

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**  
**BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**  
**Community Room – Brecksville City Hall**  
**July 11, 2016**

Present: Eric Hall, Robert Hasman, Kim Veras, Bruce McCrodden, Dennis Rose

Absent: Kathleen Roberts, Mayor Hruby

Others: Building Inspector Synek, 17 guests

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Mr. Rose started the meeting with an explanation of the code, the job of the Board of Zoning Appeals Committee, and the appeal process.

**APPEAL 2016-27**

Bette Klein for a variance from Section 1151.24 of 15 ft. from the minimum required 125 ft. front setback to allow 110 ft. for the construction of an addition on the rear of a non-conforming house located at 13114 Snowville Road, PP# 605-27-002.

Mr. Rose explained to the Klein's that the Board understood their hardship and confirmed with Mr. Synek that this is another case where anything they would do with the house would need a variance. Mr. Synek stated that was correct, it is an existing non-conforming house in front of the building line.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience and there were none.

Motion by Mr. McCrodden seconded by Mrs. Veras to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-28**

Julie Jerdonek for a variance from Section 1119.09(d) not to install the required public sidewalks until such time that the City deems appropriate, for the construction of a single family dwelling located at 6959 Cranbrook Drive, PP# 603-08-080.

Rich and Julie Jerdonek were present. Mr. Rose again explained that there are no sidewalks on the street at this time and understood the need for a variance. He asked Mr. Synek how this came to the attention of the Building Department. Mr. Synek stated that it is a vacant lot and they are building a new house.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience and there were none.

Motion by Mr. McCrodden seconded by Mr. Hasman to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-29**

Amanda Golem for a variance from Section 1185.03 to install a chain link fence in the front yard 1 ft. from the Right of Way, minimum 60 ft. setback required, as shown on the drawing dated June 21, 2016 located at 6826 Hilton Road, PP# 601-17-005.

Jeff and Amanda Golem spoke to the Board regarding their appeal. Mrs. Golem stated that they live on a corner lot and they would like to install a 4 ft. chain link fence in their front yard to keep their children and dogs in their yard. The fence will help keep other neighborhood dogs out of their yard, because they have had to call the Animal Warden at least three times regarding other dogs coming on to their property. It is also a very busy street during the school year.

Mr. Rose asked how many feet they have behind their house for a back yard. Mr. Golem stated that it was approximately 8 ft. Mr. Rose asked Mr. Synek, that if their front yard faced Mill Road and their driveway was off of Mill Road, how far away would they have to be from the right-of-way. Mr. Synek stated that it is a corner lot, so they have to meet the setback on both corners from both streets, which would be 60 ft., so it would not make a difference.

Mr. Rose stated that he understood the reasons for the location of the fence, because it is a difficult situation. He asked to see the drawing on the overhead screen. Mr. Rose asked Mr. Synek to explain the markings on the drawing. Mr. Synek explained that the red line indicated where the fence could go, and the orange line approximating the 60 ft. setback.

Mr. Hasman asked the appellants if they had considered any alternatives to the chain link fence. Mrs. Golem stated that she had not. Mr. Hasman asked if the dogs that keep coming on to their lot was the same dogs from the same family. Mrs. Golem stated yes, they are the same three dogs.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Synek about a past appeal that the Board granted which was a white fence on a corner lot across the street from the Golem's. Mr. Synek did not recall the circumstances. Mr. Rose said if he recalled it correctly, that owner was also keeping their grandchildren and dogs contained, and there was also a sewer issue. Mr. Rose asked the Golem's if they had a sewer, they stated that they did not. Mr. Rose asked if they would consider another type of fencing instead of the chain link fence, possibly something similar to the one across the street since it would be in the front yard. Mrs. Golem stated that they could, they might need to put something behind it to keep the kids and dogs in. Mrs. Golem explained that when they obtained the fence regulations, a chain link fence was one of the permitted types of fencing. Mr. Rose stated that he understood it is allowed, but it might not be the most attractive looking fence, especially being placed right in the front on the street. Mrs. Golem stated that they planned on planting trees so that you couldn't see it directly from the street.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. Sheila Ventura, 6773 Mill Road spoke to the Board. She stated that she was not in favor of the chain link fence. Mr. Rose asked if they installed a more decorative fence like the one across the street, would she object. Ms. Ventura stated that she would be fine with that. Mr. Rose asked if they kept the chain link, but planted trees so that it would not be visible from the street would she be alright with that. She stated that she would not. Mr. Rose confirmed that it was not the location of the fence, but the type of fence. Ms. Ventura stated that she felt a chain link fence does not add to the beauty of the natural environment in our City.

