

**PENINSULA TOWNSHIP
REGULAR MEETING
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MINUTES
13235 Center Rd., Traverse City, MI 49686
July 20, 2021
7:00 p.m.**

Corrected by: Robin Noval 8/23/2021

1. **Call to Order** by Soutar at 7:00 p.m.
2. **Pledge**
3. **Roll Call of Attendance** Elliott, Dolton, Soutar, Serocki, Couture
Deeren (Director of Zoning), Meihn (township attorney on speaker phone).
4. **Approval of Agenda** Elliott moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Dolton **Passed Unan**
5. **Conflict of Interest** None
6. **Brief Citizen Comments – for items not on the Agenda** None
7. **Old Business Tabled from June 15, 2021**
Serocki moved to bring this request off the table, seconded by Elliott **Passed Unan**

1. Request No. 892, Zoning R-1C

Owner: ACMEPEN One LLC, 5168 US 31 N. Mailbox 8, Williamsburg, MI 49690

Applicant: ACMEPEN One LLC, 5168 US 31 N. Mailbox 8, Williamsburg, MI 49690

Property Address: 10602 Bluff Rd., Traverse City, MI 49686

1. Requesting a variance from the required twenty-five (25) foot front setback to nineteen (19) feet from the road right-of-way in order to construct a 1290 square foot structure on an existing legal non-conforming lot of record.
2. Requesting a variance from the required fifteen (15) foot side yard setback to a zero (0) foot side yard setback on the southerly property line in order to construct a 1290 square foot structure on an existing legal non-conforming lot of record.
3. Requesting a variance from the required sixty (60) foot setback from the ordinary high water line and for the entire 1290 square foot proposed structure to be constructed within the ordinary high water line setback on an existing legal non-conforming lot of record.
4. Requesting a variance from the required twenty-five (25) percent lot coverage to thirty-one (31) percent lot coverage in order to construct a 1290 square foot structure on an existing legal non-conforming lot of record.
5. Requesting a variance under Section 7.5.6 Moving or Replacing a Non-conforming structure items 1-5.
6. Requesting a variance under Section 7.5 Non-Conforming Uses and Structures (REVISED BY AMENDMENT 171B); Non-Conforming Structures.

Parcel Code # 28-11-625-009-50

Fred Campbell Architect 225 E. 16th St. Suite B

The property at 10602 Bluff Rd. was flooded in 2020. East Bay flowed over the sea wall and deposited sediment and water into the home. In removing some walls to begin renovation we discovered the concrete walls had buckled. The extent of damage to the foundation may be extensive. The water in the Great Lakes is cyclical and 13 years from now, the property might be facing the same situation. The house was built in the road right of way and none of the setbacks are within the current code. There is a driveway off Bluff Rd. with room for 4 vehicles. If you were to rebuild the house, none of the setbacks fall within the current code. The house has already been granted variances for all of the setback requirements for a rebuild. As a result of the failure of this existing, non-conforming building, my recommendation is to elevate the building off of the water. Phase 1 would be to tear down the existing structure and build a 2 bedroom, 2 bath house much like what is currently there. In order to do this, I need the zoning board of appeals approval. The neighbors across the street have continued visibility to the lake view. There is substantial justice by removing cars off of Bluff Rd. and solve any future problems from rising lake levels.

Andy Blogett 901 S. Garfield #200

I am the attorney representing the applicant. Blogett reads from Section 7.5.4 of the zoning ordinance. This represents an alteration for reducing the footprint by elevating the building.

Soutar: questions from the board for the applicant.

Dolton: you have indicated there are 2 options; one is to rebuild the existing structure and the other is to elevate the building. What is the existing floor plan for the current house?

Campbell: verbally describes the interior of the existing house.

Dolton: from my site visit, there does not appear to be any access to the house.

Campbell: there is no access to the house. The seawall, CMU, and stairs have been removed.

Elliott: directed question to attorney Meihn regarding on how height is measured. Are we measuring the height of a legal non-forming from the height where the current structure sits or at grade, street level? Provided in the meeting packet a letter from attorney David Rowe states "the increase from a small single-family (level to the road) cottage to a three-story lake house would substantially increase the intensity of the residential use on the legal non-conforming lot." Is this a true statement?

