

CITY OF BURTON
REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES
JUNE 19, 2003, 6:00 P.M., COUNCIL CHAMBERS

THE MEETING WAS CALLED TO ORDER BY CHAIRPERSON JAMIE CURTIS AT 6:00 P.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Weatherford, Scott, Terry Parker, Centilli, Grantner, Welch, Curtis

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: T. Strasser, Deputy Planning Official, J. Adams, Clerk's Office

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No audience participation at this time.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Parker said he believes there are two months of meeting minutes that have not been approved.

Moved by Weatherford, seconded by Scott to approve the Regular ZBA meeting of April 17, 2003 at 6:00 p.m., and May 15, 2003 at 6:00 p.m. Motion carried, 7-0.

Please Note: The April 17, 2003 Reg. ZBA meeting minutes were already approved at the Reg. ZBA meeting on May 15, 2003.

NEW APPLICATIONS:

1. ZBA #03-27

BY: Kenneth Micinski
1192 N. Genesee Rd.
Burton, MI 48509

RE: Lot #3 Cypress Gardens
Section 11, Zoned M-1

FOR: Request permit or a front yard fence be denied
at 1182 N. Genesee Rd. (5 Votes Required)

Mr. Strasser said the City has never had an application such as this before. The owner at 1182 N. Genesee Rd., filled out an application for a front yard fence. In our Zoning Ordinance we have to notify the adjoining property owners. If the adjoining property owner has an objection to the front yard fence in the neighbor's yard, he subsequently has to fill out a Zoning Board of Appeals application, pay a \$50.00 filing fee for that and come before this Board. Mr. Micinski objects to the front yard fence at his neighbor's property. It is up to the ZBA if the fence is allowed or not.

Mr. Welch said he believes it is not worded properly. It is not that the variance should not be granted, it is the permit should not be granted.

Mr. Strasser said it is not a variance, it is a determination by this Board as to whether we issue a permit for a front yard fence or not.

Kenneth Micinski, 1192 N. Genesee, Burton, MI, said he has a commercial property there. He feels if this fence was constructed it would create a traffic hazard for the people that come and go from his building. It would restrict the view of Genesee Rd. and would also be non-conforming with the other properties along Genesee Rd. Mr. Micinski presented pictures to the Board members.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Parker asked if the east side of Genesee Rd. is zoned M-1.

Mr. Strasser replied yes it is.

Mr. Parker inquired regarding the application for 1182 N. Genesee and if they proposed a chain link or privacy fence.

Mr. Strasser said it was just for a front yard fence which is stipulated in the ordinance as any 4 ft. fence or shorter, which includes chain link, picket, wrought iron or split-rail.

Mr. Parker said when he looked at Ordinance 19, it stated no front yard fence can be a 6 ft. privacy fence, it has to be 4 ft. or less.

Mr. Micinski stressed it will create a hazard for the people who occupy his building. There is a tremendous amount of traffic particularly after a train goes by. If they won't be able to have clear view vision, I think it is a hazard.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Mike Langdon, 1172 N. Genesee Rd., Burton, MI, said he lives right next door. There are trains going in and out, there are children and I see no reason for it. Nobody on the whole street has one fence out there. There will be 96 condo units going in across the street and I can't see them putting a fence there.

Keith Mefford, 1162 N. Genesee, Burton, MI said he opposes the fence too. He asked for clarification as to the definition of M-1 zoning.

Mr. Strasser responded M-1 zoning is light industrial.

Mr. Mefford stated that his property is residential. If the fence was approved, then they would be allowed to plant bushes and it will be a total hazard. When a train goes through it has taken me 5 to 7 minutes just to pull out of the driveway. I don't think we need any more obstructions.

Mr. Strasser said the neighbors have spoken. There are not any other fences along that roadway.

Mr. Parker inquired as to the depth of most of the neighbors lots.

Mr. Langdon said his lot is 200 ft.

Mr. Parker said those houses sit up quite close to Genesee Rd. With a 200 ft. deep lot, I question the reason for fencing in the front yard. Mr. Parker said he will not support the fence request.

