

**VILLAGE OF HINSDALE
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
October 21, 2009**

1. Call to Order – Administer Oath of Office

Vice-Chairman Haarlow called the special meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals to order on Wednesday, October 21, 2009 at 6:37 p.m. in Memorial Hall of the Memorial Building, 19 E. Chicago Avenue, Hinsdale, Illinois.

Deputy Clerk Christine M. Bruton administered the Oath of Office to newly appointed member of the Zoning Board of Appeals, Robert K. Neiman and to newly appointed Chairman, William Haarlow.

2. Roll Call

Present: Chairman William Haarlow, Members Gary Moberly, Debra Braselton, Keith Giltner and Bob Neiman

Absent: Members Marc Connelly and John Callahan

Also Present: Village Manager Dave Cook, Building Commissioner Robb McGinnis, Staff Secretary Christine Bruton and Court Reporters Janice Heinemann and Kathy Bono

3. Approval of Minutes

There being no corrections or additions to the minutes, Ms. Brazelton **moved approval of minutes of the Regular Meeting of September 16, 2009.** Member Moberly seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Brazelton, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: Member Neiman

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

4. Receipt of Appearances

All persons expecting to testify in any of the public hearings before the Board were sworn in by the Court Reporter Bono.

5. Receipt of Requests, Motions, Pleadings, or Requests to make Public Comment of a General Nature - None

6. Pre-Hearing and Agenda Setting - None

7. Public Hearings

Chairman Haarlow pointed out that due to the fact that there are five Board members present as opposed to a full Board of seven, in order to approve a variance, the applicant must receive four affirmative votes. In a sense, this means the bar is set higher, however, each applicant has the option to defer their hearing to the next scheduled meeting. He also pointed out that future attendance cannot be guaranteed.

Due to the fact that APP-02-09 is likely to require a substantial amount of time, the Board will hear the other three public hearings and deliberate on those before moving to the appeal.

a) **643 S. Lincoln, V-04-09** (*A transcript of these proceedings is on file*)

The hearing was opened and Mr. Groenewald opted to continue. He apologized to the Board and the community for his ignorance regarding the fact that he should have obtained a permit before he completed the construction on the side of his house. With regards to hardship, he stated his is a corner lot; the front of the house faces Lincoln Street and was built in the 1890's. There have been two subsequent additions resulting in a long, skinny house. He thought about tearing the house down, but decided to maintain the look and integrity of the home. He removed the old deck that was to the rear of the house and put it on the side of the house because it afforded more privacy. He built the patio on the side, too, and it is too close to Seventh Street by 3' feet. However, if they had maintained the proper setbacks it would be a less-functional long, skinny patio. Mr. Groenewald stated that comments from fellow residents have all been positive. He described the high quality, tasteful materials used to construct the patio and service walk. Further, he doesn't believe the fireplace is in a dangerous location and, in any event, he is careful.

Mr. Giltner asked Mr. Groenewald when he learned about the setback requirement. Mr. Groenewald explained that after the work was almost complete, it was red flagged by the building department. He was instructed by Village staff to request a permit for the work, it would be denied and he could take it up with the ZBA. Mr. Neiman said the work looks terrific, but he is struggling with the fact that the work was done without a permit and if the ZBA approves this request a signal is sent to others to try to get away with building without a permit. He is concerned about setting precedence in this type of matter. Ms. Braselton suggested an alternative location for the patio, discussion followed, and Chairman Haarlow remarked that while they can be sensitive to the aesthetics, it is not one of the standards the ZBA is charged with upholding. Mr. Groenewald said the layout of the house and the lot are not a self-created hardship. He also noted the expense of reconfiguring the patio at this time. The contractor on the project, Mr. Goss, stated that if the fireplace is moved to the east, a 20 year old maple tree would be removed

because of the proximity to the chimney. Discussion followed regarding the possible locations of the fireplace and the resulting effect on the trees.

