

CITY OF CLEVELAND HEIGHTS
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MINUTES OF THE MEETING
AUGUST 15, 2018

MEMBERS PRESENT:	Denver Brooker George A. Gilliam Benjamin Hoen Thomas Zych Dennis Porcelli	Vice Chair
MEMBERS ABSENT	Liza Wolf	
STAFF PRESENT:	Vesta A. Gates Karen Knittel Elizabeth Rothenberg Richard Wong	Zoning Administrative Assistant City Planner Assistant Law Director Planning Director

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Zych called the regular meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at which time all members except Ms. Wolf were present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE JULY 18, 2018 PUBLIC HEARING

Mr. Zych stated that he had given Ms. Gates some corrections prior to the meeting. He asked for a motion on the minutes as amended.

Mr. Gilliam moved to approve the minutes as amended. Mr. Brooker seconded the motion. The vote carried 3-0-1. Mr. Hoen abstained having not been present at the July meeting.

THE POWERS OF THE BOARD AND PROCEDURES OF THE BOARD OF ZONING
APPEALS PUBLIC HEARINGS FOR REGULAR VARIANCES

Mr. Zych stated that the purpose and procedures for tonight's meeting are stated for all in attendance. The hearings are quasi-judicial in nature and certain formalities must be followed as if this were a court of law. Anyone who wishes to speak about a case will first be placed under oath. For each case, City staff will make a presentation and then each applicant will present his or her case stating practical difficulty for which we are being asked to grant a variance. The Board will then open a public hearing to obtain testimony from any other persons interested in the case. The applicant will have an opportunity to respond to any testimony from the public and will address those comments to the Board. The Board may then ask questions of the applicant. Based on all the evidence in the record, the Board will make findings of fact and render its decision by motion. The formal nature of these proceedings is necessary because each applicant is asking for an extraordinary remedy called a variance. A variance is formal permission by the City for an individual not to comply with a portion of the municipal Zoning Ordinances which is binding to all others.

In making its decision of whether to grant a standard variance, the Board will weigh factors set forth in the Zoning Code in Section 1115.07(1). The burden is upon the applicant to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that the literal enforcement of the Zoning Code would result in a practical difficulty. Preponderance of evidence means the applicant proved his or her position is more likely than not true. The applicant must demonstrate circumstances unique to the physical character of his or her property. Personal difficulties, personal hardships or inconvenience are not relevant to the Board's determination.

The Board is the final administrative decision maker for all regular variances.

PUBLIC HEARING

AUGUST 15, 2018

CONTINUED CASES

CALENDAR NO. 3463:

Rozita Davis, 2378 North Taylor Rd., 'A' Single-family district,
requests a variance to Section 1121.12(a)(9) to permit parking
area in front yard (not permitted).

Mr. Zych stated that this is a continued case so the record will consist of what we hear tonight as well as what was presented in the July meeting. We have 3 Board members present who were at the July meeting so we have a quorum to decide this. We have the record from the July meeting in addition to some other items,

such as what we hear tonight in the presentation and a report dated 8/3/2018 which, without objection, will become part of the record of this continued case. Hearing no objection, it is so entered. He asked the applicant and anyone else who wished to testify to stand and be sworn in.

All those who wished to testify regarding this request were sworn in by Ms. Rothenberg.

Ms. Knittel explained that she would briefly review the facts of the case and the applicant's request which is slightly modified from the presentation at the July meeting. Her staff report was as follows:

Context

2378 North Taylor Road is a single family house surrounded by single family houses in an 'A' Single- family district.

Project

This case was continued from the July BZA meeting. The applicant proposes to widen the driveway to be wider at the garage. The revised request is to create an area that would be 6' wide by 20' long and then the area would angle back into the existing driveway. This would result in the pavement being 4'2" from the side property line.

The applicant has submitted a letter of support from her neighbor which has been copied and submitted to the Board.

Mr. Zych stated that without objection, the letter dated 8/1/2018 and signed by Tracy Robinson will be entered into the record.