Mr. Centilli said there is a big condominium project going in across the street. He has never seen a request to run a fence line to the front property line in a commercial area.

Mr. Welch asked if the applicant was aware of the request tonight.

Mr. Strasser replied yes.

Mr. Welch asked if it would obstruct the view and how far would it come out.

Mr. Strasser said the fence can only come out to the front property line. I am not trying to argue their point or the home owners. A lot of times when you look at a picture, it does not justify the actual structure on the property. The fence could be a hindrance for visibility or vehicles. You don't really know till it is there.

Mr. Granter stated he drives that road every day. When you get closer to Steve's Plumbing, the elevation of the lots is higher than Genesee Rd., so you are not looking at a level plain across. It is flatter as you go south but as you get closer to the tracks, their side of the lots creep up above Genesee Road. So if you put a 4 ft. fence it will be a visibility hindrance and it will be a problem.

Mr. Welch asked Mr. Strasser if he knows the reason behind the front yard fence.

Mr. Strasser said he can only deal with the facts. If there is a personal purpose, it really should not enter into it.

Mr. Curtis said if a request for a permit for the front yard fence is denied at 1182 N. Genesee by this Board, do they still have an opportunity under the ordinance to put in a fence.

Mr. Strasser replied no.

Mr. Centilli said he does not believe there should be a fence in the front yards of any of the properties because of the traffic.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved by Centilli, seconded by Weatherford to approve ZBA #03-27.
Motion carried, 7-0.

2. ZBA #03-28

BY: Julie Clark
2221 Amy St.
Burton, MI

RE: 2221 Amy
Part of Lot 20 Torino Gardens
Section 22

FOR: To build within 4' of lot line with a 24'x36' addition in
line with present home. Waive 10' setback
(4 Votes Required)

Julie Clark, 2221 Amy St., Burton, MI, indicated they want to put an addition onto their home that is closer than 10 ft. from the lot line. We have a narrow lot, 75 ft. wide and we would like to stay in line with the existing foundation and house which is currently 4 ft. from the lot line. If we moved over with an additional 6 ft. which is required, we would be too close to the garage. It would also leave very little yard for the kids in between the addition, the porch and existing garage. Mrs. Clark stated further, they need to add a bedroom for their daughter who is currently in a 9 x 7 bedroom about the size of a large closet. Our computer is in our kitchen and we are lacking space and storage space. We would rather do this in Burton than sell their home and move into something bigger.

Mr. Strasser said the request is reasonable being the existing home was already 4 ft. from the side property line. They see no reason to deny it.

Mr. Parker inquired regarding the pool in the applicant's back yard and their access into the back yard. He mentioned putting a garage door at the back of their garage so they have access to the back yard without encroaching onto the neighbor's.

Mrs. Clark indicated she would have a garage door installed if that is the Board's wishes.

Discussion continued regarding the pool and yard access.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved by Scott, seconded by to approve ZBA #03-28.
Motion carried, 7-0.

3. ZBA #03-29

BY: Jennifer Mailhot
2267 Heilmann Ave.
Burton, MI

RE: 2267 Heilmann Ave.
Lots 476, 477, 478 Stratmoor
Section 32

FOR: To exceed square footage for an accessory structure.
Presently has 1,740 sq. ft. and wants to add another
460 sq. ft. giving a total 2200 sq. ft.
(4 Votes Required)

Jennifer Mailhot, 2267 Heilmann Ave., Burton, MI, stated their pole barn currently is 24 x 40 and we want to add an 8 by 40 on the side for a weight room and the shed in the front as a 10 x 10. We were approved on the pole barn at one time on the addition, but now that we put the shed on, we have to appear before the Board because of the extra square footage. Mrs. Mailhot stated further, there are three separate lots. The house is on one lot, the garage on another and the pole barn is on a separate lot. Right now it is a foot to a foot and a half away from the property line what we want to put on it.

Mr. Curtis asked if the three lots are all on one tax roll.