Meihn: yes, the statement is correct. Does Christina want to weigh in on this?

Deeren: yes, the statement is correct. I disagree that section 7.5.4 applies to this situation. If the house is torn down then there is no renovating or repairing the current non-conforming property. Yes, if you were just going to go in and make the repair then 7.5.4 would apply. 7.5.4 applies for a repair, alteration, renovation or reinforcement, but does not apply to a complete demolition.

Elliott: do we have any information from the health department regarding septic and safety concerns?

Campbell: am I allowed to introduce new material?

Meihn: it is up to the board to determine if this material is vitally important. If this is the case, the board would need time to carefully review the material as well as the public. The applicant would need to come back next month.

Soutar: please present the material and the board will make a determination at that time.

Campbell: I have had several conversations with Brent Wheat from the health department.
(Passes around a map from health department)

Deeren: is this where the septic would be located no matter whether you repaired the existing house or built a new one? What about the well?

Campbell: I am unsure of these issues.

Dolton: can you tell me the square footage of the current house?

Campbell: 1,300 square feet- 440 feet of garage and 860 square feet of living space.

Soutar: is the board comfortable proceeding after seeing this information?

Dolton, Couture, Soutar vote to continue. Elliott and Serocki would like additional information. There are enough yes votes to continue.

Serocki: under our zoning law, can you have a drain field in the road right of way? Can you back fill in the road right of way?

Deeren: no, you cannot backfill 200 feet from the ordinary high water mark.

Serocki: on 1.3 of the building plan, it appears you should be asking for a 25 foot variance instead of a 19 foot variance.

Meihn: our goal is to decide based on what is presented in the request and not to redraft, change, or modify the request.

Soutar: you stated the septic system is operational. Where is the ordinary high watermark on the sea wall?

Campbell: according to the zoning ordinance it would be 2 feet below the line of the retaining wall.

Couture: my question is for Mr. Blodgett-do you think this falls under zoning section 7.5.6 regarding intensity of use.

Blodgett: the use of the property is still residential and does not increase intensity based upon the structure.

Serocki: on the building plan at A11 there is a discharge pipe above ground and with no side yard setback, would the water not drain onto the neighbor's property?

Campbell: the water would discharge into the east bay. The water issue is not something to be considered by the zoning board. After our first meeting before this board, I made contact with Andy Smits, the Traverse City Drain Commissioner. The water flows from the properties above to the southwest corner of my client's property and down below the lake level. Brent Wheat put me in touch with Jacob Riley of EGLE who stated they do not regulate water flowing into the lake provided the water is clean. If the discharge pipe is above the ordinary high water mark, no permit would be required. Andy Smits is the designated agent for the township and I have not received a response to my inquiry.

Soutar: is there anyone who wishes to speak in favor of the proposal?

David Anaman 10617 Bluff Rd.
I have known Justin for 10 years and am in favor of this proposal.

Soutar: is there anyone who wishes to speak against this proposal?

David Rowe Attorney 202 E. State St. Suite 100

I represent Mr. Snow and Mr. Glinke who are the closest adjoining property owners to the applicant's house. They do not have any issue with replacement of the existing house. They do have an issue with a monstrosity of 35 feet tall being built across the street Under section 7.5.6, the proposal increases the intensity of use. The increased square footage, an additional bathroom, moving from a one story to a two story house all substantially increases intensity. The proposal is to move the house out of the water. Why is it being moved 12.5 feet higher? Why not 2-3 feet higher? The ordinance states there should be no detriments to adjacent properties. We are concerned about increased water coming onto these properties. They built the retaining wall without a permit. This has caused significant water erosion already. We are asking you not approve this proposal.

Tony Glinke 10591 Bluff Rd.