Mr. Rose asked if they spoke with any of their other neighbors. Mrs. Golem stated that she did not.

Motion by Mr. Hasman seconded by Mr. Hall to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

### **APPEAL 2016-30**

Jackson Comfort Systems for David & Jodi Vanderwiel for a variance from Section 1326.01 to Install an air conditioning unit on the side of the house instead of the rear as required by code located at 8970 Cedar Street, PP# 601-34-088.

Keith McCann representing Jackson Comfort Systems spoke to the Board. He stated that the code requires an air conditioning unit to be installed in the rear, but as you can see, there is no good spot in the back because of the deck and the hot tub. On the left side of the house there is shrubbery that conceals the unit, so the best spot would be the side of the house.

Mr. Hasman asked if the air conditioner was already installed. Mr. Jackson stated that it was.

Mr. Rose asked how this came to the attention of the Building Department. Mr. Synek stated that we discovered it as part of the plan review for the permit. Mr. Rose asked Mr. Jackson, if there was no deck, the unit could be installed in the rear, it was not an efficiency issue. Mr. Jackson stated that was correct. Mr. Rose asked if there was an air conditioning unit there before. Mr. Jackson stated no, this unit was a new system. Mr. Rose explained that this variance related to a noise issue, and assumed that the unit had a low decibel rating regarding the output of noise. Mr. Jackson affirmed that you could stand next to it and barely hear it running. Mr. Rose asked if the neighbors were consulted on this. Mr. Jackson stated that as far as he knew they were not.

Mr. McCrodden asked Mr. Jackson if the shrubs where the air conditioning unit was located are on the Vanderwiel's property or the adjacent property. Mr. Jackson did not know. Mr. McCrodden wanted to know if the shrubs will be preserved even though the air conditioning unit was there. Jodi Vanderwiel spoke to the Board, she stated that the shrubs are on the property line, and she has taken care of them with the owner's knowledge for at least fifteen years. Mr. McCrodden confirmed that the shrubs will remain there. Ms. Vanderwiel stated that there is no doubt that they will stay there because their driveway is on the other side. Their neighbor built a garage pretty close to the property line, so those shrubs help screen them. She stated that the unit

is surprisingly quiet, you can hardly hear it. Ms. Vanderwiel also apologized for installing the unit without a permit. She stated that she warned her contractor to submit a permit prior to the construction. She wanted the Board to know that she respects the system, and they should not have installed it prior to obtaining a permit. Mr. Rose confirmed with Ms. Vanderwiel, that if something happened to the existing shrubs, she would find something else to screen it with. Ms. Vanderwiel stated that was correct, it is more to screen the neighbor's driveway from her house, rather than to screen their unit from them.

Mr. Hall commented that the unit appeared to be as far away from the neighbor's house as it could be, and is on the garage side. Ms. Vanderwiel affirmed that was correct.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience and there were none.

Motion by Mr. Hall seconded by Mr. Hasman to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

### **APPEAL 2016-31**

The Arcus Group, Inc. for Rupesh Raina for (1) a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum roof area over 30 ft. is limited to 20% of ground floor to allow 51.2%, and (2) a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum building height of 30 ft. to allow 35.67 ft. and (3) a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum overall height of 40 ft. to allow 45.25 ft. for the construction of a new house located at 9470 Glen Drive, PP# 603-15-029.

Tom Liggett, The Arcus Group, Inc. spoke to the Board in place of the owner's absence. He stated that basically their hardship is the hill in the rear of the property, which has caused a hardship with the overall height of the house. He went on to explain that if you judged this house based on just the front elevation, and it was being built on flat parcel of land, they would not have needed to request a variance. The hill drops approximately 15 ft. from the front of the yard to the rear yard. He is proposing the back to be raised up a couple feet because they are unsure of what they are doing with the lower level of the house, so he is trying to be realistic on how much ground is going to have to be filled in. The overall variances that are needed seem extreme, but because it is due to the hillside. Mr. Liggett explained it on the overhead drawing.

Mr. Rose asked what the drawing was that was submitted to the Board this evening. Mr. Synek stated that it was a submittal from a neighbor that had concerns regarding the height of the house. Mr. Rose explained that the audience will get a chance to speak after the appellant gives their explanation. Mr. Rose asked Mr. Synek if the information that Mr. Liggett explained was accurate, that if it was built on a flat lot, there would be no height issues. Mr. Synek stated that was correct.