Mrs. Mailhot said she believes it is, they just purchased the house last year. We do not have a basement to put anything so the extra addition on the side of the pole barn will be for our extra things and weights. Right now the garage holds two cars and that is just what we have and there is not much extra.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

William Kotarski, 2246 McLaren, Burton, MI, said they did a wonderful job cleaning up the property. The previous owner ran a business out of there. I use to live behind there. The house size is 26 x 32, 800 sq. ft. on the main house. They have a detached garage that is the same size, then they put in a pole barn. Mr. Kotarski asked how many storage units can you have on a property. He owns a glass company. Is he moving his business in there.

Ella Delduca, 2351 E. Maple, stated she owns the land next to the property connected to their pole barn. How close are they going to her property line. Last year when she drove by, a guy with a bobcat was on her land dumping dirt. He said he was dumping the dirt from this driveway onto this lot and was told he could do it. My husband told him no, he himself owned it. Then, the next incidence a call came from another neighbor who said they are building a shed on your land. The shed was 4 ft. or more on our lot. They had to have some guys come to pick it up and move it. Then another incidence I get a call from a neighbor that a cement truck is stuck in my land. It was stuck up to the axle and a bobcat was milling around it, tearing up the yard. The cement guy said he thought the owner of the property was the guy that owned the house. We told him he didn't and the guy with the bobcat straightened up our property. Then the next time I found out Burton is over mowing my property, which this land has not been mowed in thirty years. No one contacted us to ask if we would brush hog the land or do anything for it. The land is now cleared off and there is nothing on it. I have not seen it myself, but I was just told there is now cement on it and some big tree limbs in the front where the property was mowed.

Mr. Curtis re-iterated the variance request.

Mrs. Delduca said the cement is already there and the boards are already up. The only reason they made the application is because I called the Mayor. I want to know how close it is to my property line and right now it looks like it is about a foot or two.

Mr. Strasser said the only thing lacking in this application is the actual square footage they are asking to exceed the ordinance by. Presently, they are allowed 1,402 sq. ft. If this addition is approved, the total square footage would exceed by 798 sq. ft., which will end up being 2,200 sq. ft. The accessory structure can be as close as 18 inches to a side or rear property line and they have to put a firewall on the inside of the structure.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mrs. Weatherford asked if they are building on the side close to Mrs. Delduca's lot.

Mr. Strasser replied yes.

Mr. Parker said he will state his standard comments. The City Council re-visited this ordinance and we have given people ample square footage for accessory structure by ordinance. Unless somebody has 50 acres, I cannot support anything that wants more than what City Council has approved. They were very, very generous in giving accessory structures square footage. I cannot support this request.

Mr. Grantner said he concurs. City Council spent a lot of time looking at this and there was a rather significant change. I am in complete agreement and cannot support this.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved by Parker, seconded by Scott to approve ZBA #03-29.

Motion carried to deny, 7-0. Weatherford – no, Scott – no, Terry Parker – no, Centilli – no, Grantner – no, Welch – no, Curtis – no.

4. ZBA #03-30

BY: Dennis A. Kellogg and Karen M. Kellogg
3030 S Center Rd.
Burton, MI 48519

RE: 3030 S. Center Rd.
Parcel #59-28-529-041

FOR: 1) To exceed the allowable square footage for
accessory structures by 168 sq. ft with a 23'x24'
garage, 1824 sq. ft. allowed, 1,992 sq. ft. requested.
2) To expand the non-conforming residential use of the
property with said structure.
(4 Votes Required)

Dennis Kellogg, 3030 S. Center Rd., Burton, MI, said he apologizes to the Board. This is the third time that I have been here, and the second time on this item. I did not have correct information from the very first time, but I believed it to be correct. The information given in error was the size of my property. I believed my property was 150 ft. wide and 300 ft. deep. I got that information from the City of Burton two years ago when this project started. My actual lot size is 132 x 264. I am asking to exceed my square footage by 24 ft. long and 7 ft. wide. When I was here before I stated I would be able to build a garage that was 20 ft. wide and 24 ft. long. Knowing now that my yard is smaller than what I was originally told, I can't even build that. The maximum size I can build without a variance is 24 ft. x 16 ft. wide. If I had known from the beginning, I would have built my pole barn smaller.

