

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS – COUNCIL CHAMBER
31555 W ELEVEN MILE ROAD
FARMINGTON HILLS, MICHIGAN
APRIL 12, 2022 – 7:30 PM**

CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Chair Lindquist called the meeting to order at 7:33 P.M. and made standard introductory remarks explaining the formal procedure, courtesies and right of appeal.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Irvin, King, Lindquist, Masood, Rich, Vergun
Alternate Collins

Members Absent: O’Connell

Others Present: City Attorney McLaughlin, Zoning Supervisor Randt, Recording Secretary McGuire

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Rich, support by Irvin, to amend and approve the agenda as follows:

- Change Item C, Code Section as follows: 34-31.~~24~~.25.E

Motion approved unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS

A. ZBA CASE: 4-22-5695
LOCATON: 29975 - 29977 Orchard Lake Road
PARCEL I.D.: 23-03-433-045
REQUEST: In a B-2 Zoning District, in order to construct an addition to the rear of an existing non-conforming retail building, the following variances are requested: 1. A 6.9-foot variance to the required 20-foot north side setback requirement. 2. Variance that no structure may be enlarged or altered in a way which increases its non-conformity.
CODE SECTION: 34-3.1.24. E. 34-7.3.A.
APPLICANT: CLV Orchard L.L.C.
OWNER: Jim Seba, Managing Partner

Member Masood called the case.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Zoning Supervisor Randt reviewed the facts of the case. The property was located on the west side of Orchard Lake Road north of 13 Mile. In order to construct an addition to the rear of the existing building, the applicants were requesting that a portion of the addition be allowed in the north side setback, consistent with the existing building.

Chair Lindquist invited the applicant to speak.

Jim Seba, 28818 Greening Street, Farmington Hills, gave the following information:

- He had purchased this 1984 building in late 2014/early 2015, in order to move their business C'est La Vie from Southfield to Farmington Hills.
- At that time they were granted a variance in order to add a window display to the second floor.
- He was not asking for a storage addition, but was actually requesting a new back room that would be used to process merchandise before it was put on the sales floor. The existing back room would be made part of the sales floor, expanding the retail space.
- The ordinance requires a 20' setback from the property line. The addition would be a 16-foot tall, 1400 square foot building, setback almost 14' from the property line.
- Their business was growing, they needed the extra space, and Mr. Seba asked for approval this evening.

In response to questions from Chair Lindquist, Mr. Seba gave the following information:

- All the utilities came in on the north side of the building.
- The new addition would add 35' to the west, with the overall dimensions 35'x40', or 1400 square feet.
- Part of the addition will be utilized as a hallway to a separate rear access for Dubin Cleaners, which is next door to Mr. Seba's retail store.

Member Rich suggested moving the building further to the west, and move the northern line of the addition to the south, thereby not needing a variance at all. Member King thought the variance could at least be reduced by shifting that wall.

Mr. Seba said they had looked at various options. Moving the addition to the south to meet the 20' setback requirement and lengthening the building to the west would impact the following:

- Parking. There was limited parking in front of the building – approximately 8 spaces. The rear parking was overflow parking for the building as well as parking for their approximately 10 employees. Dubin Cleaners also had 4 to 6 employees, depending on the season. Four parking spaces may need to be eliminated in order to provide fire truck access, although the Fire Marshal had suggested seeking an easement from the property to the north. Building further to the west would eliminate parking spaces.
- Moving the building line south would also eliminate direct rear access to the store, and require a complete reconstruction of the interior, including removing the existing bathrooms, with no place to put them except into the new addition itself, in order to meet accessibility requirements.
- Dubin Cleaners had their own separate bathrooms, with access off their hallway that led to their separate exterior entrance.
- It was not realistic to share a rear door with Dubin Cleaners. Mr. Seba's store, C'est La Vie, needed to be able to receive merchandise from their own separate entrance.

Member King brought up the issue of enlarging a nonconforming use, and whether parking requirements were met or exceeded on the site.

Mr. Seba said the requested variances represented the best use on the site. Parking calculations were listed on the plans.

Chair Lindquist noted the issue of parking was not before the Board this evening.

Chair Lindquist opened the floor for public comments. Seeing that no public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Lindquist brought the matter back to the Board.