Facts

- This parcel is code conforming as it is 62' wide and 7,750 square feet (code minimum is 50' wide and 7,500 square feet)
- This is a single-family house with an attached one car garage facing the street.
- The housing style of this neighborhood is predominately single family houses with attached garages facing the street.
- There is approximately 10' 2" from the existing driveway to the side property line.
- There is approximately 6' from the side of the house to the south property line.
- The current driveway is approximately 14' wide at the garage and narrows to 10' by the public right-of-way.
- A code conforming parking space is 9' wide, two spaces would measure 18' wide; therefore the 14' width of the current garage can accommodate one car.
- The distance from the garage door to the public right away is approximately 44.78'.
- The west side of the North Taylor Road is posted as a tow away zone

with no stopping permitted from 3PM to 7PM from Monticello Blvd. north to Stuart Road.

- Code Section 1161.11(a) states that a standard parking space is 9' wide by 20' wide and that a compact car space is 7'6" wide by 16' long.
- Code Section 1161.105 states that a residential driveway that provides access to a garage is limited to twelve (12) feet in width. A driveway apron, the width of the garage, as measured from the garage walls, is permitted to extend for a distance (depth) of twenty (20) feet. For garages located twenty-five (25) feet or less from the lot line, the driveway is permitted to be the width of the attached garage and no tapering is required on private property, however, the apron shall be a maximum of twelve (12) feet.
- The applicants has identified the following properties on North Taylor Road with the same or similar parking arrangements:
 - 2226 North Taylor Rd.
 - 2256 North Taylor Rd.
 - 2275 North Taylor Rd.
 - 2290 North Taylor Rd.
 - 2319 North Taylor Rd.
 - 2320 North Taylor Rd.

If approved, conditions should include:

1. Receipt of a Building Permit;
2. Landscape Plan approved by the Planning Director; and
3. Complete construction within 18 months of the effective date of this variance.

That concluded Ms. Knittel's report.

Mr. Zych stated that he had a problem with the dimensions not being reflected in the request. He assumed it would be appropriate, if the Board was so inclined to approve the request, based upon the redesign of the proposal, for the motion and the variance to include some restriction based upon the revised siting, as opposed to, 'you can just generally park in the front'.

Ms. Knittel stated that was correct, or the motioner could state the dimensions that are being approved within the motion.

Mr. Zych stated that right now the Board is simply saying, as presented, to permit literally parking anywhere in the front yard.

Ms. Knittel stated that was correct.

Mr. Zych stated that the applicant has been sworn in and remains under oath. He asked the applicant to come to the microphone stating that the Board appreciated all the comments she made last time, which are still germane and a part of the

record. He asked if she had anything further to add.

Rozita Davis, 2378 North Taylor Road, stated that Ms. Knittel had been very helpful to her. In doing all of this she hadn't known where to start so she really appreciated Ms. Knittel's assistance. As was stated she decreased the proposed width of the driveway expansion. She felt that she could live with that.

Mr. Zych thanked the applicant and noted for the record that the Board has a great staff that is always more than happy to help out and are quite skilled in the process.

PUBLIC OPENED/PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

There being no further questions or comment from the Board, Mr. Zych asked for a motion.

Mr. Brooker moved regarding Calendar No. 3463 Rozita Davis, 2378 N. Taylor Rd., to grant the application for the variance to Section 1121.12(a)(9) to permit parking area in the front yard where it is not permitted consistent with the revised document submitted this evening. After reviewing the application and other submissions, hearing the evidence under oath, the Board finds and concludes, there are special circumstances that exist here such as in this area of North Taylor there are times in the day when you cannot park on the street so the ability to back a car out, and park on the street to let another car out just doesn't exist at certain times of the day and that is an extenuating circumstance in this case. I think that this actually would improve the value of the property if someone else would want to purchase it. I think in light of other residences on the street in the immediate two or three blocks that have similar circumstances, the variance is not substantial. It doesn't detract from the character of the neighborhood and does not adversely delivery of government services. There really is no way to resolve the basic parking maneuverability of 2 people changing cars at the same time. That is the extent of my motion. The conditions are:

1. Receipt of a building permit;
2. A landscape plan approved by the Planning Director; and
3. Complete construction within 18 months of the effective date of this variance.

Mr. Gilliam seconded the motion.

Mr. Zych asked if the motioner and seconder would be agreeable to an additional condition to state that the additional paving in no part exceed 6 feet in width and 20 feet in length and that any additional paving by the applicant and or any future owner of the property would require a separate variance.

