

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

1776 E. Washington Street

Urbana, IL 61802

DATE: April 12, 2012

PLACE: Lyle Shield's Meeting Room

1776 East Washington Street

Urbana, IL 61802

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Catherine Capel, Thomas Courson, Eric Thorsland, Paul Palmgren, Brad Passalacqua

MEMBERS ABSENT : Roger Miller

STAFF PRESENT : John Hall, Andrew Kass

OTHERS PRESENT : Roger Burk, Ann Burk, Rick Balsbaugh

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Declaration of Quorum

The roll was called and a quorum declared present with one member absent and one vacant Board seat.

3. Correspondence

None

4. Approval of Minutes (March 15, 2012)

Mr. Courson moved, seconded by Mr. Passalacqua to approve the March 15, 2012, minutes as submitted. The motion carried by voice vote.

Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for any public hearing tonight must sign the witness register for that public hearing.

5. Continued Public Hearing

Case 685-AT-11 Petitioner: Champaign County Zoning Administrator. Request to amend the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance by revising Section 6.1 by adding standard conditions required for any County Board approved special use permit for a Rural Residential Development in the Rural Residential Overlay district as follows: (1) require that each proposed residential lot shall have an

4/2/12

1 area equal to the minimum required lot area in the zoning district that is not in the Special Flood
2 Hazard Area; (2) require a new public street to serve the proposed lots in any proposed RRO with
3 more than two proposed lots that are each less than five acres in area or any RRO that does not
4 comply with the standard condition for minimum driveway separation; (3) require a minimum
5 driveway separation between driveways in the same development; (4) require minimum driveway
6 standards for any residential lot on which a dwelling may be more than 140 feet from a public street;
7 (5) require for any proposed residential lot not served by a public water supply system and that is
8 located in an area of limited groundwater availability or over a shallow sand and gravel aquifer other
9 than the Mahomet Aquifer, that the petitioner shall conduct groundwater investigations and contract
10 the services of the Illinois State Water Survey (ISWS) to conduct or provide a review of the results; (6)
11 require for any proposed RRO in a high probability area as defined in the Illinois State Historic
12 Preservation Agency (ISHPA) about the proposed RRO development undertaking and provide a copy
13 of the ISHPA response; (7) require that for any proposed RRO that the petitioner shall contact the
14 Endangered Species Program of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources and provide a copy of
15 the agency response.

16
17 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for this public hearing must
18 sign the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
19 register they are signing an oath.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland asked if the Petitioner desired to make a statement outlining the nature of their request.

22
23 Mr. Hall stated that staff did complete some work on Case 685-AT-11 during the past week. He said that he
24 has been ill for the past couple of days and did not have a chance to document staff's work for the Board's
25 review. He requested that Case 685-AT-11 be continued to the May 17, 2012, public hearing.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to continue Case 685-AT-11 to the May 17, 2012, public hearing.

28
29 **Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Palmgren to continue Case 685-AT-11 to the May 17, 2012, public**
30 **hearing. The motion carried by voice vote.**

31
32
33 **702-V-11 Petitioner: Roger Burk Request to authorize the following in the I-1 Light Industry Zoning**
34 **District: Part A. Variance for a proposed warehouse storage facility with a setback of 54 feet from the**
35 **centerline of Paul Avenue, a local street, in lieu of the minimum required 58 feet; and Part B.**
36 **Variance for a side yard of 5 feet in lieu of the minimum required side yard of 10 feet; and Part C.**
37 **Variance for a rear yard of 5 feet in lieu of the minimum required rear yard of 20 feet; and Part D.**
38 **Variance from the visibility triangle requirements for a corner lot; and Part E. Variance from the**

41212

1 **minimum required number of parking spaces for industrial uses; and Part F. Variance from the**
2 **loading berth requirements in lieu of the required 1 loading berth; and Part G. Variance from a**
3 **minimum separation from a side property line for parking spaces of 1 foot in lieu of the minimum**
4 **required 5 feet. Location: Lots 299 and 300 of Wilber Heights Subdivision in the Southwest Quarter**
5 **of Section 31 of Somer Township and commonly known as the buildings at 101 Paul Avenue,**
6 **Champaign.**

7
8 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that this is an Administrative Case and as such the County allows
9 anyone the opportunity to cross examine any witness. He said that at the proper time he will ask for a show
10 of hands for those who would like to cross examine and each person will be called upon. He requested that
11 anyone called to cross examine go to the cross examination microphone to ask any questions. He said that
12 those who desire to cross examine are not required to sign the witness register but are requested to clearly
13 state their name before asking any questions. He noted that no new testimony is to be given during the cross
14 examination. He said that attorneys who have complied with Article 7.6 of the ZBA By-Laws are exempt
15 from cross examination.

16
17 Mr. Thorsland informed the audience that anyone wishing to testify for this public hearing must
18 sign the witness register for that public hearing. He reminded the audience that when they sign the witness
19 register they are signing an oath.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland asked if the Petitioner desired to make a statement outlining the nature of their request.

22
23 Mr. Roger Burk, who resides at 2611 Sangamon, Champaign, stated that when he entered into the contract to
24 purchase the property the proposed building is the type of building that he envisioned. He said that the way
25 that the rental units are all separate and are self sufficient. He said that with the assistance of staff he has
26 come up with some other ideas but they all involve a large building that would require him to be available at
27 all times to unlock the doors so that nothing is damaged when he is absent. He said that the design of the
28 building has not been changed much and the ADA parking was moved slightly. He said that the ground in
29 front of the building is for the septic system and that is why there is so much room at that location. He said
30 that the design of the project is basically the same.

31
32 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Burk and there were none.

33
34 Mr. Thorsland asked if staff had any questions for Mr. Burk and there were none.

35
36 Mr. Thorsland asked the audience if anyone desired to cross examine Mr. Burk and there was no one.