I live across the street from the applicant and do not support this application for 6 variances. ACMEPEN/Justin Helton is an established real estate developer with 10 properties in the Traverse City area. Justin bought this property as a real estate investment knowing full well this was a non-conforming parcel with a damaged house. The plan all along was to take an existing non-conforming house and make it more non-conforming, larger, and requires 6 variances. In my first meeting one and half years ago with Justin Helton as a neighbor, he asked me if I would move my fresh water well to a different location so he could improve and increase his septic system. When I asked him why he wanted me to do this, he said he was going to expand the property up two additional floors and make the house larger. The argument of a failing foundation is disingenuous at best. There is no report regarding the functionality of the current septic system. They are asking to increase the lot coverage from 25% to 31%, which is a 24% increase. From my house the increase in height makes the house look like a wall or monolith. The peninsula township zoning ordinance contains these various items for a reason. I ask this citizen board not to set a dangerous precedent for future development. I respectfully request the 6 variances be turned down.

John Snow 10650 Bluff Rd.

I live directly across the street from the applicant's property. They made this request in April, but no engineering report has been forthcoming. We are just being asked to go on faith the foundation is damaged. Recently the zoning administrator, the township engineer, and the drain commissioner went to the property. A woman who claimed to be representing Justin Helton swore at them and demanded they get off of the property, and threatened them to the point where they did not feel physically safe. He stated there is not a sea wall overhang and you have all been down there and this is simply not true. This is not acting in good faith. He said he was going to handle the drainage, but he was cited months ago by the soil erosion people. This house, if allowed to be raised to the level they are seeking, will directly affect my property in a severally negative way. There will be this ominous building which totally affects my property. I have seen some minor stretches of the ordinance to allow several feet to add a porch or

garage, but this request is bizarre to the extent he wants to increase the size. I respectfully ask you deny this request.

Aram Shanafelt 7402 East Shore Rd.

Reading about this, the amount of exceptions requested is in the extreme. I am worried this will set a precedent for the future. I do not need see any reason to change the non-conformity of this property. I do not represent the owner or home owners; I have no dog in this fight. I am rejecting this request on the basis of principle and respectfully request this application be denied.

Bill Smethells 10547 Bluff Rd.

I live a few properties down from the Glinke and Snow properties. I and my wife have concerns and am resistant to this proposal. It is understandable to repair the existing house, but putting in such a larger house increases the density of use. I do not see any way this would not increase the intensity of use. Having such a large structure right before their eyes does reduce the pleasure they get from their homes. Please reject this request.

Soutar: is there anyone else who wants to speak against this proposal. Hearing none, I bring this back to the board and close the public portion of the meeting.

Elliott: I am learning there has been no assessment of the damage. I need to see a report from an engineer. I understand an act of God created the flood, but not the damage, so this changes my yes to a no on condition 1. I have heard several claims, but they have not been substantiated here tonight. A house this big is going to increase the intensity of use.

Dolton: why do we have this in the zoning ordinance? The structure existing now was grandfathered in, but could not be built today due to the zoning ordinances. The ordinance prevents having these types of structures all along the coastline. The request to add an additional bathroom and garage will increase the intensity of use. Is there a detriment to the adjacent properties? We have heard tonight the neighbors' rejection of this proposal.

Couture: we have to get past section 7.5.6 before we even consider 5.7.3. The intensity of use is substantially changing. The ordinance reads there will be no additional detriment to adjacent properties and this is not the case from the neighbors whom have attended the meeting this evening. I am sympathetic to working to get cars off Bluff Rd. and make this safer.

Serocki: I agree with all that has been said and I am looking at 7.5.6 and items 1-4. (1) The replaced structure is **more** non-conforming than the previous structure; (2) There is not increased safety to the residents of the structure **as the cars will be backing out on the road.**

Soutar: this house has been in front of the ZBA in 1998. The following actions were prescribed to install a peaked roof, to not block the neighbor's view with a retaining wall, no living space be create in the storage space and approval is obtained from following: soil and erosion, the county road commission, and an adequate septic system is in place. We must assume these items were done. There is no real reason to increase the size of this house except for safety. Raising the house up 2 feet is acceptable, but raising it up 12 feet is not. The ZBA in 1998 indicates there is to be no increase in living space and I am not one to go against decisions made the previous ZBA decisions.

Deeren: we need to decide on what was published for this case. The request is for a demolition

and rebuild of a new structure of this property.

Couture moved Variance Request Number 1 be approved, seconded by Elliott.

