



**CITY OF WALLED LAKE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
(ELECTRONIC MEETING PLATFORM)
MONDAY, MAY 18, 2020**

The Meeting was called to order at 7:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL: Arnold, Easter, Gunther, Hecht, O'Rourke, Rundell

OTHERS PRESENT: Consultant Building Official Wright, City Attorney Vanerian,
Recording Secretary Stuart

REQUESTS FOR AGENDA CHANGES: None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

**ZBA 5-1-20 APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 24, 2020 ZONING BOARD OF
APPEALS MEETING MINUTES**

Motion by O'Rourke, seconded Rundell: CARRIED: To approve the February 24, 2020
Zoning Board of Appeals meeting minutes.

COMMUNICATION:

Recording secretary Stuart said there were letters regarding ZBA 2020-03 and asked if board
wanted them read now or when case was heard. Chairman Easter suggested when case was
heard.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Public Hearing

Open Public Hearing 7:36 p.m.

Public Hearing

Case: 2020-01
Applicant: Michael Petryczkowycz
Location: 566 E Walled Lake Drive
Request: Non-Use Variance

Chairman Easter read the public notice; applicant proposes complete renovation of structure
located at 566 E. Walled Lake. Currently this structure is a preexisting nonconforming structure

with a side yard setback on the west of 0.6' and on the east 18'11". Front yard setback currently is at the minimum 2.2".

Section 18.03 Nonconforming Structures of the Walled Lake Zoning Ordinance item (a) states no such structure shall be enlarged or altered in a way which would increase their nonconformity. With altering the second floor from a bungalow type structure to a colonial style structure this increases the nonconformity by having more exterior wall space and roof structure in the required side and front yard setbacks. A dimensional variance is required.

Applicant Michael Petryczkowycz explained he is proposing a bungalow style home with a second floor to make it conforming to what is exciting along E Walled Lake to the north of his residence. Mr. Petryczkowycz explained his design will bring up the neighborhood beautifully. He said the home is dilapidated, but he does not want to tear it down he wants to make it nicer to live there. He explained the structure of the roof will be changed.

Member Gunther explained he has an issue not with the use variance but the 8-inch overhang on the existing structure, its only 6 inches to get to the neighbor's property on the east side. Member Gunther explained the 8-inch overhang on the east side is trespassing on the neighbor's property much less not being anywhere near the setback requirements

Mr. Petryczkowycz said he did not see where Member Gunther was explaining. He said there is an 8-inch overhang on the west side, the front of the home. There is a 6 -inch overhang and that is right on the property line.

Chairman Easter asked if that includes gutters as well, he did not any gutters noted on plan. Chairman Easter said there was also a drainage issue not addressed by the applicant from a previous meeting.

Member Arnold said there needs to be gutters or the neighbors would be adversely affected.

Mr. Petryczkowycz said he did not have a problem with installing gutters it will make it look nice.

Member Rundell said the drawings indicate a 12-inch overhang on the property line, it will be 6 inches over onto the neighboring property. Member Rundell said he is concerned that board is not considering the drainage and situation with the seawall area and water draining into the lake. Member Rundell explained the board discussed at a prior meeting and nothing was resolved.

Member Gunther explained looking at the rear elevation it shows a one-foot overhang on the east side and that must be addressed.

Mr. Petryczkowycz said he will make sure he is not hanging over onto the neighbor's property.

Vice Chairman Hecht said he agrees with addressing the overhang issues. He said at the last meeting there was discussion about the drainage and seawall as a possible solution.

Member Rundell said Building Official Wright also mentioned this at last meeting and drainage areas behind the seawall. If it drained off it would drain off the sides and right back into the lake. There needs to be some site mitigation done to make sure we are not polluting the lake in any way or allowing anything to go in there because applicant has changed his property to accommodate his use.

Vice Chairman Hecht said the seawall discussion was proposed as a solution so application would not have to tear up the concrete in-between the home and garage. It was discussed the applicant was to review possibly installing a drywell.