Mr. Hasman asked for confirmation on whether there were any homes behind this house that would be exposed to this. Mr. Liggett stated that there were not, and showed him on the overhead drawing, and explained that you wouldn't really see anything that far away, unless the

leaves had fallen off the trees, and still it is so far in the distance. He stated that he is trying to bring the scale of the house down as far as he could, he is also not in favor of a three story house.

Mr. Rose asked how deep the lot was. Mr. Liggett stated that the left property line is 561 ft. and the right property line is 365 ft. The creek cuts almost two thirds of the way thru. There are only a few lots left in Crosswinds, and unfortunately, they will probably have similar issues, maybe not as extreme as this particular lot.

Mr. Hasman stated that Mr. Synek was kind enough to provide the Board with the history of this development, and some similar variances that were granted in the past. He asked Mr. Synek if the variances in the past were as extreme as these variances are. Mr. Synek stated that he did not recall what those past numbers were. Mr. Rose mentioned that there was a zoning change. Mr. Synek stated that he was unsure this was one of the zoning districts that had the percentage changed. Mr. Liggett explained that there are two other neighbors to the east of this property that are also built on the hillside, and the first one in the development is the tallest one, and they will be somewhat comparable to that.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. Don Brinsky, 9475 Glen Drive, spoke to the Board. He has lived in the development for 7 years and is essentially across the street from this property. He stated that he will attest to the fact that it is a unique development. Having lived there, the property does pose a challenge, and felt that it may be a tough property to design. He stated that they do have a Homeowners Association that has a Review Architect that works for The Arcus Group, and he has confidence that they are being sensitive to the requisites of the community, in terms of not only the design, but the overall sensitivity of the neighborhood. Mr. Brinsky explained that the way the Association works, is that they are there to get the understanding that a house meets the guidelines, which essentially is a traditional American Country feel, and that all the materials, the look, etc. meet the guidelines of the Homeowners Association. Mr. Brinsky explained that his point in coming to this meeting, was to mention that he is confident in The Arcus Group completing a project that not only follows the Homeowners Association, but betters the community. He stated that when he initially received the notification he was somewhat concerned, and made note of the house that went in next to him that appeared to be in an awkward position on the street. One of the reasons why their lots have been selling lately, is the charm of the community, which is held up by consistency on all fronts, the construction, and how all the houses relate to each other in the style and quality on which they are built. He asked his architect, David Ellison, who built his home, to take a quick look at what was submitted, and he had some comments on getting the home closer to compliance with the code. Mr. Brinsky stated that he was not here to say that he disapproves of this, but only to express that he has confidence that The Arcus Group, which is doing a great job on the house going up now, will do a similar job in building this home, and also stay consistent with the City's requirements and keeping the Homeowners Association's best interest in mind.

Mr. Rose stated that he appreciated Mr. Brinsky's comments. He also stated that the Board does not enforce Homeowners Deeds and Restrictions, but stated that Mr. Brinsky is fortunate to have

one, as well as an Architectural Review Board, because they will take care of things that the community cares about. He added that it will be a challenging lot, and the house looks nice, as long as it won't tower over the other houses. Mr. Brinsky stated that he is confident that The Arcus Group will do a good job. Mr. Liggett indicated that he was not really interested in going with a flat roof because of maintenance issues, but if it was really necessary, they could look at lowering the pitch, but it would only really bring it down 1.5 ft., possibly 2 ft. at most. Mr. Brinsky stated that if the pitch of the roof was brought down, it would make the house even better looking in terms of fitting in with the ideals of the community. Mr. Liggett stated that they will work with the Architectural Board and the homeowner to explore their options, with regards to the pitch, and to make the house look good. The homeowner really likes the look of the house, and the 12/12 pitch is really keeping with every home that is built there. Mr. Brinsky had submitted a letter to the Building Department when another house was going in a month or so ago, about the house next to him, it was in regards to respecting the consistency, and the way that the house comes off to the overall community. In this particular case, he did not have the opportunity to see what the house looked like in scale to the house next door. Mr. Rose understood the challenge, and said the Board faces the same challenge, you don't want the house to be disproportioned.

Motion by Mr. Hasman seconded by Mrs. Veras to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

#### **APPEAL 2016-32**

Roger and Carole Knapp for a variance from Section 1326.01 to install an air conditioning unit on the side of the house instead of the rear as required by code located at 9957 Gatewood Drive, PP# 605-12-058.