Mr. Neiman moved **to close the public hearing for V-04-09**. Ms. Braselton seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

b) **707 S. Bodin, V-05-09** (*A transcript of these proceedings is on file*)

Mr. Jeff Spirek, the senior engineer on the project, on behalf of the homeowners, Darius & Greta Filmanaviciute, elected to proceed despite the reduced number of Board members present. He proceeded to provide history to the Board regarding the homeowners situation and their purchase of the vacated alley in the rear of the property in order to place a detached garage as far from the residence as possible. On March 6, 2009 the preliminary plans were completed for the garage and submitted to the homeowner who was surprised to notice that the garage was not in the back of the lot because of a 42" inch easement located in the back of the property. He recapped the time line, as he understood it, of the purchase of the vacated alley and other communications. He stated that the house is partially framed at this time, as they are waiting for this matter to be resolved before continuing.

Mr. Spirek stated that the hardship lies in the fact that if the variance is not granted the resulting driveway will severely limit turning movement. Additionally, it will result in more impervious surface and he described the current drainage path. Mr. Neiman asked did Village staff know when the alley was purchased, why it was being purchased. The homeowner, Mr. Darius Filmanaviciute said he explained the purpose of the purchase and the Village knew. He doesn't believe it will be possible for two cars to use the garage if the 6' foot setback is required. Mr. Neiman wondered if the garage could be built on the easement with the caveat that it would have to be torn down if necessary. Village Manager Cook said he wouldn't recommend this, but given the circumstances the repurchase of this vacation would have some merit with the Board of Trustees. There was discussion about moving the sewer line, and exhausting all other alternatives. Mr. Spirek said that sewer line couldn't support the garage over it, and he would think the cost of moving the sewer would be enormous. Mr. Spirek outlined the proposed downspout location and stated that he does not believe it will exacerbate the drainage problems. He also noted that the homeowner has not

netted any benefit from the purchase of the land in terms of FAR. Chairman Haarlow mentioned the letters received from neighbors that speak to stormwater and drainage concerns.

Mr. Paul Miller of 702 S. Monroe lives to the east of the property being built. He pointed out that the new garage will be a two-car garage where there is only a one-car presently. He believes that this larger building will adversely impact stormwater drainage. He doesn't believe the existing sewers can handle the increased run-off.

Ms. Diane Griffin of 711 Bodin is the property owner immediately to the south. She stated that there are water issues and that she was never noticed of any of the construction on this property. She believes stormwater will flow into her backyard, because there will be more concrete. She thinks the house should have been smaller.

Member Moberly asked if the Village is aware of the water issue. Mr. Cook confirmed that there is no question there are stormwater issues in that part of town.

Ms. Griffin asked if the house or garage need the easement to be the size it is. Building Commissioner McGinnis said the house is fully code compliant.

Chairman Haarlow suggested that the Board hear from Community Development Director Tim Bleuher on how all of this came about. In order to do that, we would have to continue this matter to the next meeting. If the applicant is serious about approaching the Village to buy back the property, he would have the opportunity to pursue this avenue, but this is his choice. Member Neiman commented that Mr. Bleuher's comments could affect his vote. Chairman Haarlow explained that Mr. Filmanaviciute would have to formally request a continuance. Mr. Filmanaviciute elected not to continue the matter to a later date.

Ms. Braselton moved **to close the public hearing for V-05-09**. Mr. Neiman seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

c) **240 S. Bruner Street, V-06-09** (*A transcript of these proceedings is on file*)

Ms. Tracy McArdle and her contractor Mr. Chuck Forsythe elected to continue with

the hearing, despite the number of ZBA members present. Mr. Forsythe explained that this variation request is for a second floor addition. He commented that the house is tight now, and that the planning for this addition began a year ago, much time and money was spent in the effort. This design keeps all bearing loads stacked with the first floor, resulting in the most affordable and easily achieved addition. He noted that it is difficult to comply with zoning laws on a 100 year old house. To comply with the code would result in a substantial loss of inside space, if they could get architect approval.