Soutar: The Board will now go through the 6 Basic Conditions that must be met.

Section 5.7.3 (1) BASIC CONDITIONS: The applicant must meet ALL of the following Basic Conditions.

1. That any variance from this Ordinance: a) That the need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water or topography, of the property involved and that the practical difficulty is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

Yes: Dolton –Condition has been met.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture- Condition has not been met

2. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner (self-created) or previous property owners.

No: Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton, Elliott- Condition has not been met

3. That strict compliance with area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimension requirement will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome. (Because a property owner may incur additional costs in complying with this ordinance does not automatically make compliance unnecessarily burdensome.)

Yes: Soutar, Dolton-Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Couture, Serocki-Condition has not been met

4. That the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation than applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

5. That the variance will not cause adverse impacts on surrounding property, property values or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood.

No: Dolton, Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture- Condition has not been met

6. That the variance shall not permit the establishment within a district of any use which is not permitted by right, or any use for which a conditional use or temporary use permit is required.

Yes: Soutar, Dolton, Couture- Condition has been met

No: Serocki, Elliott, - Condition has not been met

Deeren: Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, Fail.

Roll call vote to approve No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Dolton moved Variance Request Number 1 be denied, seconded by Serocki.

Roll call vote to deny Yes: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Deeren: Variance Request Number 1 is denied.

Couture moved to approve Variance Request Number 2, seconded by Dolton.

Soutar: The 6 Basic Conditions must be met.

1. That any variance from this Ordinance: a) That the need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water or topography, of the property involved and that the practical difficulty is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

Yes: Soutar, Dolton- Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Couture, Serocki- Condition has not been met

2. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner (self-created) or previous property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

3. That strict compliance with area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimension requirement will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome. (Because a property owner may incur additional costs in complying with this ordinance does not automatically make compliance unnecessarily burdensome.)

Yes: Soutar, Serocki, Dolton- Condition has been met

No: Couture, Elliott- Condition has not been met

4. That the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation than applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

Yes: Soutar- Condition has been met

No: Dolton, Elliott, Serocki, Couture- Condition has not been met

5. That the variance will not cause adverse impacts on surrounding property, property values or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

6. That the variance shall not permit the establishment within a district of any use which is not permitted by right, or any use for which a conditional use or temporary use permit is required.

Yes: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has been met

Deeren: Conditions 1, 2, 4, 5 Fail.

Roll call vote to approve No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Elliott moved Variance Request Number 2 be denied, seconded by Couture.

Roll call vote to deny Yes: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Deeren: Variance Request Number 2 is denied.

Couture moved to approve Variance Request Number 3, seconded by Elliott.

Soutar: The 6 Basic Conditions must be met.

1. That any variance from this Ordinance: a) That the need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water or topography, of the property involved and that the practical difficulty is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

Yes: Dolton, Serocki- Condition has been met

No: Soutar, Couture, Elliott- Condition has not been met

2. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner (self-created) or previous property owners.

Yes: Soutar- Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Serocki, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

3. That strict compliance with area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimension requirement will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome. (Because a property owner may incur additional costs in complying with this ordinance does not automatically make compliance unnecessarily burdensome.)

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

4. That the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation than applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

5. That the variance will not cause adverse impacts on surrounding property, property values or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

6. That the variance shall not permit the establishment within a district of any use which is not permitted by right, or any use for which a conditional use or temporary use permit is required.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

Deeren: Conditions 1, 2, 3 4, 5, 6 Fail.

Roll call vote to approve No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Dolton moved Variance Request Number 3 be denied, seconded by Couture.

Roll call vote to deny Yes: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Deeren: Variance Request Number 3 is denied.

Couture moved to approve Variance Request Number 4, seconded by Elliott.

Soutar: The board will now go through the 6 Basic Conditions that must be met.

1. That any variance from this Ordinance: a) That the need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water or topography, of the property involved and that the practical difficulty is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

Yes: Soutar, Dolton-Condition has been met

No: Serocki, Elliott, Couture- Condition has not been met

2. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner (self-created) or previous property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

3. That strict compliance with area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimension requirement will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome. (Because a

property owner may incur additional costs in complying with this ordinance does not automatically make compliance unnecessarily burdensome.)