Chair Lindquist asked City Attorney McLaughlin to address the issue of increasing a nonconformity, when the existing building was already nonconforming in its distance from the property line, and the addition would add 35' lineal feet to the building, without getting closer to the property line.

Township Attorney McLaughlin said that if the addition was not going further into the setback than the existing building, the nonconformity was not being increased.

Member Vergun pointed out that the the request was adding to the total square footage of a nonconforming structure.

Township Attorney McLaughlin said that although the square footage of the building was increasing, the building itself was not moving further into the setback, and the nonconformity was not expanding, as long as the square footage did not exceed the square footage allowed in the zoning district.

Zoning Supervisor Randt said there were no issues with the overall square footage of the building, or with the rear setback.

Member Vergun thought that if the wall was moved south, the applicant would need to go out one exterior door to enter another exterior door, which was a significant inconvenience.

Member Rich asked why access to the new addition couldn't be through a new interior door, if the addition were shifted south.

Mr. Seba explained that each business needed its own exterior back entrance. C'est La Vie will be processing new merchandise in its own separate, unshared space; having employees from the business next door wandering through the space would not be optimum. Dubin's existing southern door will be eliminated in order to ensure that area is clear at all times for emergency vehicle access. Dubin had an existing rear door, which, with the addition, will lead into a private hallway. Dubin had their own bathrooms, mechanicals, and dry cleaning equipment such as compressors and steam generators. There was a demising wall between the two businesses.

Chair Lindquist noted the plans in the packets were very small, and no interior detail had been provided regarding Dubin Cleaners. The discussion had been helpful in ascertaining whether an alternative plan might work.

Member Rich noted there was still the issue of whether the Fire Department will need to eliminate additional parking spaces, and whether an easement might be available on the northern neighbor's property. Mr. Seba said he had attempted to contact the northern neighbor, without success. Such an easement would require installing a driveway to that property.

Member Masood referred to the February 22, 2022 letter from Staff Planner Perdonik stating that the Fire Marshal had reviewed the plans. Also, for purposes of the record, there was an affidavit of mailing, with 6 returns.

Member Masood asked why the structure was nonconforming. Was the building a legal nonconforming structure?

It came out in discussion that the ordinance may have changed after the building was constructed. Also, the lot was 75' wide, which was narrower than other lots on Orchard Lake Road.

Chair Lindquist said the ZBA was not registering an opinion on compliance with the Fire Marshal's review, but was only addressing the zoning variances that had been requested. If the variance was granted and there were other standards that still needed to be met, the applicant would deal with those separately.

Member King summarized that the existing building was only 4 feet from the property line. The proposed addition would be approximately 13.5 feet from the property line, requiring a 6.9 foot variance. The City Attorney had advised that as long as the building was not closer to the property line than the existing structure, the non-conformity was not considered to be enlarged. The only decision the ZBA had to make tonight was regarding reducing the setback.

City Attorney McLaughlin said that was correct. The use was conforming; only the structure was nonconforming.

Member Rich referenced previous cases for this property:

- At the July 24, 2015 ZBA meeting, the applicant was granted a variance to put a second floor on the building. That approving motion referenced a variance from the requirement that a nonconformity could not be enlarged or altered in a way that increases its nonconformity.
- However, on January 10, 1984 a variance was granted so that the building could be constructed in its current location, 4 feet from the property line, due to the narrowness of the lot. Therefore the building wasn't technically nonconforming, and the requested expansion was a request to expand the 1984 variance.

Chair Lindquist summarized that the decision to allow the upper level in 2015 was based on the fact that the upper level did not get any closer to the front line of the property, and did not expand any nonconformity. Tonight's case was asking basically the same question. The request will not result in the building getting any closer to the property line, for which a variance was granted in 1984.

City Attorney McLaughlin said if the location of the building was a result of a variance, it was not nonconforming, and the Board had the authority to grant a variance allowing the construction of the addition as proposed.