37
38 Mr. Kass distributed a Supplemental Memorandum dated April 12, 2012, which outlined the status of the

41212

1 case and includes new evidence to be added to the Summary of Evidence. He said that item 5.B of the
2 Summary of Evidence should be revised as follows: B. The revised Site Plan of the proposed development
3 was received on April 11, 2012, and includes the following: (1) Location of the proposed 1,728 square feet
4 (72' x 24') warehouse storage building with four 10' x 24' rental units and one 32' x 24' unit for the
5 Petitioner's personal use; and (2) Location and dimensions of the ADA accessible parking space (16' x 20')
6 and pad (5' x 5'); and (3) The proposed warehouse storage facility is indicated as having the following
7 setbacks and yards: (a) A 75-1/2 feet setback from the centerline of Market Street; and (b) A 54 feet setback
8 from the centerline of Paul Avenue; and (c) A front yard of 38 feet along Market Street; and (d) Side yards of
9 21 feet along Paul Avenue and 5 feet along the property line opposite from the Paul Avenue frontage; and (e)
10 A rear yard of 5 feet along the property line opposite the Market Street frontage. (4) Location of three 10' x
11 20' parking spaces 1 foot from the north property line; and (5) Location of six 9' x 8' overhead doors.

12
13 Mr. Kass stated that item 5.C should be revised as follows: (1) Variance for a side yard of 5 feet in lieu of
14 the minimum required side yard of 10 feet; and (2) Variance for a rear yard of 5 feet in lieu of the minimum
15 required rear yard of 20 feet; and (3) Variance from the minimum required number of parking spaces for
16 industrial uses; and (4) Variance from the loading berth requirements in lieu of the required 1 load berth; and
17 (5) Variance from the minimum separation from a side property line for parking spaces of 1 foot in lieu of
18 the minimum required 5 feet. Mr. Kass stated that the site plan which was submitted on April 11, 2012, the
19 ADA parking has been moved out of the visibility triangle therefore the variance from the visibility
20 requirements is not necessary.

21
22 Mr. Kass stated that item 6.E.(3) of the Summary of Evidence should be revised as follows: (3) The required
23 number of spaces for the proposed use is 6 parking spaces with one of the parking spaces being accessible.
24 The Petitioner has indicated an accessible space and three regular parking spaces on the site plan. He said
25 that items 7.D and 8.C should be revised as follows: The visibility triangle requirements require that 1,250
26 square feet of a corner lot not be encroached upon by development to keep the corner of two intersecting
27 streets free from sight obstruction. The subject property is 5,750 square feet in area. This requirement
28 significantly reduces the available area of the lot for development. Additionally, the small size of the lots
29 makes it difficult to accommodate all of the required parking spaces and the required loading berth.

30
31 Mr. Kass stated that items 10.B.(1) and (2) should be revised as follows: B. The Zoning Ordinance does not
32 clearly state the considerations that underlay the side and rear yard requirements. In general, the side yard is
33 presumably intended to ensure the following: (1) Adequate light and air: The property to the east contains
34 an abandoned mobile home and is approximately 53 feet from the east property line. A shed also exists on
35 the property to the east and would approximately be 5 feet from the proposed warehouse storage facility; and
36 (2) Separation of structures to prevent conflagration: Structures in the rural zoning districts are generally
37 located farther from fire protection stations than structures in the urban districts and the level of fire
38 protection service is generally somewhat lower given the slower response time. The subject property is

41212

1 within the Eastern Prairie Fire Protection District and the station is approximately 2,400 feet to the east of
2 the subject property. The proposed building is separated by 15 feet from the nearest structure on the property
3 to the south.

4
5 Mr. Kass stated that item 10.C should be deleted because the visibility triangle variance is no longer
6 required. He said that item 10.E should be revised as follows: The requested variance is as follows: (1) A 5
7 feet side yard is 50% of the 10 feet required for a variance of 50%; and (2) A 5 feet rear yard is 25% of the
8 20 feet required for a variance of 75%; and (3) Under the current site plan in addition to the ADA accessible
9 parking space 3 additional spaces are indicated for a total of 4 parking spaces in lieu of the 6 required. This
10 is 67% of the required 6 total parking spaces for a variance of 33%; and (4) Variance from loading berth
11 requirements of no loading berth is 100% of the 1 loading berth required for a 100% variance; and (5)
12 Minimum separation of 1 foot for parking spaces from a side property line is 20% of the required 5 feet for
13 an 80% variance.

14
15 Mr. Kass stated that new item 11.G should be added to the Summary of Evidence as follows: G. At the
16 March 29, 2012, public hearing members of the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals suggested that
17 the Petitioner continue to work with Planning and Zoning Staff to address the following concerns regarding
18 the proposed use: (1) No loading berth. The lack of a loading berth could contribute to street congestion
19 which is already a problem in the area; and (2) Parking too close to a property line. The proposed 21 feet
20 between the proposed building and north property line is not enough to accommodate the length of a pick-up
21 truck and trailer which are anticipated uses at the self-storage units; and (3) The proposed building is too
22 large for the small property and does not result in adequate area onsite for a loading berth and required
23 parking.

24
25 Mr. Kass stated that a new item 11.H should be added to the Summary of Evidence as follows: H. Planning
26 and Zoning Staff worked with the Petitioner to address the concerns of the Board. The Petitioner submitted
27 a revised site plan on April 9, 2012, which addressed some concerns the Board had voiced at the March 29,
28 2012, public hearing. On April 11, 2012, the Petitioner submitted a revised site plan that is nearly identical
29 to the original site plan and that, presumably, will result in the same Board concerns.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for staff or the petitioner regarding the new
32 evidence.

33
34 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Kass if the new site plan with the "red" notations was presented by the petitioner or
35 staff.

36
37 Mr. Kass stated that the site plan with the "red" notations was created by staff. He said that the site plan
38 indicates that the building could be moved 7 feet to the west and would have the minimum 12 foot area

41212

1 required for a loading berth. He said that theoretically moving the building 7 feet would allow for a 12 feet
2 wide loading berth to exist on the property and a variance would be required for side and rear yards. He said
3 that the loading berth would be located right on the property line and right next to the building.

4
5 Mr. Passalacqua asked if the two annotated spots pose a concern since they are located in the visibility
6 triangle.

7
8 Mr. Kass stated that the parking spot closest to the original parking spots barely enters the visibility triangle.

9
10 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Kass if staff has discussed the annotated site plan with the petitioner.

11
12 Mr. Kass stated no, but he did remind Mr. Burk about the loading berth.