It was confirmed that the addition would maintain the existing side footprint, but the five foot addition to the back would run the full width of the house. Discussion followed regarding increasing nonconformities and maintaining an existing nonconformity as it pertains to the rear five feet of the addition. Mr. Forsythe stated that he saw no problem with making the back addition conforming.

Mr. Neiman moved **to close the public hearing for V-06-09**. Ms. Braselton seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

Chairman Haarlow called a short recess before beginning deliberations. The Board reconvened at 8:35 p.m.

DELIBERATIONS

V-04-09, 643 S. Lincoln

Mr. Neiman started discussion stating his concerns about ignoring the permit process, therefore he would have to vote no. Mr. Giltner added that based on hardship this matter would not pass. Ms. Braselton concurred with the precedent concerns as did Mr. Moberly who also suggested there may be a way to reconfigure the project. Chairman Haarlow stated there are standards to be met and unfortunately this matter falls short.

There being no further discussion, Ms. Braselton moved to **deny approval of the variation request know as V-04-09**. Mr. Moberly seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

V-05-09, 707 S. Bodin

Mr. Moberly began discussion by stating that he comes back to the fact that if the homeowner had not purchased the alley, the garage would be in essentially the same location, however, he does not want to trivialize the water issues. Chairman Haarlow cautioned that the ZBA has always been mindful of neighbors comments, but they are not the determining criterion.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Moberly moved **to approve the variation request know as V-05-09**. Mr. Neiman seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner

NAYS: Chairman Haarlow

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

V-06-09, 240 S. Bruner Street

Chairman Haarlow began discussion by noting that the issue of increasing the non-conformity can be taken off the table and must focus on the merits as presented by applicant, however, we could decide to make the back adhere to existing code. Mr. Moberly thinks density would thereby be reduced, and leans toward approving the second story request and having the five feet to the rear conform resulting in a one foot offset. Mr. Neiman agreed.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Moberly moved **approve the variation request known as V-06-09**. Ms. Neiman seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

d) **26-32 E. First Street, APP-02-09** (*A transcript of these proceedings is on file*)

Chairman Haarlow opened the public hearing by stating that all parties have agreed not to have attorneys speak on their behalf so as to keep fees down and avoid a chilling effect on someone filing an appeal with the ZBA. Mr. John Bohnen will speak on behalf of the Alliance for Hinsdale and Village Manager Cook will speak on behalf of Village.

Mr. Neiman stated that Mr. Bohnen has been represented by Attorney Bob O'Donnell in this matter and that Mr. O'Donnell was his attorney in the Hinsdale Club case. He made the disclosure in order to avoid the appearance of impropriety.

Chairman Haarlow reminded Mr. Bohnen that he has the option to continue the matter to a later date if he wanted to try to garner a greater attendance of ZBA members; Mr. Bohnen opted to present at this time.

Mr. John Bohnen of 230 E. First Street stated he is before the Board as an individual and a director of the Alliance for Hinsdale and has filed an appeal of Village Manager Cook's issuance of a Certificate of Zoning Compliance as it related the Garfield IV project at 26-32 First Street. He reiterated the absence of attorneys to avoid additional escrow fees.

He said there are complex issues before the Board tonight regarding the height of the proposed building and the horizontal expansion of a noncompliant building and parking. It is his contention that the Certificate of Zoning Compliance was issued in error because the Village Manager did not determine that Mr. Gammonley was code compliant before the issuance in terms of height, grade and horizontal expansion. He said the parking deficiency is the 'elephant in the room'; he outlined the number of spaces required and the calculations he proposes that would result in about \$30,000/per space cost. Mr. Neiman conjectured that even if the Village Manager had included an amount as part of the certificate, does not the final decision ultimately lie with the Village Board of Trustees and if so why does this render Mr. Cook's certificate defective? Mr. Bohnen responded that the ultimate decision rests with the Board of Trustees and they will listen to recommendations made by the ZBA and/or the Plan Commission. It is his opinion that the parking matter needs to be addressed early on as it could make the project cost prohibitive for the developer. He referenced §11-401 in support of his argument and assertion that a companion application identifying the parking deficiency should have accompanied the application which resulted in the Certificate of Zoning Compliance.