Both the motioner and seconder agreed to the amendment.

There no further discussion, the motion carried 3-0-1. Mr. Hoen abstained. The variance was granted.

CALENDAR NO. 3466:

Taylor Road Synagogue, 1970 South Taylor Rd., 'A' Single-family district, requests a variance to Section 1121.12(i)(1) to permit a fence that varies in height from 64" (5'4") to 69.5" (5'9.5") in the front yard (4' maximum height permitted).

Mr. Zych explained that although this case is continued, there were no previous proceedings so this is the beginning of this case.

Ms. Rothenberg suggested that since the alternate, Mr. Porcelli was present and Ms. Wolf had not arrived, that Mr. Porcelli should come on the bench.

The Board agreed and Mr. Porcelli came to the bench at 7:17 p.m.

All those who wished to testify regarding this request were sworn in by Ms. Rothenberg.

Mr. Zych stated that the Board had received a staff report dated 8/1/2018. He asked that the report be entered into to the record if there was no objection. Hearing no objection, the report was so entered.

Ms. Knittel stated that she also wanted to mention that the applicant submitted a letter today regarding the fence, copies of which have been given to each of the Board members. It does not give a name as to who wrote the statement, but is entitled 'Request for fence variance' and dated 8/15/2018 when it was received. The Board has also received a letter from the Jewish Federation Director of Security today 8/15/2018, and is so dated.

Mr. Zych stated that hearing no objection, both letters will become a part of the record.

Ms. Knittel's staff report was as follows:

Context

- The property is zoned 'A' Single-family
- North along Taylor Road is 'C2' Local Retail, behind the retail are apartments zoned 'MF-1' Multiple-family and then single family houses, zoned 'A' Single-Family
- South along Taylor Road is Cain Park, zoned P Parkland
- East across Taylor Road is Taylor Commons, zoned 'C3' General Commercial
- West behind the Synagogue is Cain Park, zoned 'P' Parkland

Project

This project was continued from the July BZA meeting.

A fence was installed along the perimeter of the Synagogue property as a result of U.S. Department of Homeland Security study. The fence in the front yard is taller than the 4' maximum height that code permits.

Facts

- This is a code conforming parcel as it is 250 feet wide and has 76,482 square feet. A code conforming 'A' Single-family parcel is a minimum of 50' wide and has 7,500 square feet.
- Synagogues are conditionally permitted uses in 'A' Single-Family districts.
- The fence was reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review and received a fence permit with the understanding that the height of the fence in the front yard would be no greater than 4 feet.
- Code Section 1121.12(i)(1) states that in a front yard, the maximum height of a fence is 4 feet (48 inches).
- Fence height is measured from the ground level to the highest point of the fence or pose.
- The fence installed in the front yard varies in height from 64" or 5'4" to 69.5 inches or 5.79 feet.

If approved, conditions should include:

1. Approval of the Architectural Board of Review of the actual fence height installed in the front yard;
2. A landscape plan approved by the Planning Director; and
3. A requirement to return to the Board of Zoning Appeals for another variance should the property owner consider modifications that would increase the fence height or location in the front yard from the current installation.

This concluded Ms. Knittel's report.

Mr. Zych asked the applicant or applicant's representative to come to the microphone.

Vladimir Victor, 3494 Shannon Road and Lionel Weber, 2681 Rochester Road, Shaker Heights, Ohio, came forward.

Mr. Victor stated that the Taylor Road Synagogue was visited by a representative of Homeland Security last year. They studied the synagogue and recommended additions that needed to be done to assure compliance in case of a terrorist attack. One of those recommendations was an 8 foot tall fence but we were having a difficult time getting suppliers to come and give a quote. We were also informed by the city that the maximum height is 4 feet and then discussed it with Homeland Security representative. Homeland Security maintained that 4 feet is too low and would not be a deterrent. A height of 5 feet was recommended. The fence is not for beauty even though everyone thinks the property looks better with the fence and Homeland Security actually paid for it. That is the reason we are here today.

Mr. Weber stated that regarding the mass or footprint of the building, the fence doesn't really add anything substantial. It does not detract from the appearance of the building or the residential nature of the neighborhood. It does fit in very well with the overall aesthetic of the neighborhood given the fact that it is commercial and Cain Park is across the street. Going from a height of 4 feet to 5 feet does not have a major impact.

