

AS APPROVED OCTOBER 1, 2009

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

1776 E. Washington Street

Urbana, IL 61801

DATE: September 17, 2009

PLACE: Lyle Shields Meeting Room  
1776 East Washington Street

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

Urbana, IL 61802

MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Bluhm, Thomas Courson, Roger Miller, Melvin Schroeder, Eric Thorsland

MEMBERS ABSENT : Catherine Capel, Paul Palmgren

STAFF PRESENT : Connie Berry, John Hall, J.R. Knight

OTHERS PRESENT : Sam Shreeves, Helen McGee, Chris Huffman, Denise Huffman, Sawyer Huffman

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:02 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The roll was called and a quorum declared present with two members absent.

3. Correspondence

None

4. Approval of Minutes

None

5. Continued Public Hearing

None

Mr. Bluhm requested a motion to rearrange the agenda and hear Case 654-V-09, Kathy Oliger prior to Case 652-V-09, Samuel Shreeves.

Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Thorsland to rearrange the agenda and hear Case 654-V-09, Kathy Oliger prior to Case 652-V-09, Samuel Shreeves. The motion carried by voice vote.

1 6. New Public Hearings

2  
3 Case 652-V-09 Petitioner: Samuel Shreeves Request: Authorize the use of an existing detached  
4 accessory storage building with a setback of 41 feet and a front yard of 11 feet in lieu of the required  
5 55 feet setback and 25 feet front yard, in regard to CR 1200N, a minor street, in the CR Zoning  
6 District. Location: A 12.8 acre tract in the South Half of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest  
7 Quarter of Section 31 of South Homer township and commonly known as the house at 2546 CR  
8 1200N.

9  
10 Mr. Bluhm informed the audience that this is an Administrative Case and as such the County allows anyone  
11 the opportunity to cross examine any witness. He said that at the proper time he will ask for a show of  
12 hands for those who would like to cross examine and each person will be called upon. He requested that  
13 anyone called to cross examine go to the cross examination microphone to ask any questions. He said that  
14 those who desire to cross examine are not required to sign the witness register but are requested to clearly  
15 state their name before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross  
16 examination. He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 6.5 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt  
17 from cross examination.

18  
19 Mr. Hall stated that the property in this case had a shed built in 1998 and testimony from Mr. Shreeves and  
20 Elbert Rogers, South Homer Township Road Commissioner indicates that they both spoke to staff in 1998  
21 and were informed that he needed a variance but all that was necessary for the variance was the South  
22 Homer’s Township Highway Commissioner’s approval. Mr. Hall stated that on July 7, 2009, Mr. Shreeves  
23 submitted a Zoning Use Permit Application to construct an attached garage to his existing house and since  
24 the project was not related to the shed issue he approved the permit provided that an application for the  
25 variance for the shed was received. He said that the a written statement has been received from Mr. Elbert  
26 Rogers indicating that he has no concerns related to the location of the existing building.

27  
28 Mr. Bluhm asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Hall and there were none.

29  
30 Mr. Bluhm called Mr. Samuel Shreeves to testify.

31  
32 Mr. Samuel Shreeves, who resides at 2456 CR 1200N, Homer stated that he had no new information to add  
33 but would be happy to answer any questions that the Board may have. He said that he slightly disagrees  
34 with Item #7.C.3 because staff was contacted by the road commissioner, as indicted in his letter, and he was  
35 told that as long as he approved the construction of the shed at its present location then it was okay. He said  
36 that it isn’t as if staff did not know the situation because they were contacted at the time that the shed was  
37 proposed to be constructed.

38  
39 Mr. Bluhm asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Shreeves.

40  
41 Mr. Miller asked Mr. Shreeves how long he had owned the property.

42  
43 Mr. Shreeves stated that he has owned the property for approximately 12<sup>1/2</sup> years.

44

9/17/09

AS APPROVED OCTOBER 1, 2009

ZBA

1 Mr. Bluhm asked the Board if there were any additional questions for Mr. Shreeves and there were none.

2  
3 Mr. Bluhm asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Shreeves and there were none.

4  
5 Mr. Bluhm asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Shreeves and there was no one.