Building Official Jim Wright explained there was a prior ZBA case with the applicant regarding concrete that was poured without permits. Building Official Wright said at the last meeting that issue had to be rectified before consideration of this additional variance. There was a lot of options provided to the applicant. The applicant has met with the city engineer, but he has seen no plans as of yet. He said one proposed plan was to create additional drainage behind the seawall, but we know from seawall construction that water behind the seawall undermines the reason for a seawall. You cannot view that as drainage if you will have water behind it. There was another suggestion of a drainage ditch or pit to control the water drainage related to the additional concrete and that has not been completely addressed. Also, at the last meeting the wrong plans were submitted for the home, the plans the board has now are correct. He said there are fire codes and building codes that address the structures to the property line and another structural items and those items if plans were approved could be addressed through the building code. The possible elimination of the overhang was discussed. Mr. Wright said rather than the board mandate gutters it would be best that the applicant proposed a drainage system and have that reviewed by the city engineer.

Chairman Easter said he agrees and explained if the board places requirements of gutters, those have to be reviewed by city engineer to make sure they address the complete drainage system for the site.

Building Official Wright explained the gutters may not work it will need to be proposed by the applicant and reviewed by the city engineer.

Chairman Easter explained the non-conforming structures should be alright however, the drainage needs to be addressed.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Ben Berry, 821 E. Walled Lake Drive – said he is looking forward to the site improvements.

Close Public Hearing 7:58 p.m.

Chairman Easter explained figuring out the drainage is crucial getting the city engineer involved is necessary.

Member Gunther said he is still really struggling with how close the structure comes to other property line regardless if it is an existing non-conforming structure. He said an overhang within a half a foot from the home is an issue for him. He explained it is unfortunate due to the size of the lot and proposed losing the wall on east side to gain the required setback. Member Gunther explained lots less than 65 in width may have setback with the least side being 3.5 feet. Member Gunther said this needs to be addressed and told applicant to revise the plans and resubmit.

ZBA 5-2-20 MOTION TO TABLE CASE 2020-01 FOR 566 E. WALLED LAKE DRIVE FOR SUBMITTAL OF REVISED PLAN ADDRESSING DRAINAGE AND SIDE YARD SETBACKS

Motion by Gunther, seconded by Rundell, CARRIED: To table case 2020-01 for 566. E. Walled Lake Drive for submittal of revised plan addressing drainage and side yard setbacks.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes (6) Gunther, Hecht, Rundell, O'Rourke, Arnold, Easter
Nays (0)
Absent (0)
Abstention (0)

Chairman Easter explained the pitch of roof and home design must address proposed drainage to ensure no adverse effect to neighboring properties.

Member Rundell said turning the gable to opposite side may help.

Mr. Petryczkowycz said changing the gable does not look aesthetically pleasing.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Case: 2020-02
Applicant: McDonald's Restaurant
Location: 1212 E. West Maple Road
Request: Non-Use Variance

Chairman Easter reviewed the public notice this matter relates to property located at the above referenced location. The applicant is requesting variances from Article 21.00 General Provisions of the Walled Lake Zoning Ordinance as follows:

- Section 21.29(I)(19)(c) requires minimum lot frontage of 150 feet. Existing site is 140 feet; and
- Section 21.29(I)(19)(e) requires buildings to have a minimum setback from residentially zoned property of 40 feet. Existing building is 23 feet from RM-1 zoned property; and
- Section 21.29(I)(19)(g) requires a site to have a six (6) foot high masonry wall and a twenty (20) foot landscape setback. Existing site has a six (6) foot high masonry wall and no landscape setback; and

- Section 21.29(I)(19)(h) requires a ten (10) foot landscape setback on the side yard. Existing site has a zero (0) foot landscape setback; and
- Section 21.29(I)(19)(i) requires only one (1) ingress/egress per street frontage. The site has one (1) ingress and one (1) egress on E. West Maple Road.

Open Public Hearing 8:10 p.m.

Member Gunther explained the ingress and egress language will need to be revised if that is how it reads in the ordinance it does not make sense.