Yes: Soutar-Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Serocki, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

4. That the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation than applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

5. That the variance will not cause adverse impacts on surrounding property, property values or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

6. That the variance shall not permit the establishment within a district of any use which is not permitted by right, or any use for which a conditional use or temporary use permit is required.

Yes: Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

No: Elliott- Condition has not been met

Deeren: Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Fail.

Roll call vote to approve No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Dolton moved Variance Request Number 4 be denied, seconded by Couture.

Roll call vote to deny Yes: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Deeren: Variance Request Number 4 is denied.

Couture moved to approve Variance Request Number 5, seconded by Dolton.

Soutar: Please read the 6 Basic Conditions. Section 5.7.3 (1) BASIC CONDITIONS: The applicant must meet ALL of the following Basic Conditions.

1. That any variance from this Ordinance: a) That the need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water or topography, of the property involved and that the practical difficulty is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

Yes: Dolton, Soutar- Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Serocki, Couture - Condition has not been met

2. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner (self-created) or previous property owners.

Yes: Soutar-Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Serocki, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

3. That strict compliance with area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimension requirement will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome. (Because a property owner may incur additional costs in complying with this ordinance does not automatically make compliance unnecessarily burdensome.)

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

4. That the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the

district, or whether a lesser relaxation than applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

5. That the variance will not cause adverse impacts on surrounding property, property values or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

6. That the variance shall not permit the establishment within a district of any use which is not permitted by right, or any use for which a conditional use or temporary use permit is required.

Yes: Dolton, Couture, Soutar- Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Serocki-Condition has not been met

Deeren: Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Fail.

Roll call vote to approve No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Dolton moved Variance Request Number 5 be denied, seconded by Elliott.

Roll call vote to deny Yes: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Deeren: Variance Request Number 5 is denied.

Couture moved to approve Variance Request Number 6, seconded by Elliott.

Soutar: Once again please read the 6 conditions.

Section 5.7.3 (1) BASIC CONDITIONS: The applicant must meet ALL of the following Basic Conditions.

1. That any variance from this Ordinance: a) That the need for the variance is due to unique circumstances or physical conditions, such as narrowness, shallowness, shape, water or topography, of the property involved and that the practical difficulty is not due to the applicant's personal or economic hardship.

Yes: Dolton- Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture- Condition has not been met

2. The need for the variance is not the result of actions of the property owner (self-created) or previous property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

3. That strict compliance with area, setback, frontage, height, bulk, density or other dimension requirement will unreasonably prevent the property owner from using the property for a permitted purpose, or will render conformity with those regulations unnecessarily burdensome. (Because a property owner may incur additional costs in complying with this ordinance does not automatically make compliance unnecessarily burdensome.

Yes: Soutar- Condition has been met

No: Elliott, Serocki, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

4. That the variance will do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district, or whether a lesser relaxation than applied for would give substantial relief to the owner of the property involved and be more consistent with justice to other property owners.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met

5. That the variance will not cause adverse impacts on surrounding property, property values or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood.

No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton- Condition has not been met
6. That the variance shall not permit the establishment within a district of any use which is not permitted by right, or any use for which a conditional use or temporary use permit is required.
Yes: Couture, Dolton, Soutar, Serocki-Condition has been met
No: Elliott-Condition has not been met
Deeren: Conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Fail.

Roll call vote to approve No: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Elliott moved Variance Request Number 6 be denied, seconded by Serocki.

Roll call vote to deny Yes: Elliott, Serocki, Soutar, Couture, Dolton

Deeren: Variance Request Number 6 is denied. All of the variances have been denied. The applicant can come back in 1 year with the same request. They can come in if they wish to rebuild the house or do something else.

9. Approval of Minutes from June 15, 2021 Regular Meeting

Couture moved to approve the minutes with a second by Serocki.

Passed Unan

10. Citizen Comments None

11. Board Comments None

12. Adjournment Couture moved to adjourn the meeting with a second by Serocki. Passed Unan

Meeting adjourned 8:58 p.m.