6  
7 Mr. Bluhm asked Mr. Hall if, due to staff error there was no fee was charged for variance.

8  
9 Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Bluhm was correct.

10  
11 Mr. Hall stated that a new Item #9.B. could be added with the same text which is included in Item #7.B.

12  
13 Mr. Knight agreed.

14  
15 Mr. Thorsland stated that the text from Item #7.B. should be added to new Item #9.B.

16  
17 Mr. Hall stated that Item #13 should be corrected to indicate the following: No special conditions of  
18 approval are proposed.

19  
20 Mr. Bluhm closed the witness register for Case 652-V-09.

21  
22 **Finding of Fact for Case 652-V-09:**

23  
24 From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing for zoning case  
25 652-V-09 held on September 17, 2009, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County finds that:

- 26  
27 **1. Special conditions and circumstances DO exist which are peculiar to the land**  
28 **or structure involved, which are not applicable to other similarly situated land**  
29 **and structures elsewhere in the same district.**

30  
31 Mr. Thorsland stated that special conditions and circumstances DO exist which are peculiar to the land or  
32 structure involved, which are not applicable to other similarly situated land and structures elsewhere in the  
33 same district because the Petitioner contacted the Planning and Zoning Department in 1998 and after getting  
34 permission from the road commissioner he assumed that he had taken all of the necessary steps to place the  
35 building in its current location.

- 36  
37 **2. Practical difficulties or hardships created by carrying out the strict letter of**  
38 **the regulations sought to be varied WILL prevent reasonable or permitted**  
39 **use of the land or structure or construction.**

40  
41 Mr. Thorsland stated that practical difficulties or hardships created by carrying out the strict letter of the  
42 regulations sought to be varied WILL prevent reasonable or permitted use of the land or structure or  
43 construction because it would be difficult to move the structure and the Petitioner placed the shed in its  
44 current location due to a leach field to the north of the shed and tree roots and stumps would have prevented

1 the construction of a floor for the shed.

2  
3 **3. The special conditions, circumstances, hardships, or practical difficulties**  
4 **DO NOT result from actions of the applicant.**  
5

6 Mr. Thorsland stated that the special conditions, circumstances, hardships, or practical difficulties DO NOT  
7 result from actions of the applicant because the Petitioner acted in accordance with information given at the  
8 time of construction.

9  
10 **4. The requested variance IS in harmony with the general purpose and**  
11 **intent of the Ordinance.**  
12

13 Mr. Thorsland stated that the requested variance IS in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the  
14 Ordinance because the Petitioner acted in accordance with all other regulations set forth in the Zoning  
15 Ordinance and the building is not prohibited by the Ordinance.

16  
17 **5. The requested variance WILL NOT be injurious to the neighborhood or**  
18 **otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare.**  
19

20 Mr. Miller stated that the requested variance WILL NOT be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise  
21 detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare because in a written statement was received from the  
22 South Homer Township Road Commissioner indicating that the building will not interfere with the township  
23 road's safety and all other safety and health concerns will not be effected.

24  
25 **6. The requested variance IS the minimum variation that will make possible**  
26 **the reasonable use of the land/structure.**  
27

28 Mr. Courson stated that the requested variance IS the minimum variation that will make possible the  
29 reasonable use of the land/structure because the building will remain in its current location and no comments  
30 or concerns regarding safety were received from the township road commissioner.

31  
32 Mr. Bluhm added that the trees and an existing septic field limited the relocation of the structure.

33  
34 **7. No special conditions are hereby imposed.**  
35

36 **Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Miller to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Finding of Fact and**  
37 **Documents of Record as amended. The motion carried by voice vote.**  
38

39 **Mr. Thorsland moved, seconded by Mr. Courson to close the public hearing for Case 652-V-09,**  
40 **Samuel Shreeves. The motion carried by voice vote.**  
41

42 Mr. Bluhm informed Mr. Shreeves that two Board members are absent from tonight's meeting therefore it is  
43 at his discretion to either continue Case 652-V-09 until a full Board is present or request that the present  
44 Board move forward to the Final Determination.