Applicant's architect Mr. Frank Martin explained the variances requests are a direct result of a store that has been in operation 46 years, the variances are due to improvements that are proposed for the site. Mr. Martin explained the building is within 23 feet of existing building, the masonry wall does exist but there is not a 20-foot landscape setback. Mr. Martin explained the city zoning ordinance now as compared to when the site was first constructed has a strict parking requirement. Mr. Martin explained the new proposal for the double drive thru is in order to provide stacking, they eliminated parking on the west side, created additional landscaping. Mr. Martin explained one ingress and egress was approved by Planning Commission and in turn a bypass lane was created. Mr. Martin explained they are currently going through the building permit plan review process. The health department plan review process was done and completed. Mr. Martin explained they look forward to an improved site and barrier free conditions for the interior and exterior.

Chairman Easter thanked the applicant for moving through the required city processes.

Member Rundell said the applicant came before the board 40 years ago with their drive thru proposal it appears they are not expanding the drive thru away from wall but adding behind the building.

Mr. Martin explained expanding the cash window area and moving it to the rear or south approximately 6 to 8 feet is a result from McDonald's corporate studies of their drive throughs showing this modification helps to not hold up the drive through pay options. Mr. Martin explained the expansion to the south of the cash window is to improve the spacing so that the extra car can be between the two drive through windows.

Mr. Martin said the drive through represents 70 to 75% of the business. Mr. Martin explained the current outdoor playland has been eliminated and a small indoor playland was created. The whole drive through ordering and stacking will be improved with this modification.

Member Gunther asked of the current condition of the masonry screening wall.

Mr. Martin said he has not done a visual inspection of that wall.

Vice Chairman Hecht said the plans look great.

City Attorney Vanerian recommended to the board to make a motion for each variance request and include a statement of reasons if inclined to grant variance that the applicant satisfied the board and that what the applicant submitted this evening met each of the criteria for granting a variance. Attorney Vanerian explained if motion is to disapprove the board needs to include the reasons why and criteria not met.

Close Public Hearing 8:30 p.m.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: None

ZBA 5-3-20 MOTION TO APPROVE NON-USE VARIANCE REQUEST FROM SECTION 21.29(I)(19)(C) REQUIRING A MINIMUM LOT FRONTAGE OF 150 FEET DUE TO IMPRACTICAL DIFFICULTY TO PURCHASE LAND AS THERE IS NO ADDITIONAL LAND TO THE EAST AND WEST THIS IS NOT A NOT SELF-CREATED HARDSHIP THE EXISTING SITE IS 140 FEET

Motion by Gunther, seconded by O'Rourke: CARRIED: To approve non-use variance request from Section 21.29(I)(19)(c) requiring a minimum lot frontage of 150 feet due to impractical difficulty to purchase land as there is no additional land to the east and west this is not a self-created hardship the existing site is 140 feet.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes (6) Gunther, Hecht, Rundell, O'Rourke, Arnold, Easter
Nays (0)
Absent (0)
Abstentions (0)

ZBA 5-4-20 MOTION TO APPROVE NON-USE VARIANCE REQUEST FROM SECTION 21.29(I)(19)(E) REQUIRING BUILDINGS TO HAVE A MINIMUM SETBACK OF 40 FEET FROM RESIDENTIALLY ZONED PROPERTIES THE EXISTING BUILDING IS 23 FEET FROM RM-1 ZONED PROPERTY

Motion by O'Rourke, seconded by Hecht: CARRIED: To approve non-use variance request from Section 21.29(I)(19)(e) requiring buildings to have a minimum setback of 40 feet from residentially zoned properties the exiting building is 23 feet from RM-1 zoned property.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes (6) Rundell, O'Rourke, Arnold, Gunther, Hecht, Easter
Nays (0)
Absent (0)
Abstentions (0)

ZBA 5-5-20 MOTION TO APPROVE NON-USE VARIANCE REQUEST FROM SECTION 21.29(I)(19)(G) REQUIRING THE SITE TO HAVE A 6-FOOT-HIGH MASONRY WALL AND A 20 FOOT LANDSCAPE SETBACK DUE TO PRACTICAL DIFFICULTY AND PLANS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING ON SITE

Motion by Gunther, seconded by Hecht: CARRIED: To approve non-use variance request from Section 21.29 (I) (19) (e) requiring the site to have a six (6) foot high masonry wall and a twenty (20) foot landscape setback due to practical difficulty and plans to provide additional landscaping on site.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes (6) O'Rourke, Arnold, Gunther, Hecht, Rundell, Easter
Nays (0)
Absent (0)
Abstentions (0)