Mr. Kellogg stated he can reduce the size of his barn by 3 ft. 6 inches on one side and that would completely accommodate the extra square footage that I would have needed to build this garage. The pole barn is a secondary structure to the garage. The ten years we have lived there we have not had a garage. We had the remnants of one and the slab. The pole barn had to go up first because you cannot build behind your garage, it is too hard to get all the materials back there. My hardship is due to the information I had no reason to question my lot size quoted to me. I never intended on going over the square footage and when I planned this project it was for both buildings at the same time. Originally, I asked for a 24 ft. x 20 ft. garage. I asked for it to be 20 ft. wide because the well's head sits next to the garage. At that time I was led to believe the well had to be 6 ft. away from the structure. This whole project was done for this garage to go in there. The only way I could do this to make it look right is to actually pull square footage off of the pole barn and that would be costly.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION:

Francis Johnson, 3472 E. Atherton Rd., Burton, MI, asked if the structure he has now is as big as it can get on the property without adding another 20 x 24 onto that, to be 400 some ft oversized. The last time it was 186 sq. ft. over. He can put 6 cars in the pole barn, I don't know why he needs another garage. He does not know where the hardship is.

Mr. Strasser said included in the packet is all minutes from the previous meetings. The request exceeds 168 sq. feet of accessory structure more than what he would be allowed under normal circumstances.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Parker indicated in the Board's packet of information it shows 5 feet between the proposed garage and the pole barn that is there. He thought it should be 10 ft. He asked Mr. Strasser if it is because it is accessory structures.

Mr. Strasser responded, it is accessory structure and one of them would need a firewall to protect from the other one.

Mr. Parker said as he looked through the minutes, on October 17, 2002, I asked Mr. Kellogg for clarification that he wants to build a garage too and he responded yes. I said a 30 x 48 comes close to the sq. ft. requirements, and Mr. Strasser asked Mr. Kellogg the size of the property and Mr. Kellogg indicated 150 x 300. At that time I questioned if he would have enough room, so he should have been aware then that he was going to exceed the accessory structure limits if he wanted to put a garage in. He came here on May 15th and we told him he exceeded the accessory structure square footage. I still cannot support it.

Mr. Grantner said he concurs and he sees nothing has changed since the last time other than the fact the lot size was smaller than he thought it was. All the rationale for the decision was there made the first time and I see no difference, so I will not be supporting this.

Mr. Centilli asked if he can build a 16 x 24. The extra 7 ft. will be hidden behind the house according to the drawing.

Mr. Strasser said a smaller portion of it.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved by Parker, seconded by Scott to approve ZBA #03-30.

Motion carried to deny, 6-1. Weatherford – no, Scott – no, Terry Parker – no, Grantner – no, Welch – no, Curtis – no.

5. ZBA #03-31

BY: Kelly C. Money
6350 E. Court St. South
Burton, MI 48509

RE: 6350 E. Court St. South
Lot 1 of Eastern Plains
Section 13, R-1A Zoned

FOR: 6' chain link fence to extend 40' beyond house on a
corner lot. Does not extend into side yard.
(4 Votes Required)

Kelly Money, 6350 E. Court St. South, Burton, MI, said she purchased the house April 1st and one of the big deciding factors was the size of the back yard because she has two dogs. I have plans to fence in the back yard so they can run free so they don't have to be on a leash all the time. I cannot extend it the 40 ft. past the side of the house because it cuts off a little over a third of my back yard. It will still be 27 ft. from the curb of the road.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No audience participation.

Mr. Strasser asked the applicant if there is an existing fence on the property.

Ms. Money replied no.

Mr. Strasser asked Ms. Money to clarify she is requesting a 6 ft. chain link fence, and what type of dogs she has.

Ms. Money said one dog is a beagle mix and the other a boxer mix. The boxer can jump a 4 ft. fence.

Mr. Curtis asked if the dog could jump a 5 ft. fence.

Ms. Money replied she did not know.

REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Strasser said this request is unusual to have a 6 ft. chain link fence in a residential neighborhood. It will look like a wall. You might think one foot is not that much but it is. A 5 ft. fence is allowed.