13
14 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were additional questions for Mr. Kass.

15
16 Mr. Courson stated that currently on the lot to the east of the subject property there is an abandoned trailer
17 and shed which appears to be on the property line. He asked Mr. Kass if he has visited the subject property
18 and viewed the property to the east because the loading berth will be sandwiched in between the proposed
19 building and the shed. He said that the shed was very close to the northwest corner of the lot therefore it
20 might prove difficult to back a truck and trailer into a loading berth at that location.

21
22 Mr. Thorsland stated that on the aerial it appears that the trailer is closer than the shed and that it is on the
23 property line.

24
25 Mr. Kass stated that the shed is the closest structure.

26
27 Mr. Passalacqua stated that he isn't sure how functional 12 feet will be for the loading berth.

28
29 Mr. Kass stated that it will be 12 feet from the proposed building to the property line which is the minimum
30 width of a loading berth. He said that the required size of a loading berth is 12' x 40'.

31
32 Mr. Thorsland stated that at the last meeting the idea was proposed to have three 10' x 24' units to allow for
33 room of the loading berth to the east. He said that the other idea was to have people, if there was more than
34 one person present at a time, park parallel to the building rather than backing up to the unit. He said that in a
35 small way putting the three lots and the ADA together helps that because there is an actual drive or parking
36 area that is now contiguous without any gravel in between and that will only help if there is only one or
37 perhaps two tenants at the site at a time.

4/2/12

- 1 Mr. Thorsland requested that Mr. Burk return to the witness podium.
2
3 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Burk if he had a chance to review the annotated site plan.
4
5 Mr. Burk stated yes.
6
7 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Burk if he had any comments regarding the annotated site plan.
8
9 Mr. Burk stated that if the building was moved 7 feet to the west that would leave 31 feet and when he spoke
10 with the people about the septic system they indicated that it would be difficult to install septic system in that
11 area. He said that for economical reasons he desires to maintain four units.
12
13 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any questions for Mr. Burk.
14
15 Ms. Capel asked Mr. Burk if he was planning on installing a septic system with a tank and septic field.
16
17 Mr. Burk stated that he believes that is required.
18
19 Ms. Capel asked if a multi-flow unit is possible.
20
21 Mr. Burk stated no.
22
23 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Burk heard the Board's concerns at the last meeting and asked Mr. Burk what
24 kind of flexibility he has to address those concerns.
25
26 Mr. Burk stated that he has very little flexibility. He said that the proposed use of the property is how he
27 intends to use it and if the proposed building is not suitable then he will have to propose the use in a different
28 location and not at this site.
29
30 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board does not know for sure whether a septic system will be installed on the
31 subject property because there is no plumbing, at the moment, proposed in the building and leaving
32 sufficient room for a future septic system is important. He said that the Board has voiced concerns regarding
33 the absence of a loading berth area or a rather tight loading berth area as proposed by staff. He said that staff
34 proposed that the building could be moved to the west although it would require a variance for the visibility
35 triangle for the one parking spot and a fraction of the other parking spot and allow for a very tight loading
36 berth.
37
38 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the very tight loading berth would only be allowed with a variance.

41212

1
2 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Passalacqua was correct that a variance is required for the tight loading berth
3 due to the zero lot line. He said that the petitioner has indicated that for economical reasons he requires the
4 proposed four rental units to allow for the project to be viable. He asked the Board how they would like to
5 proceed.

6
7 Mr. Passalacqua stated that he does not think that a property line abutting the side of building at 12 feet is a
8 functional space. He said that he drives trucks and trailers and he does not think that the area is sufficient
9 and there is no other entrance to the loading berth other than from the north from Paul Avenue making the
10 loading berth even more difficult to utilize.

11
12 Ms. Capel requested an explanation of yard averaging.

13
14 Mr. Hall explained that yard averaging is the provision in the Ordinance which allows the minimum setback
15 to be the average of the yards that existed in 1973 if 25% or more of the lots were occupied.

16
17 Ms. Capel stated that in this case it makes for little yard.

18
19 Mr. Passalacqua asked if it would be a mistake to bring the corner of the west side of the building out into
20 the visibility triangle which will be less than the 31 foot yard average. He said that there will be some
21 distance between the actual northwest corner of the site plan to the triangle and not just the parking space.
22 He said that Mr. Burk was concerned with leaving ample space for the future septic system.

23
24 Mr. Kass stated that if the building was moved seven feet he does not believe that the building would have
25 encroached into the visibility triangle.

26
27 Mr. Passalacqua asked how much more movement is available without encroaching into the visibility
28 triangle.

29
30 Mr. Kass stated that if the building was moved eight or nine feet it would encroach into the visibility
31 triangle.

32
33 Mr. Hall reminded the Board that there is stop sign on Paul Avenue and the Ordinance requires the same
34 visibility triangle regardless of the presence of a stop sign. He said that in the past there have been variances
35 for visibility triangles when there was a stop sign present. He said that this week neither Mr. Kass or Mr.
36 Burk had access to what the Board was thinking about regarding the visibility triangle and but the one thing
37 that visibility triangle does provide for is the septic system.

38

41212

1 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board has approved much larger variances for visibility triangles regardless of
2 the presence of a stop sign or not. He said that moving the building into that area is the last hold out for any
3 kind of septic and there was testimony tonight that the 31 feet would be pushing that and there is no real way
4 to divide that into two points or locate the septic anywhere else. He said that the lot, not because it is a
5 corner lot but because it is small, is a difficult lot to fit this size of a building upon. He said that with the
6 requirements of the septic system and the loading berth the Board is looking at two less parking spots. He
7 asked if the loading berth could also be considered as a parking area.

8
9 Mr. Hall stated that normally the loading berth cannot be considered as a parking area but he could imagine a
10 condition where the petitioner may be able to manage the overlap. He said that the overlap would have to be
11 actively managed and he is sure that it would prove difficult.

12
13 Mr. Thorsland asked if there was a requirement that the loading berth must be perpendicular to the road.

14
15 Mr. Hall stated that the only requirement in the Ordinance is that the loading berth needs to be 12 feet by 40
16 feet and quite often loading berths are placed in the most convenient spot but those properties are normally
17 much larger than this lot.