Mr. Shreeves requested that the present Board continue to the Final Determination.

**FINAL DETERMINATION FOR CASE 652-V-09:**

**Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Miller that the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals finds that, based upon the application, testimony, and other evidence received in this case, that the requirements of Section 9.1.9.C HAVE been met, and pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.1.6.B of the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County determines that the variance requested in Case 652-V-09 is hereby GRANTED to the petitioner Samuel Shreeves, to authorize the use of an existing detached accessory storage building with a setback of 41 feet and a front yard of 11 feet in lieu of the required 55 feet setback and 25 feet front yard, in regard to CR 1200N, a minor street in the CR Zoning District.**

The roll was called:

<b>Capel-absent</b>	<b>Courson-yes</b>	<b>Miller-yes</b>
<b>Palmgren-absent</b>	<b>Schroeder-yes</b>	<b>Thorsland-yes</b>
<b>Bluhm-yes</b>		

Mr. Hall informed Mr. Shreeves that the variance request has been approved and that staff will send out the appropriate paperwork as soon as possible.

**Case 654-V-09 Petitioner: Kathy Oliger Request: Authorize the division of a lot less than five acres. Location: Lot 1 of Oliger First Subdivision located in the Northeast Quarter of Section 31 of Mahomet township and commonly known as the house at 1889 CR 50E, Seymour.**

Mr. Hall distributed a Supplemental Memorandum dated September 17, 2009, for the Board’s review. He said that the memorandum includes an e-mail from Steve Peidl, Engineer/Field Manager with HDC which indicates that on behalf of John and Katherine Oliger, he respectfully requests to withdraw the petition for Case 654-V-09.

**Case 656-V-09 Petitioner: Larry and Helen McGee Request: Authorize the following in the R-2 Single Family Residence Zoning District: A. the construction and use of a room addition to an existing dwelling with a side yard of five feet two inches in lieu of the required side yard of six feet; and B. the use of an existing detached garage that will be connected to the room addition in Part A, which also has a side yard of five feet two inches in lieu of the required side yard of six feet. Location: Lot 76 in Dobbins Downs III Subdivision in Section 2 of Champaign Township and commonly known as the house at 2207 Dale Drive, Champaign.**

Mr. Bluhm informed the audience that this is an Administrative Case and as such the County allows anyone the opportunity to cross examine any witness. He said that at the proper time he will ask for a show of hands for those who would like to cross examine and each person will be called upon. He requested that

1 anyone called to cross examine go to the cross examination microphone to ask any questions. He said that  
2 those who desire to cross examine are not required to sign the witness register but are requested to clearly  
3 state their name before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross  
4 examination. He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 6.5 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt  
5 from cross examination.  
6

7 Mr. Hall stated that the petitioners submitted a Zoning Use Permit Application in August for a proposed  
8 addition. He said that the new addition attaches to the home and wraps around the existing garage thereby  
9 converting the garage from a detached accessory structure to part of the principal structure. He said that the  
10 zoning technicians worked with Mr. McGee to simply change the site plan and move the wall of the addition  
11 to meet the required six foot side yard. He said that when the application came to his desk for approval he  
12 determined that the garage is non-conforming but converting it to part of the principal structure requires a  
13 variance because it does not meet the side yard requirements. He said that after working so hard with the  
14 zoning technicians in changing the site plan Mr. McGee was very frustrated to find out that he now needed a  
15 variance. Mr. Hall stated that in 1984 a small addition was added to the principal structure which connected  
16 the house to the garage and that had not been flagged as an issue at this time. He said that the Mr. and Mrs.  
17 McGee were ready to build their addition and they cooperatively worked with staff and finally found out  
18 that they needed a variance. He said that Mr. McGee submitted a statement, included as an attachment to  
19 the Preliminary Memorandum dated September 11, 2009, that he would be willing to abide by any  
20 reasonable determination of the Board therefore he issued the permit so that construction could begin and  
21 the case is before the Board tonight.  
22

23 Mr. Hall stated that before he issued the permit for construction of the addition he checked with the Zoning  
24 Officer, who has been with the department since 1984, and she did not remember issuing a permit on this  
25 property and agreed that a variance is required.  
26