Mr. Zych asked the applicant if the information contained in the application dated 6/29/2018 was true and correct to the best of his knowledge.

Mr. Victor stated that it was.

Mr. Zych stated that hearing no objection, the application will be made part of the record.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED/PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Mr. Zych observed that Cain Park is to the south and west. He asked if the fence extended along those boundaries as well.

Ms. Knittel explained that the fencing extended beyond the front yard but the balance is code-conforming.

Mr. Zych stated that it was usual for an applicant to request a variance prior to doing what they want to do. Is there a reason why that step was skipped in this instance?

Mr. Victor explained that as he stated it was difficult to get suppliers to give quotes. We finally got someone in March and the fence was required by Homeland Security to be erected by April. When the supplier came and showed an example of what a 4 foot tall fence would look like, it was obvious that anyone could hop over it. We were not looking to install a fence but it became a requirement.

Mr. Gilliam stated that he also had a problem with putting something up and requesting the variance after the fact. The applicant was approved by the Architectural Board of Review for a 4 foot tall fence. Did the ABR mention that they were only approving a height of 4 feet?

Mr. Victor explained that about a year ago they had received a notice from the city that a neighbor on Superior Park had complained that there had been trees previously along the driveway facing Superior Park that that had been removed. The property owner asked if the trees could be replaced by a fence and paid for by the synagogue. Mr. Victor said the synagogue would be happy to put up the fence even though the trees that were removed were on synagogue property. That was when they became aware that a permit was necessary. We also did not realize at the time that approvals from two Boards were necessary. All this was discovered after the fact.

Mr. Wong stated that as the person who staff's the ABR, he wanted the Board to know that the applicant applied for a 4 foot tall fence.

There being no further questions or comment from the Board, Mr. Zych asked for a motion.

Mr. Hoen moved to grant Calendar No. 3466, Taylor Road Synagogue, 1970 South Taylor Road, I move to grant the application for the variance to Section 1121.12(i)(1) to permit 68" tall fence that varies in height from 64" 95'4") to 69.5" (5' 9.5") in the front yard where the maximum height of 4 feet is permitted. After reviewing the application and other submissions, hearing the evidence under oath, I find and conclude that although they did not obtain a permit prior to building the fence, the applicant did provide some substantiation for the basis of why that did not occur, due to the timing and requirements of Homeland Security to erect the fence in a tight time frame. I find that special conditions exist at the property, that this synagogue property is zoned 'A' single family but there are no single-family residential properties that are directly next to or across from the property. It is commercially zoned for all intents and purposes. The fence itself would not alter the neighborhood at all. There is fencing around other parts of the property, including along the entire Cain Park district to the south of the property. The variance, although not insubstantial, is also not substantial. This Board has recently considered other cases in this neighborhood that were brought before us for security concerns. Variances were granted to those other applicants to erect fences that are taller than this fence, therefore I would consider this variance to be insubstantial in that regard. If granted I would add the following conditions:

1. Approval of the Architectural Board of Review of the actual fence height installed in the front yard;
2. A landscape plan approved by the Planning Director; and
3. A requirement to return to the Board of Zoning Appeals for another variance should the property owner consider modifications that would increase the fence height or location in the front yard from the current installation.

Mr. Brooker seconded the motion.

Mr. Zych added that for him the adjacency to Cain Park is important. It is not a fenced park, and is what we love about that park. But there is a lot of traffic through that part of the park and code-conforming fencing along that side is appropriate and the fencing subject to the variance connects to that. That is also a factor in favor of it.

Mr. Zych asked for other comments from the Board.

Mr. Gilliam stated that he would vote against the request. He did not want to set the precedent of people doing something and then coming to us for a permit. This has been done over the years from everything like other fences to back yard swimming pools. So I intend to vote no on this one.

There being no further discussion, Mr. Brooker seconded the motion which carried 4-1, Mr. Gilliam was opposed. The variance was granted.