18
19 Mr. Thorsland stated that if the building is moved the 12 feet wide space would allow for two parking spots
20 although they would be small parking spots. He said that there would be two parking spots to the east of the
21 building and it would be up to the customers to decide who was coming first and leaving first. He said that
22 the loading berth and some other parking could be allowed in the front parallel to Paul Avenue and somehow
23 work in the loading berth without taking out the visibility triangle or the area for a potential septic system.

24
25 Mr. Courson stated that essentially the loading berth would be blocking all of the entrances to the warehouse
26 units.

27
28 Mr. Thorsland stated that the customers would have to coordinate amongst themselves but it would allow
29 this rather tight lot to be used for something other than an abandoned lot.

30
31 Mr. Hall stated that earlier this week staff did see a site plan that had a different building and a loading berth
32 at five feet from the property line and immediately adjacent were two parking spaces and the parking spaces
33 could only be used in a certain sequence and staff identified that as a concern for Mr. Burk. He said that the
34 building on the earlier site plan is not the building before the Board tonight because Mr. Burk has made it
35 clear that he requires the proposed building which includes four rental units. He said that even if the Board
36 considered some sort of non-standard parking he would not know how that area could be accommodated and
37 keep the area for a septic system.

38

41212

1 Mr. Thorsland stated that he suggested moving the building seven feet and having two of the proposed
2 parking spots to the east be linear and sequential in fashion and then have the loading berth and additional
3 parking fill up the area breaking the parking up with the ADA requirements. He said that the only other
4 alternative to make things work is to make Mr. Burk's area, which is 24 feet by 32 feet, smaller which would
5 not affect the economic aspect of the property but would limit Mr. Burk's private space. He said that he is
6 effectively thinking out loud and trying to look at these as elements that can be moved around and
7 sometimes putting the elements next to each other makes a little less sense but allows them all to be there.
8 He said that the Board has given some visibility triangle flexibility and the other stuff just becomes creative.
9

10 Mr. Passalacqua asked if the 10 feet by 20 feet parking spaces that are indicated on the site plan is the
11 minimum allowed.
12

13 Mr. Hall stated that parking spaces only have to be 9 feet by 20 feet.
14

15 Mr. Thorsland asked if the 16 feet by 20 feet parking space the required area for the ADA requirement.
16

17 Mr. Hall stated yes.
18

19 Mr. Thorsland stated that if the building was moved to a little bit to the west and two spots were on the east
20 side of the building and two spots were pointed to the east and were 9 feet by 20 feet then the rest of the area
21 would have to be for the loading berth and the ADA parking. He said there are possibilities in alleviating
22 some of the Board's concerns yet meeting Mr. Burk's needs but it may take some time and he is not sure if
23 this meeting is the appropriate place. He said that he does not believe that the proposed site plan addresses
24 enough of the Board's concerns so that they are comfortable with making a determination at this time.
25

26 Mr. Courson stated that he believes that the building is too large for the lot.
27

28 Mr. Hall stated that there is a variance for the visibility triangle and the minimum parking requirements
29 therefore if the two parking spaces indicated on the annotated plan were not located in front of the personal
30 space he could imagine a loading berth in that location that might be a pull-in and pull-out situation,
31 depending upon if no one is parked in the accessible parking space when trying to pull into the loading berth
32 that is parallel with the north lot line. He said that he could even imagine a parking space for the personal
33 use between the building and the loading berth. He said that he does not imagine someone being parked in
34 the loading berth area all of the time so the encroachment into the visibility triangle would only be part time
35 and there would be a loading berth with sufficient access and Mr. Burk would have a building of this size.
36

37 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the variance would still be required because there are a small number of parking
38 spaces in lieu of the loading berth. He asked Mr. Hall if he is proposing a special condition that allows the

41212

1 ADA parking area to be part of the loading berth.

2
3 Mr. Hall stated no. He said that the loading berth would begin at the west line of the ADA parking space
4 and then encroach into the visibility triangle a little bit when the loading berth is occupied.

5
6 Mr. Courson stated that this would be placing a heavy truck over a septic field.

7
8 Mr. Hall stated that it depends upon exactly where the septic field is located.

9
10 Mr. Passalacqua stated that in order to make this plan work the east unit has to be eliminated or reduce the
11 size of the private space.

12
13 Mr. Thorsland asked if the east unit was eliminated would one parking space also be eliminated.

14
15 Mr. Hall stated yes.

16
17 Mr. Thorsland asked if the private space was reduced the same amount of parking spaces would be required
18 but there would be more room to place those parking spaces.

19
20 Mr. Passalacqua stated that the 12 feet by 40 feet loading berth, as annotated, has no setbacks. He asked if
21 the required setback at the east side is five feet.

22
23 Mr. Hall stated yes.

24
25 Mr. Passalacqua stated that if the east unit is eliminated there could be three feet added to the remaining
26 three units making them larger. He said that he would like to review a new plan incorporating all of the
27 Board's suggestions.

28
29 Mr. Hall reminded the Board of Mr. Burk's testimony.

30
31 Mr. Thorsland stated that he has no doubt that having four rental units over three rental units does makes the
32 project more viable and he believes that perhaps it could be done if the building is moved and there is a
33 reduction in the private space. He said that if 5 feet came out of the 32 feet then that may give enough room
34 for the loading berth on the east side with even a little yard to make it more usable or make some sort of odd
35 arrangement of the parking spaces and make a parallel loading berth that is in the front of the building that
36 will be somewhat functional. He said that the only thing that cannot be adjusted is the ADA parking. He
37 said that Mr. Burk and staff can evaluate the suggestions and perhaps design an alternative plan because he
38 does not want the building designed during the meeting.

41212

1
2 Mr. Hall stated that the idea whether or not the rental units need to be 10' wide is a good point because there
3 would still be four rental spaces. He said that if one foot was taken off of each rental unit and if the building
4 was moved 7 feet to the west added to the five feet there would be a 17 foot gain and if that is enough room
5 for a functional loading berth then maybe the biggest question is, if that will work for the Board will it work
6 for Mr. Burk.