Chair Lindquist indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by Masood, support by King, in the matter of ZBA Case 4-22-5695, 29975 – 29977 Orchard Lake Road, that the petitioner's request for variances for 1) a 6.9-foot variance to the required 20-foot north side setback requirement and 2) a variance that no structure may be enlarged or altered in a way which increases its non-conformity, **be granted**, in order to construct an addition to the rear of an existing non-conforming retail building, because the petitioner did demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case in that he set forth facts which show that:

1. Alternate plans were considered and for various reasons as mentioned, such as the business's changing footprint or reducing of the parking spaces, compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the petitioner from using the property for a permitted purpose in a B-2 zoning district, or would render conformity with the ordinance unnecessarily burdensome.
2. That granting the variance requested would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as to other property owners in the district. The existing nonconformity is not impacted.

3. That the petitioner's plight is due to the unique circumstances of the property, which faces Orchard Lake Road and limits the layout and footprint of the building.
4. The problem is not self-created.

With the following condition:

1. 1. The addition be constructed in accordance with the plans as submitted.

And with the following determination:

1. This motion makes no ruling regarding parking spaces meeting ordinance standards or regarding emergency fire access vehicles being able to utilize the site.

Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

- B. ZBA CASE: 4-22-5696
LOCATON: 27730 Orchard Lake Road
PARCEL I.D.: 23-14-101-036
REQUEST: In a B-3 Zoning District, in order to construct a gas station/convenience store, the following variances are requested: 1. A 4.0 variance to the required 10-foot east side yard setback requirement. 2. A 6-foot variance to the required 10-foot southwest corner parking setback.
CODE SECTION: 34-3.1.25. E. & 34-3.5.2.J.
APPLICANT/Owner: Aly Bazzi, Member, Bazco Holding, L.L.C.

Member Masood called the case.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Zoning Supervisor Randt reviewed the facts of the case. The property was located on the southeast corner of Orchard Lake Road and 12 Mile Road. The applicant proposed to remove the current service station and rebuild.

Uldis Vitins, Vitins Engineering, 44275 Brandywine Rd. Canton MI was present on behalf of this application for a request for site plan approval. Architect John Saad, 31786 Clarita St., Livonia MI, and Ali Bazzi, Bazco Oil Company, 30825 26 Mile Road, New Haven, were also present.

The Applicants gave the following information:

- The existing gas station was by definition a practical difficulty, with difficult access drives, and topographic issues including existing retaining walls that would not be changed. The City wanted connections between adjacent developments on Orchard Lake Road, and there was an existing retaining wall and connecting drive between the two sites. Maneuverability was very difficult on the site.
- They were not proposing to change the existing curbs or drive approaches, which were relatively new.
- The variance for the side yard setback would provide more maneuvering space in front of the store.

Mr. Saad explained the design and existing condition of the site. It was very impractical to construct the new gas station substantially differently than it was right now, in order to maintain required site circulation. However, in the course of his presentation, Mr. Saad suggested some changes to the site plan.

Chair Lindquist noted that the plan before the BZA was based on a plan that had already been approved by the Planning Commission, and the variances considered this evening were in conformance with that

plan. The Board of Zoning Appeals would only be considering whether or not to grant the two specific variances as advertised, or lesser variances of the advertised requests.

Mr. Vitins said that the most difficult aspect of the site was receiving fuel deliveries onsite. In order to increase maneuverability in that area, the building will be moved back slightly. The car wash equipment to the east will not be disturbed. If the requests are granted, maneuverability will increase.

In response to questions from the Board, Mr. Vitins said the buildings shown on the plan were the new proposed buildings. The topographic survey showed the existing conditions. The furthest east structure, marked "proposed," was the structure requiring a variance. The plans as shown reflected what was conditionally approved by the Planning Commission.

Chair Lindquist opened the public hearing. Seeing that no public indicated they wanted to speak, Chair Lindquist closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Commission for discussion and/or a motion.

Member King asked about an email from Interim City Planner Perdonik indicating the Planning Office recommends removal of the second existing driveway (south of 12 Mile Road) on Orchard Lake Road, as noted in the January 26, 2022 Engineering Review, as a condition of approval. The proponents had indicated they were not making any changes to the driveways. The Board had previously discussed the issue of driveways and gas stations at this intersection, in terms of reducing the accident potential there.

Chair Lindquist asked the proponents if there was an objection to the closure of the curb cut as mentioned.

