.

Mr. Ryan stated that the board was not discussing that because it was not applicable to the case.

Ms. Gaier asked if there were any further questions for the applicant. Hearing none, Ms. Gaier asked if there was anyone else that wished to speak. Hearing none, Ms. Gaier asked if there was a motion to close the public hearing.

MOTION: Ms. Zimmers made a motion to close the public hearing. Seconded by Mr. Burkhardt. Approval by voice vote.

Ms. Gaier stated that the public hearing was now closed and asked for a motion to approve Case

#19-A-04.

MOTION: Motion by Ms. Zimmers to approve Case #19-A-04 Request from Douglas Carpenter for a conditional use for a community center use at 241 S Plum St. in a CN-2, UPOD, Neighborhood Commercial District, Unified Plan Overlay District. Seconded by Mr. Brown.

Hearing no further discussion or questions, the Board determined the following findings of facts:

1. Neighbors expressed concerns through phone calls, but did not show up for the hearing.
2. There is not enough information provided about the use, but not a reason to deny.
3. The fact that it is a residential area is a concern.

VOTE:

YAYS: Mr. Ryan, Mr. Brown and Mr. Burkhardt

NAYS: Ms. Anderson and Ms. Gaier.

ABSTAIN: Ms. Zimmers.

Motion Approved 3 to 2.

Board Comments:

Board members discussed the process the previous applicant would have to go through to get the property up to code. Mr. Thompson explained that he had spoke with the applicant on several different occasions.

Staff Comments:

Mr. Thompson expressed his appreciation for the board's professionalism and thoroughness. Mr. Thompson informed the board about a former member of the City Planning Board's passing.

Subject: Adjournment

Ms. Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Ms. Zimmers.

Ms. Gaier adjourned the meeting at 7:50 pm.



Ms. Dori Gaier, Chairperson

Ms. Denise Williams, Vice-Chairperson