Mr. Karl Weber of 219 E. First Street and a member of the Alliance for Hinsdale addressed the Board on the matters of height and grade, but first reiterated the seriousness of the parking issue. He began his remarks by stating that the height limit in the B-2 district is 35", however there are exceptions made if a building is built into a slope. After determining the average slope, it can be added to the 35" height. In this matter, the measurements should be taken from the footprint of the existing building, not the whole lot as were used in the Garfield III iteration. He believes the wrong corners were used to calculate the average slope and therefore the calculations are incorrect. Additionally, the south elevations were taken from the top of a retaining wall which is not on the property. He stated that the lot is level, there is no slope and every square foot of the existing building is at an altitude of 706.6 feet. He read the section of the code that supported his position and described the method by which he arrived at his numbers.

Upon receipt of this appeal, Mr. Cook went back into the Garfield file and found another drawing with elevations, but his calculations with this drawing are still incorrect. The Alliance for Hinsdale had a surveyor there yesterday, and while the drawings are not yet available, his measurements corroborated the Alliance numbers.

Mr. Neiman commented that it seems reasonable engineers might agree on how to calculate these numbers. Mr. Weber stated that's why they hired one. Mr. Bohnen commented that the developer didn't follow the code and the Village Manager used erroneous information from a drawing that is not properly authenticated. There is no slope, the building is level.

Mr. Weber noted the existing building and the proposed building back up on the pedestrian alley which cuts from First Street through to the parking lot and if you go up a series of steps you wind up on the level of the parking lot of the middle school. This is where the elevations were shot that were used by Mr. Gammonley and the Village Manager, but this is not on the property in question, it is the property next door.

Mr. Bohnen then introduced the matter of horizontal expansion and pointed out that the developer disregards the fact that the building is not code compliant and is increasing the noncompliance because, despite the Village Manager's answer, the front of this building is 26-32 First Street. As such, it has no 20' setback at the rear. He cited §10-104(B)(1) to support his position that the deficiency is being increased. The Village Manager and the developer are saying Garfield is the front of the building; he can find no evidence in the code that allows this. However, on the east façade facing Garfield is a loading dock, a loading dock can not be located on the front of a building, this, therefore,

reestablishes the fact that the front is on First Street. The building is not code compliant extending to the south on all floors.

Mr. Bohnen then reiterated his concerns about the parking and the associated cost and that when Mr. Cook issued his Certificate of Zoning Compliance there should have been a companion certificate regarding this matter. Mr. Neiman asked what in the code requires the Village Manager to provide guidance on the parking issue. Mr. Bohnen believes that 11-401(D) requires an application for certificate be accompanied by all other applications required and allows the Village Manager to act as gatekeeper and determine deficiencies in the application. He asserted that Mr. Cook does not understand the purpose of a certificate of zoning compliance.

Chairman Haarlow invited Mr. Cook to address the Board and state his position.

Village Manager Cook addressed the Board and began by stating that he instituted the use of a Certificate of Compliance four years ago and completely understands the process. He explained that §11-401 does, in fact, state that site plan appearance and plan development documents are all required as part of an application. However, §9-104(D) regarding parking deficiencies makes no reference to a required application. It is a procedure that is set, controlled and determined by the Board of Trustees, with standards set in the code. In no way is it an accompanying application. Further, §9-104(D)(3) states the manager shall support any conditions in the code in connection with approval granted pursuant to this code. Hinsdale Zoning Code §11-606 states that an exterior appearance plan is required and §11-604 requires a site plan review. The Certificate of Compliance, on those two components, are a recommendation for review by the Plan Commission, who will send their recommendations to the Public Safety Committee, who send their recommendation to the Village Board. In the matter of parking deficiencies, he correctly referenced the entire section of the code for this procedural question §9-105(A) through §9-104(D). Compliance to the code clearly states that the applicant must satisfy the Board of Trustees on the matter of parking, not the Village Manager, using the following standards: effect on purpose, effect on adjacent property, effect on traffic congestion and compliance.