Mr. Vitins said closing that curb cut would result in the need to take out both driveways and put a single drive in the middle of the site, something that was not feasible due to Road Commission constraints, including existing traffic control structures on Orchard Lake Road, with overhead directional signs, a span wire, etc. The road divider prohibited left turns at that access point. To make changes, a major traffic study would be required. Also, if the building to the south ever became a restaurant again, traffic backups could occur. Before the existing gas station was constructed the site had a total of 6 curb cuts, which had been reduced to 3 curb cuts, so there already had been curb cut elimination on the site. They were willing to work with the Road Commission and have further conversations with the City Engineer, but they did not think it was feasible because of the issues that would occur if the curb cut were eliminated.

Member Vergun said the January 26, 2022 Engineering Review said the curb cut *will be required* to be removed. He did not want the proponent to use the ZBA's absence of action to be able to say: "The Zoning Board says it is okay."

Chair Lindquist said the Planning Commission had conditionally approved this plan, without making the removal of the curb cut one of the conditions of approval. The Engineering Review letter was dated January 26, and the Planning Commission made their determination February 17.

Mr. Saad said they had tried to talk with the Road Commission, and had met with City Engineer Cubera, who advised them to "try to work it out." Mr. Saad described the traffic patterns on the site and said they had requested another meeting with Mr. Cubera. The Planning Commission had no problem approving the site plan without making the elimination of the curb cut a condition of approval. The proponents' position was that this change was not feasible.

Chair Lindquist agreed that the Planning Commission did not require the elimination of the curb cut, and the proponents had spoken today about the difficulties of removing the cut, and had said that the closure of both curb cuts and putting a new one in the middle would be simpler, but would also add to the cost. The curb cut closure had not been engineered at this point, and no opinion had been rendered regarding creating a single new curb cut after closing two curb cuts on Orchard Lake. While the Board could consider the Engineering Department review and the recommendation of Interim City Planner Perdonik, the ultimate determination was the Board's.

City Attorney McLaughlin said that was correct.

Zoning Supervisor Randt suggested the Board add a condition that the approval is subject to the approval of the Engineering Department, and the Engineering Department could make the final determination regarding what was safe or feasible. He emphasized that there may be safety issues that needed to be addressed.

Chair Lindquist said the Board was being asked to approve what currently exists, and no safety issue had been raised with the current station. He respected the statements that had been made from the proponents regarding the power poles, directional signs, and so on at this location, and he would be disinclined to include a condition regarding the curb cut, or that would appear to be engineering from the dais. The Planning Commission had all this information, and they rendered their conditional approval without the requirement of eliminating any curb cut. Ultimately, this was a site plan issue, which was approved by the Planning Commission, conditioned on two variances being granted, but which had nothing to do with curb cuts.

Member Vergun cautioned that if there were any changes to the plan the proponents may have to return to the Planning Commission or the Zoning Board for further approvals, and the determination might be different. But in the current case, he was amenable to a motion that did not have any requirements to close a curb cut.

Chair Lindquist indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by King, support by Vergun, in the matter of ZBA Case 4-22-5696, 27730 Orchard Lake Road, that the petitioner's request for 1) a 4.0 variance to the required 10-foot east side yard setback requirement and 2) a 6-foot variance to the required 10-foot southwest corner parking setback **be granted**, in order to construct a gas station/convenience store, because the petitioner did demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case in that he set forth facts which show that:

1. Compliance with the strict letter of the ordinance would unreasonably prevent the petitioner from using the property for a permitted purpose.
2. That granting the variance requested would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as to other property owners in the district.
3. That the petitioner's plight is due to the unique circumstances of the property.
4. The problem is not self-created.

With the following conditions:

1. That the gas station/convenience store be constructed in accordance with the specific plans and specifications submitted.
2. The exact number of curb cuts on Orchard Lake Road be reviewed, discussed and approved with the City's engineer, planning and building departments as appropriate.

Motion discussion:

Member Masood noted there was an affidavit of mailing, with 4 returns.

Motion approved 6-1 (Lindquist opposed).

- C. ZBA CASE: 4-22-5697
LOCATON: 29509 Orchard Lake Road
PARCEL I.D.: 23-03-477-056
REQUEST: In a B-3 Zoning District, in order to construct a gas station/convenience store, the following variance is requested: 1. A 8.5-foot variance to the required 10-foot west side yard setback requirement.
CODE SECTION: 34-3.1.25.E.
APPLICANT/Owner: Aly Bazzi, Member, Bazco Holding, L.L.C.