7
8 Mr. Thorsland stated that it would not be unreasonable and the most flexible part, in his mind and the least
9 flexible to Mr. Burk, is the flexibility of the private space. He said that in making a small reduction in the
10 other units and sliding the building to the west there could be a useable area to the east.

11
12 Ms. Capel requested the minimum size of the loading berth if it were located to the east.

13
14 Mr. Hall stated that the minimum size of the loading berth is 12 feet by 40 feet.

15
16 Ms. Capel stated that the loading berth has a five feet setback therefore essentially making it 17 feet.

17
18 Mr. Hall said that currently there is a variance request for no loading berth so it could be argued that an 11
19 feet wide loading berth is better than no 12 feet loading berth and if the Board finds that that much space on
20 the east end works, however Mr. Burk wants to arrange it, then the plan has been helped out a lot but he does
21 not know if the plan suggestions will still work for Mr. Burk.

22
23 Ms. Capel requested the acceptable minimum setback for the loading berth from the lot line.

24
25 Mr. Thorsland stated that he would try to work the parking spaces into the loading berth because it is not
26 unusual for vehicles to be parked in someone's driveway and no one has just one car in their driveway
27 therefore there are a lot of options. He said that there have been a lot of suggestions at tonight's meeting
28 therefore he is confident that staff and Mr. Burk can work this out. He asked the Board if the 17 feet were
29 available to the east, would they be comfortable in calling that area parking spaces or a loading berth.

30
31 Ms. Capel stated that the area could be called both.

32
33 Mr. Courson stated that he still believes that the area is still too small because of the industrial use there
34 could be future uses. He said that a semi-trailer is 53 feet in length and if a semi-trailer was placed in the
35 loading berth it would also be located in the neighbor's yard to the north.

36
37 Mr. Thorsland stated that not very long ago the Board heard a case for a recycling center and a loading berth
38 was allowed inside of the building although it is not an option for Mr. Burk. He said that small lots have

4/2/12

1 always lead to a lot of compromise but in its current state that nothing happens which is not optimal for the
2 I-1 district.

3
4 Mr. Thorsland called Mr. Burk to the witness podium.

5
6 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Burk, after hearing the Board's brainstorming, if he thought it was reasonable to
7 take the time to work with staff to work on some of the concepts and ideas suggested tonight so that a way
8 can be found to accommodate the four bays yet leave enough room for vehicles and keep the project alive.
9 He asked Mr. Burk if he would like the Board to move forward to the Final Determination now although he
10 is not sure that the outcome will be what Mr. Burk desires.

11
12 Mr. Burk requested that the Board move forward to the Final Determination tonight.

13
14 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board can certainly move forward to the Final Determination tonight but the
15 Board will be working off of the plan that is before them tonight. He asked Mr. Burk if he understood that
16 the Board must determine all of the findings in the affirmative or the variance will not be approved.

17
18 Mr. Burk stated yes.

19
20 Mr. Courson asked Mr. Thorsland if he needed to inform Mr. Burk that a full Board is not present tonight
21 due to the absence of one Board member.

22
23 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Board has a lot of work to do before he informs Mr. Burk of that matter.

24
25 Mr. Hall noted that two Board members are absent from tonight's meeting.

26
27 Mr. Thorsland stated that the distributed Supplemental Memorandum dated March 23, 2012, includes the
28 following special conditions:

29 **A. The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate**
30 **authorizing occupancy of the proposed warehouse storage facility until the Zoning**
31 **Administrator has received a certification of inspection for an Illinois Licensed**
32 **Architect or other qualified inspector certifying that the new building complies with the**
33 **following codes; (A) The 2006 or later edition of the International Building Code; (B)**
34 **The 2008 or later edition of the National Electrical Code NFPA 70; and (C) the Illinois**
35 **Plumbing Code.**

36 The special condition stated above is required to ensure that the proposed structure is safe
37 and built to current standards.

38

41212

1 **B. Regarding State of Illinois accessibility requirements:**

2 **(1) The Zoning Administrator shall not approve a Zoning Use Permit for the**
3 **proposed warehouse storage facility without certification by an Illinois Licensed**
4 **Architect or Illinois Professional Engineer that the new building will comply**
5 **with the Illinois Accessibility Code and Illinois Environmental Barriers Act,**
6 **unless the petitioner can provide documentation certifying that the proposed**
7 **warehouse storage facility would not have exceeded \$50,000 in construction cost**
8 **by hiring a contractor to construct the building and perform all other necessary**
9 **work.; and**

10 **(2) The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate**
11 **authorizing operation of the proposed warehouse storage facility until the**
12 **Zoning Administrator has verified that the warehouse storage facility as**
13 **constructed does in fact comply with the Illinois Accessibility Code and Illinois**
14 **Environmental Barriers Act.**

15 The special conditions stated above are required to ensure that the proposed Special Use
16 meets applicable state codes for handicap accessibility.
17

18 Mr. Thorsland stated that the Supplemental Memorandum dated March 29, 2012, includes a new special
19 condition as follows:
20

21 **C. Business activities between the hours of 10PM and 7AM shall be limited as follows:**

22 **(1) No activity (other than storage) shall occur in any of the self storage warehouse**
23 **spaces during these hours.**

24 **(2) No business activity (other than office) shall occur in the warehouse space**
25 **during these hours but the owner may use the space for personal activities.**

26 The special condition stated above is required to ensure that the variance for side and rear
27 yard does not contribute to undue nuisance conditions for adjacent residential properties.
28

29 Mr. Hall stated that special condition C. was modified at the last meeting to include the following
30 requirement:

31 **(3) A 1 foot x 1 foot sign at the exterior of each unit stating, “No activity between**
32 **the hours of 10PM and 7AM.”**

33 He said that staff would have included the addition to special condition C. as an update but staff was
34 anticipating a different plan until yesterday and yesterday staff found out that the plan which is before the
35 Board tonight is the final plan from Mr. Burk therefore staff was not able to go back and make the change to
36 special condition C. He said that the Board was contemplating that change and his notes he had shown it as
37 item 3. under special condition C.
38

4/2/12

1 Mr. Thorsland asked the petitioner if he was comfortable with the proposed conditions.

2

3 Mr. Burk stated yes.

4

5 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to approve the special conditions for Case 702-V-11 as amended.