ZBA 5-6-20 MOTION TO APPROVE NON-USE VARIANCE REQUEST FROM 21.29(I)(19)(H) REQUIRING A 10 FOOT LANDSCAPE SETBACK ON THE SIDE YARD WITH PLANS SHOWING ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING WITHIN THE PROPERTY

Motion by Hecht, seconded by Rundell: CARRIED: To approve non-use variance request from 21.29(I)(19)(h) requiring a 10-foot landscape setback on the side yard with plans showing additional landscaping within the property.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes (6) Arnold, Gunther, Hecht, Rundell, O'Rourke, Easter
Nays (0)
Absent (0)
Abstentions (0)

ZBA 5-7-20 MOTION TO APPROVE NON-USE VARIANCE 21.29(I)(19)(I) REQUIRING ONLY 1 INGRESS / EGRESS PER STREET FRONTAGE THE SITE WILL CONTINUE WITH 1 INGRESS AND EGRESS AS APPLICANT HAS MADE MORE ROOM ON PROPERTY FOR PATRONS TO TURN AROUND

Motion by Hecht, seconded by Easter: CARRIED: To approve non-use variance 21.29(I)(19)(i) requiring only 1 ingress and egress per street frontage the site will continue with 1 ingress and egress as applicant has made more room on property for patrons to turn around.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes (6) Arnold, Gunther, Hecht, Rundell, O'Rourke, Easter
Nays (0)
Absent (0)
Abstentions (0)

Mr. Martin thanked the board for their time they look forward to renovating the facility.

Vice Chairman Hecht asked for the timeline for the project. Mr. Pfau said the original date was May 1st now they are looking at beginning of August and should take about 6 to 8 weeks with a partial closure for a few weeks during the project.

2. Case: 2020-03
Applicant: Ben Berry
Location: 821 E. Walled Lake Drive
Request: Non-Use Variance

This matter relates to property located at the above referenced location. The applicant is requesting variance from Article 17.02 (m) Impervious Surface in Single Family Districts which is a maximum of 35%. Applicant's plan proposes lot coverage of 48.2%.

Open Public Hearing 8:31 p.m.

Mr. Berry thanked the board for hearing his case. He said he is looking to add beauty to the neighborhood and his home. Mr. Berry said the proposal has the impervious surface at 42% which is over the max due to excessively long driveway the property has because the garage is all the to the back of his yard. Mr. Berry said he said he will have to replace his driveway it is not in good condition and is proposing porous asphalt which would lessen the impervious surface from 42% to 30.3%.

Vice Chairman Hecht said the home comes forward quite a bit why not build to the back of the home.

Mr. Berry explained the orientation of the home will not allow it, the service panel is in the back and the general layout of the home. He said most of the family rooms and everything are in the backside of the home. He said the master bedroom and closet are at the front. He said if having to build in the back, the whole house would have to flip around, and it would be almost a tear down at that point.

Member Gunther asked why there was not a variance request for violating the neighbors lot lines. He said the applicant cannot be further forward than the neighboring two homes. That should require an additional variance. He said Article 17 of the zoning ordinance clearly states you cannot go forward past your neighboring properties. Member Gunther says this needs to be addressed before the board takes any action on impervious surface. He said he is not concerned with the impervious surface especially of you use material that is more pervious.

Building Official Wright said he has seen several references to Article 17. He explained Article 17 was written specifically for properties that are closer to the street line. He said when you read the article regarding Established Residential Building Pattern (ERBP) it says a minimum front setback should be based on established residential building pattern or minimum set back of schedule of regulations, whichever is less. He said that means the other side of Pontiac Trail for example, where the city has homes closer to the road because they were not able to meet the 30-foot setback. He explained the homes were able to be brought forward based on ERBP because it is less than required 30-foot setback. What the applicant is proposing meets the requirements of a setback for that street. He said this area has additional requirements of 43 feet from centerline of the road plus a 30-foot setback, which the applicant is complying with in the drawing.

Member Gunther said the article reads the ERPB setbacks equally average front setbacks of immediately adjacent dwellings on each side of the parcel on the same side of the road and same zoning district; front setback of adjacent structures. He said the article states the ERPB shall be equal to front setbacks of immediately adjacent homes, on same side of road. He said he did not see the whichever is less reference Building Official Wright noted.