John Imboden, neighbor at 9953 Gatewood Drive, spoke in behalf of Mr. and Mrs. Knapp. He stated that the project is to replace and remove a 25 year old air conditioning unit to the side of the house. He passed out pictures showing the back of the house, the fence, and the proposed side location behind the chimney fenced in, as well as the front view showing that it cannot be seen from the street. They have an existing deck, and their 25 year old unit is quite noisy. Mr. Imboden explained that the Knapp's have lived with it under the deck steps all that time. They are planning to replace the deck over time and want to position the air conditioner so that they can maintain the same placement or similar placement along the house line for the steps. He explained that one of the pictures showed a terrain issue with the hillside. Installing the unit on the side would not only benefit the efficiency of the air conditioning unit by being located closer to the furnace, but also giving it the visual protection of the side fence, staying out of the way of the stairs and allowing them the flexibility to design the deck when that comes around.

Mr. Rose stated that they received letters from both neighbors on either side approving the project. Mr. Imboden stated that one of the letters was from Mr. Teare's, which was the neighbor that will be closest to the unit. He added that the new units are a whisper compared to the 25 year old units.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience and there were none.

Motion by Mr. Hall seconded by Mr. McCrodden to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-33**

Alexander Sainato for (1) a variance from Section 1151.25(d) of 432 sq. ft. from the maximum allowed 144 sq. ft. to allow 576 sq. ft. for the construction of an outdoor pavilion, and (2) a variance from Section 1119.09(d) not to install the required public sidewalks until such time that the City deems appropriate, for the construction of a single family dwelling and (3) a variance from Section 1151.25(d) of 300 sq. ft. from the maximum 660 sq. ft. to allow 960 sq. ft. for the construction of a detached garage, located at 11160 Snowville Road, PP# 605-24-007.

There was no appellant present.

**APPEAL 2016-34**

Gary Harrison for a variance from Section 1326.01 to install an air conditioning unit in front of the house instead of the rear as required by code located at 6730 Wallings Road, PP# 601-06-003.

Mr. Harrison and his contractor Doug Seabeck with Len's Heating and Cooling spoke to the Board. Mr. Harrison stated that he lived in a 1935 house and wanted to update it by installing an air conditioning unit. His contractor installed the internal unit, but told him that code required the outside unit to be in the rear of the house. Mr. Harrison explained that he has a deck and patio in the rear of the home and he really did not want to place the unit there. He thought he could place it in the corner between the sunroom that sticks out of the back of the house and the dining room. It would be approximately 170 ft. from the property line and is set back approximately 80 ft. from the street. Mr. Harrison explained that with the landscaping there, it would be pretty much hidden. Mr. Harrison showed where the unit will be located and stated that it really isn't the front of the house. Mr. Synek explained that because it is an enclosed portion of the house, it is considered the front. Mr. Harrison stated that if it would make any difference to the Board, the way his house is situated on the lot, if the unit was placed on the west side, it would actually be closer to his neighbor and more visible from the street.

Mr. Rose asked if he had spoken with any of his neighbors. Mr. Harrison stated that he had not. The neighbor's on the east side, which would be affected, have not been around. Mr. Rose stated that there is landscaping and trees there like many houses on Wallings Road. He asked Mr. Seabeck if there would be better efficiency by placing it where Mr. Harrison wanted. Mr. Seabeck stated that it would be, it is closer to the furnace and the electrical service and electrical

meter is located there. Mr. Rose confirmed that it was a low decibel unit. Mr. Seabeck stated that the noise level would be very acceptable, and that the unit is 170 ft. away from his neighbor.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience and there were none.

Motion by Mrs. Veras seconded by Mr. Hasman to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-35**

David Latarski for a variance from Section 1151.24 of 4 ft. from the minimum required 60 ft. rear yard setback to allow 56 ft. for the construction of a deck located at 12224 Chestnut Circle, PP# 605-28-077.

David Latarski spoke to the Board. He stated that he had an existing deck on the premises, which has been there approximately 25 years built by the previous owner, and was professionally built. He explained that he is trying to make the deck smaller, it is currently 25x16.

Mr. Rose confirmed with Mr. Synek that the current deck doesn't comply with code. Mr. Synek stated that was correct. Mr. Rose asked if he spoke with his neighbors. The only one that would have a view of the deck is the house to the west, and he submitted a letter from him that they were all right with it, Lester Gicei, 12216 Chestnut Circle.

Mr. Hall asked what the property directly behind him was. Mr. Latarski stated it was common land, no one can build on it.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. Kenneth Knapp, 12227 Gatewood spoke to the Board, and is in support of what Mr. Latarski would like to do.