Ms. Money said she originally wanted a 6 ft. privacy fence but the estimate was a lot higher than what she could afford. The cost was around \$11,500.

Mr. Strasser said the Board could look at the location of the home. The freeway is across from it and even though residential is to the south of it, it is somewhat isolated to drive-by traffic.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Curtis asked Ms. Money if she has looked into invisible fencing.

Ms. Money said she is a veterinarian tech and they have seen a lot of car accidents because of the invisible fence. The dogs really don't care about a little bit of pain going out and coming back in. So once they get out, they are out and I really do not like my dogs roaming the neighborhood.

Mr. Parker said looking at the application, it did not really give much clarification. Each case is individual and because of the location of the house, I don't think it will cause problems to the neighbors on the south side or on the east and there is expressway on the north. I will support the request.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved by Grantner, seconded by Welch to approve ZBA #03-31.
Motion carried, 7-0.

6. ZBA #03-32

BY: Ruby Robinson/Gladys Taylor
1503 Webber
Burton, MI 48529

RE: 1497 Webber
Lots 274 & 275 Webber Place
Section 31, R-1C Zoned

FOR: To place a new home with attached garage at 27' from
the rear lot line, 30' required. (4 Votes Required)

Ruby Robinson, 1503 Webber, Burton, MI, stated she wants to put a manufactured home on two lots that are combined. The lot size is 90 x 98. She prefers a garage attached to the front. I am 3 feet short of the zoning.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No audience participation.

Mr. Strasser said this is in the south end and there are smaller lots. The home is not oversized, there is an attached garage planned for the front of the home. We recommend approval on it.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Centilli inquired regarding the pitch of the roof.

Mrs. Robinson said the roof will be up to the code.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved By Grantner, seconded by Scott to approve ZBA #03-32.
Motion carried, 7-0.

7. ZBA #03-34

BY: Gregory Barnes
4499 Davison Rd.
Burton, MI 48509

RE: 4499 Davison Rd.
Parcel #59-03-400-007
Zoned C-2

FOR: To connect a used car sales lot, not in conjunction
with new car sales. (5 Votes Required)

Gregory Barnes, 4499 Davison Rd., Burton, MI, indicated the Board is familiar with the location where Auto Vision was previously located at that site. Auto Vision moved to Dort Hwy. He wants to operate the same type of business that Auto Vision was doing there.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No audience participation.

Mr. Strasser said Mr. Barnes was before the Board on two different occasions for a location on Center Rd. Subsequently, they were turned down. We feel this is the place to approve this type of use. We recommend approval on this application.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Parker spoke regarding past problems at the site with unloading cars in right-of-way.

Mr. Strasser said he has not heard there has been any problems in quite a while. We have had no complaints or reports from the Police Dpt. I don't know who was doing it but it seemed to have stopped.

Mr. Grantner said for a while they were out of control. They were unloading onto Davison Rd. and rutting up the shoulder pretty bad. I have seen them inside now unloading.

Mr. Strasser said to his understanding there was two licenses in there.

Discussion continued regarding problems that have been at the site.

Mr. Barnes said Car Market and Auto Vision was at that location. Car Market imports Canadian vehicles by the truck loads on a regular basis and they were running about 150 vehicles a week at the Flint Auto Auction. I don't think any of the problems was related to Ray from Auto Vision. Car Market now unloads all their trucks inside as Mr. Grantner stated. I have had my eye on this location since Auto Vision moved out. I moved in with a gentleman on the corner of Maple and Saginaw right after my last denial here. He is the major tenant who is now moving out, I am just a small wholesaler and I am now forced to look for a new place. Mr. Barnes stated further, he approached Church & Sons and they are very interested in leasing space to him. I would not have come before this Board if the problems that existed in the past weren't corrected. I was at the ZBA meeting when Auto Vision was getting there yearly renewal and I listened to discussion regarding problems there.

Mr. Parker said he agrees with Mr. Strasser that it was a used car lot and it would be an ideal location. He will support the request.

REGULAR ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Centilli spoke regarding approval on a yearly basis.