Member Masood called the case.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Zoning Supervisor Randt reviewed the facts of the case. The property was located on the northwest corner of 13 Mile and Orchard Lake Road. As in the previous case, the applicant was proposing to demolish the existing station and rebuild.

Uldis Vitins, Vitins Engineering, 44275 Brandywine Rd. Canton MI was present on behalf of this application for a request for site plan approval. Architect John Saad, 31786 Clarita St., Livonia MI, and Ali Bazzi, Bazco Oil Company, 30825 26 Mile Road, New Haven, were also present.

Mr. Vitins said this request was similar to the prior item. The practical difficulty was working with an existing site, with existing curb cuts. In this case, the Engineering Department was fine with the location of the curb cuts and did not request any changes. The existing building that would be demolished was on the north property line; it had received a variance for that location. The applicants were requesting a variance from the west property line setback.

Mr. Vitins further explained that the existing site was approved under a different stormwater management ordinance, with parking lot detention where the water could be 6" deep during heavy rains. The applicants were proposing underground detention in the front yard area, between the canopy and Orchard Lake Road. Part of the request for a variance was to provide for that underground detention, which was generally acceptable to the Engineering Department, who had requested they also contact the Oakland County Road Commission, which was currently upgrading Orchard Lake Road. There was a deeper sewer on the east side of Orchard Lake Road, whereas the sewers on the west side were very shallow. If they couldn't reach an agreement with the Road Commission regarding the utilizing the deeper sewer, they would have a pump system. They were trying to work out that issue while Orchard Lake Road was under construction.

The applicants were requesting and 8.5-foot variance to the required 10-foot west side yard setback in order to place the building on the west side of the site.

Mr. Saad explained that by moving the building to the west side, circulation on the site would be improved. The new design was much better for the site.

Chair Lindquist opened the public hearing.

Mark Lyon, 6455 Holland Lane, Clarkston MI, said that he represented the adjacent/surrounding landowner, Himaloy, LLC. He presented the Board with a document entitled: *ZBA Case: 4-22-597, 29509 Orchard Lake Rd., OBJECTIONS TO GRANT OF VARIANCE SUBMITTED, BY HIMALOY, LLC (Adjacent/Surrounding Landowner)*. They opposed the variance request for the following reasons:

- The property immediately to the west was currently under contract for sale, signed by the buyer and owners of Himaloy. The buyer was intending to construct a coffee/donut shop on the site immediately adjacent to – what will become, if the variance is granted, - a 600-700 foot rear wall of the new gas station store. The new structure will increase the footprint of the gas station store from 900 square feet to 2700 square feet.
- Failure to grant a variance in this case would in no way alter or prevent the owner of the property from continuing to use the property as a gas station as it has been used for the past 10-15 years.
- Granting the variance may do substantial justice to the petitioner, but not to the other property owners in the district. In fact, granting the variance could substantially interfere with the sale of the property, thus harming the neighboring property owner.
- There was nothing unique to this corner property.
- The problem for the variance was self-created. The applicant's problem would not exist if they didn't want to expand their footprint on property that was not big enough to handle the expansion without asking for a variance.
- Nothing has been said by the petitioner that had come close to reaching the requirements for granting a variance, and Himaloy LLC asked that the variance request be denied.

Seeing that no other public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Lindquist closed the public hearing.

Chair Lindquist noted that the plan before the BZA was based on a plan that had already been approved by the Planning Commission on February 17, 2022, and the variances considered this evening were in conformance with that plan.

Chair Lindquist asked the applicants if they wished to respond to Mr. Lyons' comments, specifically regarding the criteria for granting a variance.

Mr. Vitins said the variance would provide a better stormwater management system.

Chair Lindquist explained that a better stormwater management system was not one of the criteria for granting a variance.