6

7 **Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Palmgren to approve the special conditions for Case 702-V-11 as**
8 **amended. The motion carried by voice vote.**

9

10 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Burk if he understood that despite the agreement to the special conditions there is
11 still potential that the case could be denied.

12

13 Mr. Burk stated yes.

14

15 Mr. Thorsland asked Mr. Burk if he understood that despite that the fact that the conditions meet his
16 approval all of the findings must be affirmative therefore regardless of his agreement to the conditions the
17 case could still be denied.

18

19 Mr. Burk stated yes.

20

21 Mr. Thorsland stated that the following items should be added as Documents of Record. 4. Supplemental
22 Memorandum dated March 15, 2012, with attachments; and 5. Supplemental Memorandum dated March 23,
23 2012, with attachments; and 6. Supplemental Memorandum dated March 29, 2012; and; 7 Supplemental
24 Memorandum dated April 5, 2012, with attachments; and 8. Revised site plan received on April 11, 2012;
25 and 9. Supplemental Memorandum dated April 12, 2012, with attachments.

26

27 Mr. Hall noted that there are several changes to the Summary of Evidence.

28

29 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Kass discussed most of those changes with the Board.

30

31 Mr. Hall stated that if the Board is comfortable with those changes then that is fine but there are a lot.

32

33 Mr. Thorsland asked the Board if there were any concerns or additions to the changes to the Summary of
34 Evidence, included in the Supplemental Memorandum dated April 12, 2012.

35

36 Ms. Capel asked if the annotated site plan is included as part of the revised site plan.

37

38 Mr. Kass stated that what was distributed tonight was the most recent site plan and the annotated site plan,

41212

1 indicated with red mark-ups, is attached.

2
3 Mr. Hall stated that the only item of evidence that was not included in the Supplemental Memorandum dated
4 April 12, 2012, which includes the changes to the Summary of Evidence, is new item 7.f. which was
5 included in the Supplemental Memorandum dated March 29, 2012. He said that he believes that item 7.f. is
6 still valid evidence.

7
8 Mr. Thorsland stated that Mr. Burk's testimony stating that the four rental units are required for the viability
9 of the proposed project.

10
11 Mr. Hall stated that Mr. Burk's testimony could be added as a new item 8.e., regarding any practical
12 difficulties or hardships related to carrying out the strict letter of the Ordinance. He said that new item 8.e.
13 could read as follows: At the April 12, 2012, public hearing Roger Burk testified that a building of this size
14 with four rental units was necessary to make the project economically feasible.

15
16 **Finding of Fact for Case 702-V-11:**

17
18 From the documents of record and the testimony and exhibits received at the public hearing for zoning case
19 702-V-11 held on March 15, 2012, March 29, 2012, and April 12, 2012, the Zoning Board of Appeals of
20 Champaign County finds that:

- 21
22 **1. Special conditions DO exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved, which**
23 **are not applicable to other similarly situated land and structures elsewhere in the same**
24 **district.**

25
26 Mr. Palmgren stated that special conditions DO exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved,
27 which are not applicable to other similarly situated land and structures elsewhere in the same district because
28 the subject property is a small corner lot without previous zoning and is somewhat located in no-man's land.

29
30 Mr. Thorsland stated that the combination of the corner location and the large visibility triangle would
31 necessitate a variance for almost any useful construction.

32
33 Ms. Capel stated that the subject property is a small lot which is zoned industrial and the Board must provide
34 for any possible future uses.

35
36 Mr. Passalacqua asked if the subject property consists of two lots.

37
38 Mr. Thorsland stated yes.

4/2/12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Mr. Hall stated that the subject property is one zoning lot composed of two lots.

Mr. Courson stated that this is a lot that could be combined with another lot in the future to accommodate a larger building.

Mr. Hall requested confirmation that Mr. Passalacqua's and Mr. Courson's questions were not part of the finding but were only questions for clarification.

Mr. Passalacqua and Mr. Courson stated that their questions were not part of the finding and were only for clarification.

2. Practical difficulties or hardships created by carrying out the strict letter of the regulations sought to be varied WILL prevent reasonable or otherwise permitted use of the land or structure or construction.

Ms. Capel stated that practical difficulties or hardships created by carrying out the strict letter of the regulations sought to be varied WILL prevent reasonable or otherwise permitted use of the land or structure or construction because the building as submitted is what is required to make the requested use economically feasible.

Mr. Courson stated the petitioner has indicated that he requires a building of this size to make the project economically feasible for the subject property.

Mr. Thorsland stated that no additional land is available to eliminate the need for the variance.

3. The special conditions, circumstances, hardships, or practical difficulties DO NOT result from actions of the applicant.

Ms. Capel stated that the special conditions, circumstances, hardships, or practical difficulties DO NOT result from actions of the applicant because they are characteristics of the zoning and of the lot.

Mr. Thorsland stated that the subject property was created prior to the adoption of zoning in 1973.

4. The requested variance, subject to the proposed special conditions, IS in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the Ordinance.

Mr. Thorsland stated that the requested variance, subject to the proposed special conditions, IS in harmony

4/2/12

1 with the general purpose and intent of the Ordinance because it allows the use that is consistent with other
2 neighborhood uses and is in general harmony with the I-1 area.

3
4 **5. The requested variance, subject to the proposed special conditions, WILL be injurious**
5 **to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare.**
6

7 Ms. Capel stated that the requested variance, subject to the proposed special conditions, WILL be injurious
8 to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare because of the lack of a
9 loading berth or parking that will accommodate a truck and trailer adequately will negatively impact traffic
10 on Paul Avenue because presumably the vehicles will be in the road interfering with traffic.

11
12 **6. The requested variance, subject to the proposed special conditions, IS NOT the**
13 **minimum variation that will make possible the reasonable use of the land/structure.**
14

15 Mr. Courson stated that the requested variance, subject to the proposed special conditions, IS NOT the
16 minimum variation that will make possible the reasonable use of the land/structure because a smaller
17 warehouse could be placed on the lot with required loading berths and adequate parking.