Before hearing the next case, Mr. Porcelli asked the Planning Director if any consideration had been given regarding the maximum fence height since it seems that a lot of the conditional uses would be best served by a higher fence height. Maybe the city could consider taller fences in many cases to create screening

barriers for neighbors or in the case of school security. It may save some variance requests down the road. It might be clarified that in some cases higher fences are beneficial for some conditional uses.

Mr. Zych thanked Mr. Porcelli for his suggestion.

NEW CASE

CALENDAR NO. 3467:

Glinda Thomas, 2736 Berkshire Rd., 'AA' Single-family district, requests a variance to Section 1121.12(b) to permit a porch in the corner side yard (14' min. setback req'd.)

All those who wished to testify regarding this request were sworn in by Ms. Rothenberg.

Mr. Zych stated that the Board had received a staff report dated 8/6/2018. He asked that the report be entered into the record if there was no objection. Hearing no objection, the report was so entered.

Ms. Knittel's staff report was as follows:

Context

- The property is zoned 'AA' Single-family
- The houses north across Berkshire Road are zoned 'AA' Single-family
- The houses to the west along Berkshire Road are zoned 'AA' Single-family
- Across Mornington Lane, along Berkshire Road the 'AA' Single-family zoning continues for two parcels and then changes to an 'A' Single-family district
- To the south at the rear of the property as houses zoned 'A' Single-family with Derbyshire Road addresses

Project

The applicant is renovating this house and would like to incorporate a small porch off the kitchen that would be located in the corner side yard along Mornington Lane. The proposed porch would be setback 6'2" feet from the Mornington Lane right-of-way.

Facts

- This parcel is a nonconforming parcel of record as it is 72.9 feet wide and the 'AA' Single-family zoning code requires a minimum width of 100 feet at the building line of a parcel.
- This parcel is 22,800 sq. feet and the minimum area and the 'AA' zoning code requires a minimum area of 15,000 square feet
- This is a corner parcel located at the southwest corner of Berkshire Road and Mornington Lane.
- The zoning code section 1121.12(b) permits unenclosed porches to extend into a corner side yard no more than 12 feet provided that it does not extend

more than 6 feet into the required front yard.

The required front yard in the 'AA' single-family district is 20 feet. Therefore the code requires a setback of 14 feet from the right-of-way.

- The front north east corner of the existing house is setback 10 feet from the Mornington Lane right-of-way.
- There is a bay window that is 8.5 from the Mornington Lane right-of-way.

If approved, conditions should include:

1. Approval of the Architectural Board of Review;
2. Receipt of a Building Permit;
3. Approval of landscape plan by the Planning Director; and
4. Complete construction within 18 months of the effective date of this variance.

This concludes Ms. Knittel's report.

Referring to the slide, Mr. Zych noted that to truly render this house code-conforming, you would have to shave off a portion of the house along Mornington Lane.

Ms. Knittel agreed.

Mr. Zych asked the applicant or applicant's representative to come to the microphone.

Ken Burney, Burney Builders Inc., 18860 Hyde Park Way, Rocky River, Ohio, represented the applicant. He stated that this unique parcel, because of being a corner lot, and as the Chair pointed out, a portion of the existing house would have to be sheared off to comply with the required setback. We are trying to create a porch in the area that already encroaches the required setback. Since moving into the house the homeowners have met all their neighbors from a very small existing porch on the rear of the house. That porch is gone now due to an addition that is being constructed on the house. They did not realize how enjoyable it was to sit on that porch and meet their neighbors and the parade of people that go up and down Mornington Lane. They would like to still be able to converse and meet the neighbors. That is what brought this on. We have tucked it into the one portion of the house where it steps back to try to make the porch as small as possible, to accommodate a couple of chairs. It is not a grand porch across the front of the house or along the whole side. The particular location is adjacent to the interior kitchen. They also have a handicapped child that they wanted the porch for, as opposed to the other side of the house or facing the back yard. That is the rationale of why they wanted the porch in that location and why we tried to make it as small as possible while suiting their needs, and having as small a variance as possible.

David Ellison, architect, 3118 Carroll Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio, stated that while the property sits on a corner, I think the property qualifies as an unusual property because the house already sits so close to the property line and there is minimal

space between it and the next house while it doesn't fit the strict rule of the zoning code, it does meet the intent and purpose of the code because of the unique location on the side street and the close proximity to the next house over.