Mr. Saad said they had worked with City Engineer Cubera regarding this plan. If the building were placed within the setback requirements, the existing approach would have to be changed, because the approach would be going straight into the side of the building. The approach would have to move closer to the corner, but by regulation, the approach could not be that close to the intersection. They also were required to enhance the landscaping. They had discussed this with the Engineering Department and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Saad continued that tonight was the first they heard from the adjoining property owner. They would be happy to work with their neighbor and perhaps make some changes in the site plan. However, if the coffee shop was going to need a drive-thru, and the neighboring property had the 20-foot setback, they would be able to have the drive-thru. Regarding the proponent's situation, they needed the 1.5-foot setback because of the location of the approach to the site.

Member Masood said there was an affidavit of mailing, with 5 returns.

It came out in conversation that Himaloy, LLC did not receive notice of the Planning Commission hearing, but did receive notice of tonight's hearing.

Member Masood asked the proponents if they would be amicable to have the case adjourned to a date certain, in order to have the opportunity to work with their neighbor.

Mr. Bazzi said time was of the essence for them, and they asked that a decision be made today. Each day that passed raised costs and increased the difficulty of building due to shortages. Mr. Vitins added that Orchard Lake Road was already under construction; if the applicants were able to put their storm sewer across Orchard Lake Road, now would be the time. Once Orchard Lake Road was complete, that would no longer be an option.

Chair Lindquist asked Mr. Bazzi if a lesser variance, such as a 5' variance, would be acceptable.

Mr. Bazzi said that their neighbor's business was good for them, and vice versa. They would accept the lesser variance if the Planning Commission would allow them to be deficient on their parking requirement.

Member Vergun asked if the applicants would be willing to reduce the size of the building, in order to request a smaller variance. They could keep the front of the building where it was, but reduce the size so that a lesser variance would be needed in the rear.

Mr. Bazzi said their business model typically called for a 4000 square foot or larger building. This building was already much smaller than that.

Mr. Saad made further comments regarding Bazco Holding's business model, noting that no liquor would be sold at this gas station. They could work this out, perhaps by requesting a 5-foot variance, if the Planning Commission approved less parking.

In response to questions from Chair Lindquist, City Attorney McLaughlin said a motion to adjourn this matter would be needed to postpone action on this case.

Chair Lindquist indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

Member Rich said that as the applicants had said they did not want an adjournment, and had asked for a decision this evening, he was ready to offer the following motion:

MOTION by Rich, support by Vergun, in the matter of ZBA Case 4-22-5697, that the petitioner's request for a variance for an 8.5-foot variance to the required 10-foot west side yard setback requirement in order to construct a gas station/convenience store **be denied**, because the petitioner did not demonstrate practical difficulties exist in this case, most specifically in that he did not set forth facts which show that criterion 2 was met, in that he did not show that granting the variance requested would do substantial justice to the petitioner as well as to other property owners in the district. There has been a specific objection from a neighboring property owner who has their property or a portion thereof under contract, and indicating that transaction is in jeopardy if this particular variance is granted. There may be a possibility that was acknowledged by the applicant and the petitioner that a lesser relaxation of the setback requirement might still meet their needs. The ZBA is being asked to grant a variance while being told the site plan might change, the applicant might go back to the Planning Commission, and other various things, if the applicant

does negotiate with the neighboring property owner. The variance should not be granted when the ZBA is not entirely sure what ultimately will be built. Typically variances are approved based on plans being submitted and the ZBA has heard the plans currently submitted may not be what is built.

For those reasons the motion is **to deny** the request.

Motion discussion:

- The applicants can return to the ZBA with a lesser variance request or they can revise their plans and comply with the ordinance.
- Member Masood was more inclined to adjourn to a date certain, but would support the motion.
- Chair Lindquist felt that a vote to deny would move the process forward more quickly than extending the hearing by adjourning to a later date. A new hearing before the Planning Commission would allow the Planning Commission the opportunity to understand there was an objection by the neighboring property owner, and perhaps hear from that property owner.

Roll call vote:

Ayes: King, Masood, Rich, Vergun
Nays: Collins, Irvin, Lindquist

Motion to deny carried 4-3.

PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS:

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 8, 2022

MOTION by Rich, support by Collins, to approve the March 8, 2022 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting minutes as presented.

Motion carried 6-0-1 (Masood abstained).

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Rich, support by Collins, to adjourn the meeting at 10:13 p.m.

Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael O'Connell, Secretary

/cem