18
19 **7. The special conditions imposed herein are required to ensure compliance with the**
20 **criteria for variance and for the particular purposes described below:**

21
22 **A. The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate**
23 **authorizing occupancy of the proposed warehouse storage facility until the Zoning**
24 **Administrator has received a certification of inspection for an Illinois Licensed**
25 **Architect or other qualified inspector certifying that the new building complies with the**
26 **following codes; (A) The 2006 or later edition of the International Building Code; (B)**
27 **The 2008 or later edition of the National Electrical Code NFPA 70; and (C) the Illinois**
28 **Plumbing Code.**

29 The special condition stated above is required to ensure that the proposed structure is safe
30 and built to current standards.

31
32 **B. Regarding State of Illinois accessibility requirements:**

33 **(1) The Zoning Administrator shall not approve a Zoning Use Permit for the**
34 **proposed warehouse storage facility without certification by an Illinois Licensed**
35 **Architect or Illinois Professional Engineer that the new building will comply**
36 **with the Illinois Accessibility Code and Illinois Environmental Barriers Act,**
37 **unless the petitioner can provide documentation certifying that the proposed**
38 **warehouse storage facility would not have exceeded \$50,000 in construction cost**

41212

- 1 **by hiring a contractor to construct the building and perform all other necessary**
- 2 **work.; and**
- 3 **(2) The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate**
- 4 **authorizing operation of the proposed warehouse storage facility until the**
- 5 **Zoning Administrator has verified that the warehouse storage facility as**
- 6 **constructed does in fact comply with the Illinois Accessibility Code and Illinois**
- 7 **Environmental Barriers Act.**

8 The special conditions stated above are required to ensure that the proposed Special Use
9 meets applicable state codes for handicap accessibility.

- 10
- 11 **C. Business activities between the hours of 10PM and 7AM shall be limited as follows:**
- 12 **(1) No activity (other than storage) shall occur in any of the self storage warehouse**
- 13 **spaces during these hours.**
- 14 **(2) No business activity (other than office) shall occur in the warehouse space**
- 15 **during but the owner may use the space for personal activities.**
- 16 **(3) A 1 foot x 1 foot sign at the exterior of each unit stating, “No activity between**
- 17 **the hours of 10PM and 7AM.”**

18 The special condition stated above is required to ensure that the variance for side and rear
19 yard does not contribute to undue nuisance conditions for adjacent residential properties.

20
21 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to approve the Summary of Evidence, Documents of Record and Finding
22 of Fact as amended.

23
24 **Mr. Courson moved, seconded by Ms. Capel to approve the Summary of Evidence, Documents of**
25 **Record and Finding of Fact as amended. The motion carried by voice vote.**

26
27 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to continue to the Final Determination for Case 702-V-11.

28
29 **Ms. Capel moved, seconded by Mr. Courson to continue to the Final Determination for Case 702-V-**
30 **11. The motion carried by voice vote.**

31
32 Mr. Thorsland informed the petitioner that one Board member is absent and one Board seat is vacant
33 therefore it is at his discretion to either continue Case 702-V-11 until a full Board is present or request that
34 the present Board move forward to the Final Determination. He informed the petitioner that four affirmative
35 votes are required for approval.

36
37 Mr. Burk requested that the present Board continue to the Final Determination.

38

4/2/12

1 **Final Determination for Case 702-V-11:**

2
3 **Mr. Courson moved, seconded by Ms. Capel that the Champaign County Zoning Board of Appeals**
4 **finds that, based upon the application, testimony, and other evidence received in this case, that the**
5 **requirements for approval in Section 9.1.9.C HAVE NOT been met, and pursuant to the authority**
6 **granted by Section 9.1.6.B of the Champaign County Zoning Ordinance, the Zoning Board of Appeals**
7 **of Champaign County determines that the variance requested in Case 702-V-11 is hereby DENIED to**
8 **the petitioner Roger Burk to authorize:**

- 9
10 **Part A. Variance for a side yard of 5 feet in lieu of the minimum required side yard of 10 feet;**
11 **Part B. Variance for a rear yard of 5 feet in lieu of the minimum required rear yard of 20 feet;**
12 **Part C. Variance from the visibility triangle requirements for a corner lot;**
13 **Part D. Variance from the minimum required number of parking spaces for industrial uses;**
14 **Part E. Variance from the loading berth requirements in lieu of the required 1 loading berth;**
15 **Part F. Variance from a minimum separation from a side property line for parking spaces of**
16 **1 foot in lieu of the minimum required 5 feet.**

17
18 **Subject to the following conditions:**

- 19
20 **A. The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate**
21 **authorizing occupancy of the proposed warehouse storage facility until the Zoning**
22 **Administrator has received a certification of inspection for an Illinois Licensed**
23 **Architect or other qualified inspector certifying that the new building complies with the**
24 **following codes; (A) The 2006 or later edition of the International Building Code; (B)**
25 **The 2008 or later edition of the National Electrical Code NFPA 70; and (C) the Illinois**
26 **Plumbing Code.**

27 The special condition stated above is required to ensure that the proposed structure is safe
28 and built to current standards.

- 29
30 **B. Regarding State of Illinois accessibility requirements:**

- 31 **(1) The Zoning Administrator shall not approve a Zoning Use Permit for the**
32 **proposed warehouse storage facility without certification by an Illinois Licensed**
33 **Architect or Illinois Professional Engineer that the new building will comply**
34 **with the Illinois Accessibility Code and Illinois Environmental Barriers Act,**
35 **unless the petitioner can provide documentation certifying that the proposed**
36 **warehouse storage facility would not have exceeded \$50,000 in construction cost**
37 **by hiring a contractor to construct the building and perform all other necessary**
38 **work.; and**

4/2/12

1 (2) **The Zoning Administrator shall not authorize a Zoning Compliance Certificate**
 2 **authorizing operation of the proposed warehouse storage facility until the**
 3 **Zoning Administrator has verified that the warehouse storage facility as**
 4 **constructed does in fact comply with the Illinois Accessibility Code and Illinois**
 5 **Environmental Barriers Act.**

6 The special conditions stated above are required to ensure that the proposed Special Use
 7 meets applicable state codes for handicap accessibility.