Mr. Burney, referring to the architect's rendering of the proposed porch, stated they were also adding an elevator to the house so their child can go from floor to floor. The porch breaks up the long length of the addition in the back and the elevator breaks up the side elevation. In his opinion, the house looks better with the porch than without it.

Mr. Zych stated that the Board has received an application dated July 11, 2018. He asked the applicant if, to the best of his knowledge, the facts contained within were true and accurate.

Mr. Burney stated that they were.

Mr. Zych stated that hearing no objection, the application will be entered into the record.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED/PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Ms. Rothenberg stated that when the reason for a variance is to make an accommodation for a disability there are two routes an applicant can take. This applicant chose to apply for a variance which, as the Board knows, runs with the land and cannot be the reason for the variance. In this case, the need for accessibility cannot be the reason for granting the variance because that reason would not run with the land. If they had chosen the other way, in which the Board would approve a special accommodation, the porch would have to be removed when they were no longer occupants of the house. So this will be a permanent solution for reasons that have nothing to do with accessibility and that have been presented to the Board.

Mr. Zych commented that although the Board takes into consideration that it is not a specific accommodation for a person, but given the neighborhood, given the tenor, and one: the inclusiveness of Cleveland Heights, and two: the age and other variances. Also considering the type of people who typically may be homeowners in our city, and that it may not be for a particular accommodation but having these accommodations helps the marketability of product. That is something we consider even though it is not personal circumstance. For instance when we talk about animals, and we desire an animal proof fence, that is something that is desirable generally. He appreciated staff's clarification. He noted that along Mornington Lane all the way to Euclid Heights Boulevard, including Edgehill, Berkshire, East Overlook and Derbyshire, there are properties that abut the lane even closer. While we use the word unique maybe a little too often, this is a unique part of Cleveland Heights and given the fact that this is a corner side yard where there are corner side yard restrictions. In his mind this is one instance where the word unique actually applies.

Mr. Porcelli asked the applicant if the size of the porch was partially due to the handicapped child using the porch.

Mr. Burney stated that it was and the steps don't come off the front so there is no possibility of the wheelchair tumbling down into the street. That is why the stairs are off to the side and why the dimension that it is can accommodate the maneuvering of a wheelchair.

Mr. Porcelli asked if the door from the house to the porch adequate for wheelchair access.

Mr. Burney stated that it was.

Mr. Hoen asked if the proposed porch was where an existing porch is.

Mr. Burney stated that the existing porch is around the corner. It really is a back door with a roof over it. He hesitated to call it a porch and had just enough room for two folding chairs.

Mr. Hoen asked if that porch and the proposed porch would overlap.

Ms. Knittel showed a slide of the drawing of the side and rear elevation, which indicated the distance between the rear porch and the proposed porch.

There being no further comment from the Board, Mr. Zych asked for a motion.

Mr. Gilliam moved to grant Calendar No. 3467, Glinda Thomas, 2736 Berkshire Road, the variance to Section 1121.12(b) to permit a porch in the corner side yard to be set back 6'2" from the Mornington Road right-of-way where a 14' minimum setback is required. After reviewing the application and other submissions, hearing the evidence under oath, I find and conclude: That special circumstances exist because we are starting with a house that is already encroaching the required setback. We've removed the old porch and will construct a new one and that is a problem. The variance is insubstantial. This is on Mornington Lane which is a narrow street that has no sidewalks. So this will not impede pedestrian traffic on the street. The essential character of the neighborhood will not be substantially altered as a result of the variance because it is on the side of the building and has no bearing on the property across the road which is a driveway and a garage of that property. It will not adversely affect delivery of governmental services. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because it will not confer on the applicant any special privilege. If the variance is granted the following conditions are:

1. Approval of the Architectural Board of Review;
2. Receipt of a Building Permit;
3. Approval of landscape plan by the Planning Director; and
4. Complete construction within 18 months of the effective date of this variance.

Mr. Porcelli seconded the motion which carried 5-0. The variance was granted.

OLD BUSINESS

Ms. Knittel reported that the use variance that was approved by the Board in June, to permit a single-family home to be built in a multi-family district, was approved by City Council at the end of July.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the regular meeting was adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Benjamin Hoen, Vice Chair



Vesta A. Gates, Secretary