27 Mr. Hall distributed a Supplemental Memorandum dated September 17, 2009, for the Board's review. He  
28 said that the memorandum is for the Board's information and staff is not trying to suggest anything. He  
29 said that the west property line abuts the City of Champaign and within that jurisdiction in order to reduce  
30 the side yard requirement to less than six feet the property owner would have to have the north wall on the  
31 garage and the addition to be fire-proofed. He noted that this is the procedure if the property was within the  
32 City of Champaign because the City of Champaign has a building code but this property is actually in the  
33 County and the County does not enforce a building code. He said that it is at the Board's option, if they  
34 believe it is warranted, whether they desire to require a special condition regarding fire-proofing the north  
35 wall of the garage and the addition but the Board is not obligated to such a condition. He said that staff is  
36 proposing that the new information in the memorandum be added as part of Item #10.B.2. so that it is  
37 documented that the Board was made aware of this information.  
38

39 Mr. Bluhm asked the Board if there were any questions for staff.  
40

41 Mr. Thorsland asked staff how close adjacent structures are to the north property line.  
42

43 Mr. Knight stated that any adjacent structures are beyond six feet.  
44

1 Mr. Schroeder asked how close other structures were to the new addition.  
2  
3 Mr. Bluhm stated that there is at least 11 feet from the proposed addition to adjacent structures.  
4  
5 Mr. Schroeder stated that he is comfortable with that separation.  
6  
7 Mr. Bluhm asked the Board if there were any additional questions for staff and there were none.  
8  
9 Mr. Bluhm called Ms. Helen McGee to testify.  
10  
11 Ms. Helen McGee, who resides at 2207 Dale Drive, Champaign stated that the contractor had already  
12 planned to install a fire wall although she does not understand why he did not indicate such on the plan.  
13  
14 Mr. Thorsland asked Ms. McGee if she was comfortable with the proposed special condition included on the  
15 Supplemental Memorandum.  
16  
17 Ms. McGee stated yes.  
18  
19 Mr. Bluhm asked Ms. McGee if she would agree to the special condition.  
20  
21 Ms. McGee stated yes.  
22  
23 Mr. Bluhm asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. McGee and there were none.  
24  
25 Mr. Bluhm asked if staff had any questions for Ms. McGee and there were none.  
26  
27 Mr. Bluhm asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Ms. McGee and there was no one.  
28  
29 Mr. Hall stated that a new Item #7.E should read as follows: On the adjacent property to the north there are  
30 no structures located within six feet of the property line. He said that the following should be added to Item  
31 #10.B.(2): Regarding fire-proofing of the north wall of the proposed addition and existing garage that  
32 would be required if the subject property was inside the City of Champaign: (a) J.R. Knight, Associate  
33 Planner, spoke with Gary Bowman, City of Champaign Building Safety Division, on the phone on  
34 September 17, 2009, regarding what fire-proofing would be required if the subject property were located in  
35 the City of Champaign; and (b) Mr. Bowman indicated that the north wall would require a one hour fire  
36 rating which could be achieved by using 5/8<sup>th</sup> inch, type X or fire code C drywall. He did not mention  
37 whether the city normally accepts a double layer of regular drywall; and (c) Champaign County does not  
38 currently have a building code. He said that the last sentence of Item #10.B.(2) as written in the Preliminary  
39 Draft Summary of Evidence should be deleted and a new Item #13, Special Condition of Approval should be  
40 added as follows:  
41 **The Zoning Administrator shall not issue a Zoning Compliance Certificate for the**  
42 **proposed room addition without documentation that the north wall of both the**  
43 **addition and existing garage shall be constructed with a minimum one-hour fire**  
44 **resistance rating, achieved by using either Type X or Fire code C drywall.**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

The above special condition is necessary to ensure that:

**The likelihood of conflagration spreading to adjacent property is minimized and no greater than it would be for properties inside the city of Champaign.**

Mr. Hall stated that a new Item #4 should be added to the Documents of Record indicating the following: Supplemental Memorandum dated September 17, 2009.