On the matter of height, Mr. Cook conceded that it is a more subjective matter and that in Hinsdale, the calculation of height, slopes and grade in elevation is not easy. He agreed that staff used the wrong document to calculate height. He went to the current file to look at the information to determine whether or not it was correct. He believes it is prudent to do so, and using in-house information, and recalculating the height indicated it was still compliant with the zoning code. He asked the developer to provide a new survey before this

hearing, and that document is before the Board. It clearly indicates that the property line goes right down the middle of the retaining wall. The authenticated survey before the Board indicates that the average grade is 712.03. Mr. Cook emphasized that in the calculation of grade, one must use the grade prior to reshaping of the natural contour—this is key, natural contour. If you stand on the south of the building on the school property and look north you can determine what the natural contour was. It goes down towards Garfield Street. It is a common mistake to use the excavated grade of the building, but this would have an adverse effect all through Hinsdale. This is the way our code reads and the way the Village has always interpreted it.

Mr. Neiman asked how this Board is supposed to determine which numbers are correct and which should be used when two parties have two different views and surveys to support them. Mr. Cook replied that, historically, the Village has always relied on an outside independent third party agency, and that is what the survey before the Board, certified by Mr. Steven P. Fessenbecker represents. Mr. Cook cautioned that it is easy to confuse grade, height and elevation. Height is calculated by the vertical distance measured from grade to the highest point of the roof, per our zoning code. He confirmed for Ms. Braselton where the grades were taken at each corner.

In the matter of the side setback or front yard setback he explained that the zoning code definition of front yard says it is the shorter lot line separating such lots from a street shall be considered the front lot line. Clearly, the survey indicates that the Garfield frontage is the shorter lot line, and by code is the front yard.

Chairman Haarlow stated, for the sake of argument, if the front of the building faces Garfield, east, then a loading dock would not be permitted on this side of the building. Mr. Cook explained that it is a precode structure. Ms. Braselton confirmed in the existing building the loading dock faces the side yard, but in the proposed plan the loading dock faces the front yard. Mr. Cook stated that the developer is leaving the door in the same location, so his initial determination is this is a precode, but he would reserve judgment on that. Discussion followed regarding loading spaces and public right-of-way, Mr. Neiman interjected that, in fairness, this is not an issue that had been considered prior to Chairman Haarlow's question and suggested that perhaps Mr. Cook should be given the opportunity to make this determination. Ms. Braselton commented that with a variation, only the applicant can request a continuance. Building Commissioner McGinnis offered more information regarding the front/side yard distinction, but Ms. Braselton pointed out that the direction of the loading dock now faces residences. She asked about attached plans to the certificate. Mr. Cook confirmed that there is a second

page to the certificate that apparently had not been provided to the Board. He provided the document to the Board and explained its contents.

In the matter of horizontal expansion, Mr. Cook explained the project extends the front yard to the south and the side yard to the west. Both of those front and side yard setback requirements per the code are zero. So, there is no nonconformity by extending that building on the second and third floors.

With no further questions from the Board for Mr. Cook, Chairman Haarlow noted that unless Mr. Cook or Mr. Bohnen wish to respond further, we could entertain a possibility of closing the hearing. Discussion followed regarding closing or continuing the hearing. Mr. Bohnen considered continuing the hearing if all ZBA members would walk over to the site and walk around the building so we could take up the subject of grade, because he still believes grade is established by the four corners of the existing building and that Mr. Cook is not able to attest to the original grade on that property. Discussion followed Mr. Bohnen's assertion that the surveyor used by the Village was not a third party, but was the surveyor used by Mr. Gammonley. Mr. Cook clarified the Village requires an applicant to provide a survey, stamped and dated by a professional who is attesting to the information he is providing. Mr. Neiman asserted that if the Village Manager always uses the calculations of a surveyor paid for by the applicant then his representation that he relied on those calculations should satisfy the Board at this point. The calculations should be challenged at the Plan Commission level.