Member Arnold said it is clear. Member Arnold explained it is to allow building on the lake front side when you cannot meet the setback. He said it is the interpretation.

Chairman Easter said the problem is with interpretation. He said the ERBP is a set formula not a single line. He said every sentence in Section 17.4 has to be taken into consideration, the math has to be done, you have to come up with figure, you have to measure all the physical structures then come up with numbers. He said that is his understanding. He said this was put together in 2002, the city has had a dozen homes on E Walled lake Drive built since then and they have all seemed to follow the line except for most recently 813 E Walled Lake Drive. He said for the benefit of Mr. Berry and everyone else the item should be tabled until we can work this out. Chairman Easter said he wants to table the item and requested a motion.

Member Arnold said he wanted to clarify his point, it says, or the minimum setbacks specified, or whichever is less. There is no interpretation it is literally this or that.

Chairman Easter said he wanted to table this item right now and discuss this to figure out the interpretation. He said the board does not want this to be a wrong decision he wants Mr. Berry to have a beautiful home.

Close Public Hearing 8:48 p.m.

Member Gunther said before a motion is made the correspondence letters need to be read into the record.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Dear Jennifer Stuart

Thank you for your time, I am writing to you on behalf of the Non-Use Variance request for 821 E. Walled Lake Drive. At this time, I would like to express my concerns about allowing this variance to happen in the near future. To begin, this will affect my view of Walled Lake as well as my families view, allowing us to only see one side of the lake from our house, and additionally block all sunset views. My parents invested in this house over 25 years ago solely due to the location and stunning lake views, and they have additionally respected our neighbors when re-building our house about 8 years ago. My family and I believe it is important for each individual living on the lake to be able to have beautiful view from their home every day. Additionally, the house along Walled Lake Drive have been asymmetrical for many years and the on compliment my family always receives is how beautiful the houses all look aligned in order. Furthermore, the houses are already very close to each other on walled lake and there is little room next to each house. Allowing this variance to happen would not only block everyday views from my home, but additionally make the home surrounding 821 E. Walled Lake Drive feel very closed in and shadowed. Lastly, I believe that it is wonderful to be able to remodel a home and make it into something great, however, I know that it is important to respect the community around your home as well. I do not know very much about variance orders however I have tried my best to understand them and speak my opinion on the situation. I thank you very much for your time and wish you health and safety during this time.

Sincerely,

Alexandra Tome

*Kelly Tome
825 E. Walled Lake
Walled Lake, MI 48390*

*Zoning Board of Appeals
Jennifer A. Stuart, MPA, CMC, CMMC
1499 E. West Maple Road
Walled Lake, MI 48390*

Dear Ms. Stuart;

Due to the COVID 19 virus, I will not be attending the public hearing scheduled for Monday, May 18, 2020. Instead I am writing this letter to express my concerns for the variance request for the Case: 2020-03 for Ben Berry 821 E. Walled Lake Drive.

***IDO NOT** want this variance to be considered at all. Not only will this block my spectacular view of the lake, I feel this would change the character of our street. All the houses for many years have been asymmetrical and are*

beautifully lined in a row. We all have the same set back from the street and the street lines look stunning. Every resident can now look out their homes and view the gorgeous lake and breathtaking sunsets. If this variance is approved, I will not be able to look out of my house and see the sunsets, lake views or watching families walking the lake. All that I will see is a wall blocking mine and my families stunning views. I moved to Walled Lake over 20 years ago for the beautiful lake views and by allowing this various you will be taking this away from me and other nearby neighbors.

I feel the city zoning committee should not ever even look at a variance for allowing any changes to the Set Back/Impervious Surface Law. This is a law so that everyone living on East Walled Drive can have the same views of the lake from the right and to the left of their homes and should not be allowed to be changed.

Please consider my views on why I am opposed of this variance and to not allow this to be approved so that all the residents living close to 821 E Walled Lake drive will not lose the views of the lake. The fabulous views of the lake is why most all of us moved here. I also feel this would be such a loss to our home values by allowing this house to be built in our neighborhood.