Mr. Bluhm asked the audience if anyone in the audience desired to present testimony regarding Case 656-V-09 and there was no one.

Mr. Bluhm closed the witness register.

Mr. Bluhm requested a motion to approve the special condition as follows:

**The Zoning Administrator shall not issue a Zoning Compliance Certificate for the proposed room addition without documentation that the north wall of both the addition and existing garage shall be constructed with a minimum one-hour fire resistance rating, achieved by using either Type X or Fire code C drywall.**

The above special condition is necessary to ensure that:

**The likelihood of conflagration spreading to adjacent property is minimized and no greater than it would be for properties inside the city of Champaign.**

Mr. Thorsland moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to approve the special condition. The motion carried by voice vote.

**Finding of Fact for Case 656-V-09:**

From the documents of record and testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing for zoning case 656-V-09 held on September 17, 2009, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County finds that:

- 1. Special conditions and circumstances DO exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved, which are not applicable to other similarly situated land and structures elsewhere in the same district.**

Mr. Thorsland stated that special conditions and circumstances DO exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved, which are not applicable to other similarly situated land and structures elsewhere in the same district because the addition to the house is being constructed on a previous footprint of a sun porch and ties into what is now an attached garage, which was previously non-conforming, and requires a variance because it is too close to the side yard.





below:

The Zoning Administrator shall not issue a Zoning Compliance Certificate for the proposed room addition without documentation that the north wall of both the addition and existing garage shall be constructed with a minimum one-hour fire resistance rating, achieved by using either Type X or Fire code C drywall.

The above special condition is necessary to ensure that:

The likelihood of conflagration spreading to adjacent property is minimized and no greater than it would be for properties inside the city of Champaign.

Mr. Schroeder moved, seconded by Mr. Miller to adopt the Summary of Evidence, Finding of Fact and Documents of Record as amended. The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Thorsland moved, seconded by Mr. Courson to close the public hearing for Case 656-V-09, Larry and Helen McGee. The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Bluhm informed Mrs. McGee that two Board members are absent from tonight’s meeting therefore it is at her discretion to either continue Case 656-V-09 until a full Board is present or request that the present Board move forward to the Final Determination.

Mrs. McGee requested that the present Board continue to the Final Determination.

**Final Determination for Case 656-V-09:**

Mr. Thorsland moved, seconded by Mr. Courson that the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals finds that, based upon the application, testimony, and other evidence received in this case, that the requirements of Section 9.1.9.C HAVE been met, and pursuant to the authority granted by Section 9.1.6.B of the *Champaign County Zoning Ordinance*, the Zoning Board of Appeals of Champaign County determines that the variance requested in Case 656-V-09, is hereby GRANTED WITH CONDITIONS to the petitioners, Larry and Helen McGee, to authorize the following in the R-2, Single Family Dwelling Zoning District:

- A. The construction and use of a room addition to an existing dwelling with a side yard of five feet two inches in lieu of the required side yard of six feet; and
- B. The use of an existing detached garage that will be connected to the room addition in Part A, which also has a side yard of five feet two inches in lieu of the required side yard of six feet.

Subject to the following condition:

9/17/09

AS APPROVED OCTOBER 1, 2009

ZBA

**The Zoning Administrator shall not issue a Zoning Compliance Certificate for the proposed room addition without documentation that the north wall of both the addition and existing garage shall be constructed with a minimum one-hour fire resistance rating, achieved by using either Type X or Fire code C drywall.**

The above special condition is necessary to ensure that:

**The likelihood of conflagration spreading to adjacent property is minimized and no greater than it would be for properties inside the City of Champaign.**

The roll was called:

<b>Miller-yes</b>	<b>Palmgren-absent</b>	<b>Schroeder-yes</b>
<b>Thorsland-yes</b>	<b>Capel-absent</b>	<b>Courson-yes</b>
<b>Bluhm-yes</b>		

Mr. Hall informed Mrs. McGee that the variance request has been approved and that staff will send out the appropriate paperwork as soon as possible. He thanked Mrs. McGee for her patience.