Mr. Barnes said he would not have a problem with that.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved by Parker, seconded by Scott to approve ZBA #03-34 with the stipulation that it is a yearly renewal.
Motion carried, 7-0.

8. ZBA #03-33

BY: Apex Sign, Agent for Courtland Center
6200 N. Dort Hwy.
Flint, MI 48509

RE: 4190 E. Court St.

FOR: To exceed the allowable sq. footage for signage by
1,446 sq. ft. with a Hi-Rise Freeway sign and a
monument sign on Center Rd. 720 sq. ft. existing,
876 sq. ft. additional proposed.
(4 Votes Required)

Gary Gebhardt, 2417 Willowdale, Burton, MI, said he is representing Tucker Development, owners of Courtland Center. They have a lot of plans for renovations, landscaping and re-paving the parking lot. We have had our truck on the site raising a large banner to target where this sign would be located for better visibility from the expressway. In doing that we did a video tape and super-imposed the sign on it to scale. We turned the video tapes into slides and got different points on the expressway. We would like to share those with the Board. The other part of our request is the entrance sign that goes into the mall. It was done on the cheap side years ago, Tucker Development does everything first class and they want to make a better presentation going into the mall.

Mr. Gebhardt presented slides to the Board and audience on the projection map and detailed various positions on the expressway relating to visibility. He stated the sign will sit 10 ft. off of the property line, and will be 140 ft. from high tension wires. Consumers Power requested 130 ft. away, but we are planning it at 140 ft. In the beginning we had the sign at 16 ft. wide but increased it to 18 ft. to be able to get the letters large enough to be read at a quarter of a mile away. The height is 98 ft. which is needed to be above the trees.

Mr. Gebhardt address further detail regarding the signage. He stated this is a 60 acre site. Tucker Development owns 12 other malls in the mid-west and they are expanding. The sign code in Burton does not address property or site any where near this size. They should all be evaluated on individual merits. History has proven when you make improvements in the parking and traffic control and you get appropriate signage, you will do more business. This will be good for the whole community because it will bring more people into this area. A lot of folks are coming from Imlay City, Lapeer and Canada. They are driving right by us, they are heading over to bigger sites like the Genesee Valley Mall. At the Birch Run mall there are Canadian plates all over up there. We would like some of those people to get off the expressway and do some business in Burton, and help support this mall that has hundreds of full and part time employees there. I hope you will give good consideration to this.

AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: No audience participation.

Mr. Strasser said, as Mr. Gebhardt stated each case is on its own merit. The City of Burton only has one enclosed mall and that is Courtland Center. It is an unusually large square footage on the signage, but it is also a very unique site in the fact it is the only mall we have. The existing signage is blocked by trees. In looking at the slide presentation, the coloration and the amount of money Tucker Development is putting into this mall, our department does not feel this request should be turned down.

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Mr. Grantner said he will support the request. We are happy to have a mall here and not have to go way out to the Genesee Valley Mall. We are very proud of it.

Mr. Parker said within the last 6 months he has seen a portable sign advertising a shoe store in the mall. This bothers me that we have that kind of portable signs.

Brian Gardner, General Manager of Courtland Mall, stated before Tucker took over the project, there were the old sandwich styled boards. When Tucker took over, one of our goals was to do what we could to initially make the property look better. It is actually one of the first things we took off and they are no longer on the property. Tucker Development's vision for this property is signage repairs, increased light levels and landscaping. They just set up the property in two stages, the first being what was just mentioned and the second stage, bringing in an architect to take everything from the curbs in. We found out that bringing in new tenants is hindered by the look of the mall. It is a very profitable project. We feel we can add to the community and make it the epic-center.

Mr. Parker said he applauds Tucker Development's investment in the City of Burton. I see us looking east for people to come to us. I support this request too.

Mr. Grantner said the people at that mall have been pretty good to the community. They open it early for walkers and they are really nice to people. If they are going to make it better, that is a plus for the whole city and it is pretty exciting.

Mr. Centilli said they also have been very generous to the Memorial Day activities.

BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AND/OR ACTION:

Moved by Welch, seconded by Weatherford to approve ZBA #03-33.
Motion carried, 7-0.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:47 P.M.

jra