I want to thank the City Planning Committee for their time to review my letter and please do not allow this appeal to be approved. Please consider how we would feel by losing our view of the lake not only my house but the surrounding neighbors.

Respectfully,

Kelly Tome

Dear Jennifer Stuart

Thank you for taking the time to read this, my concerns are with the Non-Use Variance request for 821 E. Walled Lake Drive. I have lived at 825 E. Walled Lake Drive for 20 years, my parents invested in the house over 25 years ago for the location and the view. 8 years ago, when my family and I were rebuilding our home, we respected all neighbors and their views. Building out will obstruct our view and give a very displeasing look to the overall street view.

Along with these concerns, the distance between houses is already extremely close. Loving on the lake, we knew this would be the case. Yet, there is absolutely no reason to move a home even closer to another. My family and I strongly believe that every resident on Walled Lake has the right to a view. The reason for living on the lake is solely for the views. Remodeling a home on Walled Lake is definitely going to be beautiful, but it's extremely important to be respectful of our community and the residents.

Sincerely,

Sophia M. Tome

Mr. Kernan, 817 E Walled Lake Drive – said he built his home in 2002 within the proper site lines of existing homes and accordance with the laws. He said he is not in favor in having a house block his views of the lake. He said he pays a lot of money in taxes and he has lived on this lake his entire life he did not think it was right and that is the bottom line. He said variance laws should not be changed based on where you are on the street and he is going to have his attorney look into that. He said every house on his street, minus two, are all in line. He said the recent one being built should never have been approved either. He said he was unaware that was going up or he would have voiced his opinion then. He said he looks forward to the remodeling and improvements.

Kelly Tome, 825 E. Walled Lake Drive – said she thinks building the home would be beautiful but blocking the existing homes would not be appropriate. She said new construction is great, but the houses should be aligned. She said when she did her home eight years ago she respected her neighbors and she did not come any further. She said by allowing this house to be built, it will block her views of the lake on the right side.

Building Official Wright said it would be a failure on his part to not point out that this district is the only district that requires the 43 feet from center line of road and 30 feet front yard. He said the ERPB does say whichever is less. He said it would make sense that if this is what was required, that is what would be allowed rather than the ERPB. But also take into consideration this street has the requirement of 43 feet and additional 30 feet rather than being in the ERBP.

Chairman Easter said he wants to table this he asked the board to table. He said as a board, they have to get it right. He said he needs to talk with Jim Wright and Attorney Vanerian to clarify the ordinance.

ZBA 5-8-20 MOTION TO TABLE CASE 2020-03 FOR 821 E. WALLED LAKE DRIVE

Motion by Rundell, seconded by Hecht: CARRIED: To table case 2020-03 for 821 E. Walled Lake Drive.

City Attorney Vanerian reminded the board of the open meetings act and members three or more is violation of act. He advised the board to careful of internal meetings and discussions amongst themselves if a quorum of the board is present. Attorney Vanerian said the board does have interpretive power and can confer with staff and consultants. He said it is appropriate for the ZBA to exercise interpretive authority. Attorney Vanerian explained as a quorum of members of the board the City Attorney and Building Official are not members of the board.

3. Election of Officers

Chairman Easter said he would continue as chair if he has nomination and support.

ZBA 5-9-20 MOTION TO NOMINATE JASON EASTER AS ZBA CHAIRMAN

Motion by Hecht, seconded by Rundell: CARRIED: To nominate Jason Easter as ZBA chairman.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes (5)	Hecht, Rundell, O'Rourke, Arnold, Gunther
Nays (0)	
Absent (0)	
Abstentions (1)	Easter

ZBA 5-10-20 MOTION TO NOMINATE KYLE HECHT AS VICE CHAIRMAN

Motion by Rundell, seconded by Easter: CARRIED: To nominate Kyle Hecht as vice chairman of the ZBA.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes (5)	Rundell, O'Rourke, Arnold, Gunther, Easter
Nays (0)	
Absent (0)	
Abstentions (1)	Hecht

ADJOURNMENT

ZBA 5-11-20 MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion by Rundell seconded by Hecht, CARRIED, to adjourn the meeting at 9 p.m.



Jennifer Stuart
Recording Secretary

*approved 4/29/2020
(Electronic Meeting)*

Jason Easter
Chairman