Mr. Miller noted that the site plan for this case was very hard to review. He requested that the copy for the packets be darkened for review.

Mr. Hall stated that normally staff prepares an annotated site plan and this was not done for this case.

Mr. Bluhm stated that it would be helpful if the annotated site plan indicated north, south, east or west.

**7. Staff Report**

None

**8. Other Business:**

**A. Semi-Annual Review of Closed Session Minutes**

Mr. Bluhm informed the Board that an e-mail was received from David L. DeThorne, Senior Assistant State’s Attorney indicating that at this juncture, due to inadequate time for review of the closed session minutes, he would not recommend any changes. He said that currently there is only one set of closed session minutes and that meeting was held on November 22, 2005.

Mr. Courson asked Mr. Bluhm if he could review those minutes.

Mr. Bluhm stated yes, and allowed Mr. Courson time to review the November 22, 2005, closed session minutes.

Mr. Bluhm requested a motion.

1  
2 **Mr. Courson moved, seconded by Mr. Schroeder to approve maintaining the closed session minutes as**  
3 **closed. The motion carried by voice vote.**  
4

5 **B. Scheduling of wind farm zoning cases**  
6

7 Mr. Hall stated that, according to the latest news that he has received, staff may receive an application by the  
8 end of October or November although he is betting that it will be November. He said that if an application  
9 is submitted at the end of October the meeting that the case would be heard at is the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting  
10 which will be in conflict with the County Board meeting which is held in this same meeting room. He said  
11 that a wind farm hearing will require the Lyle Shields Meeting Room therefore we can have no wind farm  
12 hearings in December. He recommended that the Board suspend the rules and schedule the wind farm case  
13 on the docket for both meetings in January 2010 and the last meeting in February 2010. He noted that it  
14 may not be worth having the December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting since the meeting room will not be available although  
15 if there is someone in the position that requires their variance as soon as possible and a small turnout is  
16 expected then the meeting could be held.  
17

18 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Hall if the John Dimit Meeting Room would be available for a small meeting.  
19

20 Mr. Hall stated yes.  
21

22 Mr. Thorsland stated that if the John Dimit Meeting Room would be available he would like to keep the  
23 December 17<sup>th</sup> meeting therefore keeping the docket clear.  
24

25 **Mr. Thorsland moved, seconded by Mr. Miller to suspend the rules and schedule the wind farm cases**  
26 **on the docket for both hearing dates in January 2010 and the second meeting in February 2010 and to**  
27 **keep the December 17, 2009, hearing date on the docket at this time. The motion carried by voice**  
28 **vote.**  
29

30 Mr. Bluhm stated that some hearing dates only have one case scheduled. He asked Mr. Hall if there was a  
31 specific reason why.  
32

33 Mr. Hall stated that Case 655-S-09, which is docketed for October 29, 2009, is for a kennel, which requires  
34 exhaustive details therefore it is his recommendation that a kennel should be the only case docketed for that  
35 hearing. He said that Case 645-S-09, which is docketed for December 3, 2009, is for the RLA and it should  
36 be the only case scheduled for that date.  
37

38 Mr. Bluhm stated that he is concerned that the October 15<sup>th</sup> hearing date will be in the middle of harvest  
39 therefore a full Board may not be present.  
40

41 Mr. Hall asked Mr. Bluhm if October 15<sup>th</sup> or October 29<sup>th</sup> would be a better meeting date.  
42

43 Mr. Hall stated that the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting date may have a better chance of having a full Board than the  
44 29<sup>th</sup>.

9/17/09

AS APPROVED OCTOBER 1, 2009

ZBA

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

Mr. Bluhm asked Mr. Hall if it would be possible to move Case 655-S-09 to the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. He said that if it is possible the October 29<sup>th</sup> meeting may require cancellation.

Mr. Hall stated yes, Case 655-S-09 could be moved to the October 29<sup>th</sup> meeting and since there is a meeting scheduled for October 1<sup>st</sup> and October 15<sup>th</sup> the Board would have satisfied the two meeting requirement for the month.

**9. Audience Participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board**

None

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

ZBA //

***DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT***

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42

**DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT**

ZBA //

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13