Ms. Braselton suggested that information acquired after the issuance of the certificate, in her mind, is irrelevant. Mr. Bohnen contends that had the Alliance for Hinsdale not challenged the issuance of the certificate, it would have gone forward with the erroneous information and it is not a citizen's responsibility to do due diligence in these matters. Mr. Cook said that three or four times in the last three years a Certificate of Zoning Compliance has been challenged, but this is the first time it's become a formal appeal to the ZBA. When this happens, he goes back to the file and reviews the material, and twice he has revoked the Certificate of Zoning Compliance based upon new information. In this case, with which ever information he uses, the project is still code compliant—in either scenario, the building is under 35 feet. He explained that the difference in the surveyor's averages are a result of how one interprets the code in terms of natural grade and slope.

Upon the questioning of Mr. Neiman, Mr. Weber stated that even if this certificate is rescinded and Mr. Cook reissues a new certificate using the correct information they would still challenge the certificate as it relates to height. Ms. Braselton confirmed that Mr. Bohnen also challenges the location of the loading dock.

Mr. Weber noted §11-402(H) that states any Certificate of Zoning Compliance issued in violation of the provisions of this code, whether intentionally, negligently or innocently, shall be void ab initio and shall give rise to no rights whatsoever.

Ms. Braselton noted that on the application the developer makes no note of parking spaces. Mr. Cook explained that his was addressed in a cover memo to the Plan Commission dated June 10, 2009. Mr. Bohnen asserted that Mr. Gammonley could have provided parking information and Mr. Cook could have asked him to do so.

Mr. Neiman moved **to close the public hearing for APP-02-09**. Ms. Braselton seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

Deliberation - APP-02-09

Chairman Haarlow began deliberation by stating that the Zoning Board can choose to address the matter as broadly or as narrowly as it wishes. The Board can take up each of the issues brought up in appeal or supplement, but for the appeal to be successful only one issue needs to be found wanting. The Board discussed how best to proceed. Mr. Neiman suggested it would be expeditious to take the easiest issue, the loading dock, first. Ms. Braselton recommended that the Board not second guess elevations. If the front of the building is Garfield, it can't have been code compliant. Chairman Haarlow opined there is no way around the stipulation that no loading space shall open on a public right-of-way. Mr. Cook asked for seven days to provide supplemental information on that issue, but Mr. Bohnen does not consent to that. Chairman Haarlow agrees it is a reasonable request, Mr. Cook stated that § 11-502(D)(4) illustrates that he has 30 days to provide more information. Mr. Bohnen argued that any subsequent information has no bearing on the decision of the ZBA in this appeal. Mr. Neiman said there is enough concern among the Board because of incorrect survey information used, that even if something else was submitted on the loading dock, it would still have to go back. The developer may as well address the loading dock issue.

Mr. Neiman **moved to grant the appeal know as APP-02-09.** Mr. Moberly seconded the motion, and noted this in not a reflection on Mr. Cook. The Board agreed.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

Mr. Cook asked the Board for direction so as not to end up back before the ZBA. Chairman Haarlow commented that he didn't think they were qualified to make a decision about grade and elevation, the parking is irreconcilable and the location of the loading dock requires a change in the plans; a new set of plans. Mr. Neimen suggested that if the Plan Commission hires an independent surveyor, then we should let that happen as it normally does.

8. New Business - None

9. Unfinished Business - None

10. Adjournment

With no further business coming before the Zoning Board of Appeals, Member Braselton made a motion to **adjourn the meeting of the Zoning Board of Appeals of October 21, 2009.** Member Moberly seconded the motion.

AYES: Members Moberly, Braselton, Neiman, Giltner and Chairman Haarlow
NAYS: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Members Connelly and Callahan

Motion carried.

Chairman Haarlow declared the meeting adjourned at 11:25 p.m.

Christine M. Bruton
ZBA Staff Secretary

Approved: _____