8
 9 **C. Business activities between the hours of 10PM and 7AM shall be limited as follows:**

10 (1) **No activity (other than storage) shall occur in any of the self storage warehouse**
 11 **spaces during these hours.**

12 (2) **No business activity (other than office) shall occur in the warehouse space**
 13 **during these hours but the owner may use the space for personal activities.**

14 (3) **A 1 foot x 1 foot sign at the exterior of each unit stating, “No activity between**
 15 **the hours of 10PM and 7AM.”**

16 The special condition stated above is required to ensure that the variance for side and rear
 17 yard does not contribute to undue nuisance conditions for adjacent residential properties.

18
 19 The roll was called:

20 Passalacqua-yes	Courson-yes	Palmgren-yes
21 Miller-absent	Capel-yes	Thorsland-yes

22
 23
 24 Mr. Hall informed Mr. Burk that the Board has issued a denial for Case 702-V-11 and staff will send out
 25 paperwork documenting the Board’s finding within the next few weeks. He informed Mr. Burk that if he
 26 requires anything from staff in the mean time then he should contact staff requesting such.

27
 28 6. New Public Hearings

29
 30 None

31
 32 7. Staff Report

33
 34 None

35
 36 8. Other Business
 37 A. Review of ZBA Docket

4/2/12

1 Mr. Kass stated that the April 26th meeting consists of the return of continued Cases 699-AM-11 and 700-S-
2 11, L.A. Gourmet and new cases 697-V-11, Ronald Bryant and 714-V-12, Lee and Myrtl Pardy. He said
3 that Case 697-V-11, Ronald Bryant consists of several variances and one being the division of a lot that is
4 less than five acres. He said that Case 714-V-12, Lee and Myrtl Pardy requests a side yard of 7 feet in lieu
5 of 10 feet for a detached carport.
6

7 Ms. Capel asked if Case 697-V-11 involves structures which already exist.
8

9 Mr. Kass stated yes. He said that there are two homes on the subject property.
10

11 Ms. Capel stated that the variance is being requested after the fact.
12

13 Mr. Kass stated yes.
14

15 Mr. Courson asked if the existing homes were new homes.
16

17 Mr. Kass stated no.
18

19 Mr. Kass stated that the May 17th meeting consists of Case 707-S-12, Daniel Williams, which requests a
20 special use for a paintball park in the CR District and Case 709-V-12, Mark and Kristi Pflugmacher,
21 requests a variance to not have gain access to a principal use by means of a private bridge rather than dry
22 land. He said that the May 31st meeting consists of Case 708-S-12, Dewey Evangelical Mennonite Church,
23 which is requesting a special use for a large activity center on property which is behind the existing church.
24 He said that Case 715-V-12, Denny Anderson, consists of a variance request for an existing building which
25 was constructed within a utility easement and a zero side yard. He said that Case 716-AM-12, is a request to
26 rezone from AG-1 to I-1 to allow a theoretical and applied research development to operate on the subject
27 property.
28

29 Mr. Hall stated that Case 716-AM-12, is a request to allow the reuse of an abandoned seed research facility
30 and such a request is not uncommon and it seems such a request occurs every few years. He said that the
31 application was just received today and even though the petitioners requested a decision as soon as possible
32 it was placed on the docket for May 31st which is the soonest date that the case can be heard.
33

34 Mr. Kass stated that the June 14th meeting consists of three text amendments. He said that Case 704-AT-11
35 is a tentative case because staff is awaiting an opinion from the State's Attorney. He said that Case 710-AT-
36 12 and 711-AT-12 are related to the LESA update and changing the LE for best prime farmland from 85 to
37 an LE of 91.
38

4/2/12

1 Mr. Kass stated that the June 28, 2012, meeting consists of continued Cases 687-AM-11 and 688-S-11,
2 Philip Jones and tentative Case 712-AT-11 regarding the RHO requirements for vehicles.

3
4 Mr. Hall stated that he does not anticipate direction regarding Case 712-AT-11 until June therefore the case
5 should probably be moved to July. He said that staff is awaiting a response from Dr. Jones regarding a
6 letter that staff mailed to him a few weeks ago and Dr. Jones has been waiting for a long time and deserves a
7 determination therefore if all is a go Cases 687-AM-11 and 688-S-11 may be moved up on the docket so that
8 they can be heard prior to the text amendments.

9
10 Mr. Passalacqua asked if Case 712-AT-11 has to be determined before Mr. Dillard's case comes before the
11 Board.

12
13 Mr. Hall stated that if the case happens as he has proposed it then Mr. Dillard's case will not come before
14 the Board but he does not know how the County Board is thinking about this issue currently. He said that he
15 proposed a recommendation to the County Board that eliminated any problems and it appears that his
16 recommendation was still not good enough.

17
18 Mr. Thorsland reminded the Board to complete the Open Meeting Act requirement. He said that currently
19 he, Mr. Passalacqua and Mr. Courson have completed the requirement and submitted the appropriate
20 certificate to staff. He requested that Ms. Capel, Mr. Palmgren and Mr. Miller investigate completing the
21 requirement soon.

22
23 B. March 2012 Monthly Report

24
25 Mr. Hall distributed the March 2012 Monthly Report to the Board for review. He said that the past few
26 monthly reports have been positive in terms of exceeding averages for the past five years on those things that
27 we track and that trend stopped in March although in April, in terms of Zoning Cases, it far exceeded
28 anything in the past few years because zoning cases have really picked up and permits have slacked off. He
29 said that staff has begun completing the field visits for the wind farm and even though there are only 30
30 turbines staff is required to physically walk one-half mile for each turbine to verify compliance and it takes a
31 lot of staff's time.

32
33 9. Audience Participation with respect to matters other than cases pending before the Board

34
35 None

36
37 10. Adjournment

38

ZBA

AS APPROVED MAY 31, 2012

41212

1 Mr. Thorsland entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

2

3 **Mr. Courson moved, seconded by Mr. Passalacqua to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried by**
4 **voice vote.**

5

6 The meeting adjourned at 8:23 p.m.

7

8

9

10

11 Respectfully submitted

12

13

14

15

16 Secretary of Zoning Board of Appeals

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

DRAFT SUBJECT TO APPROVAL DRAFT ZBA //

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10