Motion by Mr. McCrodden seconded by Mr. Hasman to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING  
REGULAR MEETING  
BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
Community Room – Brecksville City Hall  
July 11, 2016**

Present: Eric Hall, Robert Hasman, Kim Veras, Bruce McCrodden, Dennis Rose

Absent: Kathleen Roberts, Mayor Hruby

Others: Building Inspector Synek, 17 guests

**APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 2016**

Motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mrs. Veras to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of June 13, 2016 as recorded.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Hall, Hasman, Veras, McCrodden, Rose

Nays: None  
**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-27**

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mrs. Veras, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1151.24 of 15 ft. from the minimum required 125 ft. front setback to allow 110 ft. for the construction of an addition on the rear of a non-conforming house located at 13114 Snowville Road, PP# 605-27-002.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Hall, Hasman, Veras, McCrodden, Rose  
Nays: None  
**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-28**

Motion by Mr. McCrodden, seconded by Mrs. Veras, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1119.09(d) not to install the required public sidewalks until such time that the City deems appropriate, for the construction of a single family dwelling located at 6959 Cranbrook Drive, PP# 603-08-080.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Hasman, Veras, McCrodden, Hall, Rose  
Nays: None  
**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-29**

There was discussion among the Board with direction from Mr. Synek on the chain link fence being a permitted type of fence and how to amend the motion to change the type of fencing that would be installed. Mr. Rose asked the appellant if they would agree to amend the motion. The appellant agreed to amend the motion and change the type of fencing that would be installed.

Motion by Mrs. Veras, seconded by Mr. McCrodden, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1185.03 **to not install a chain link fence, but any of the other permitted types of fencing** in the front yard 1 ft. from the Right of Way, minimum 60 ft. setback required, as shown on the drawing dated June 21, 2016 located at 6826 Hilton Road, PP# 601-17-005.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Veras, McCrodden, Hall, Rose  
Nays: Hasman  
**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-30**

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mrs. Veras, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1326.01 to

Install an air conditioning unit on the side of the house instead of the rear as required by code located at 8970 Cedar Street, PP# 601-34-088.

ROLL CALL:           Ayes:   McCrodden, Hall, Hasman, Veras, Rose  
                          Nays:   None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-31**

Motion by Mr. McCrodden, seconded by Mrs. Veras, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for (1) a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum roof area over 30 ft. is limited to 20% of ground floor to allow 51.2%, and (2) a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum building height of 30 ft. to allow 35.67 ft. and (3) a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum overall height of 40 ft. to allow 45.25 ft. for the construction of a new house located at 9470 Glen Drive, PP# 603-15-029.

ROLL CALL:           Ayes:   Hall, Hasman, Veras, McCrodden, Rose  
                          Nays:   None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-32**

Motion by Mr. Hall, seconded by Mrs. Veras, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1326.01 to install an air conditioning unit on the side of the house instead of the rear as required by code located at 9957 Gatewood Drive, PP# 605-12-058.

ROLL CALL:           Ayes:   Hasman, Veras, McCrodden, Hall, Rose  
                          Nays:   None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-33**

Motion by Mr. McCrodden, seconded by Mr. Hall, that the Board of Zoning Appeals table approval for (1) a variance from Section 1151.25(d) of 432 sq. ft. from the maximum allowed 144 sq. ft. to allow 576 sq. ft. for the construction of an outdoor pavilion, and (2) a variance from Section 1119.09(d) not to install the required public sidewalks until such time that the City deems appropriate, for the construction of a single family dwelling and (3) a variance from Section 1151.25(d) of 300 sq. ft. from the maximum 660 sq. ft. to allow 960 sq. ft. for the construction of a detached garage, located at 11160 Snowville Road, PP# 605-24-007.

ROLL CALL:           Ayes:   Hasman, Veras, McCrodden, Hall, Rose  
                          Nays:   None

**MOTION TABLED**

**APPEAL 2016-34**

Motion by Mrs. Veras, seconded by Mr. Hall, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval or a variance from Section 1326.01 to install an air conditioning unit in front of the house instead of the rear as required by code located at 6730 Wallings Road, PP# 601-06-003.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Veras, Hall, Hasman, Rose

Nays: McCrodden,

**MOTION CARRIED**

**APPEAL 2016-35**

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mrs. Veras, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1151.24 of 4 ft. from the minimum required 60 ft. rear yard setback to allow 56 ft. for the construction of a deck located at 12224 Chestnut Circle, PP# 605-28-077.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: McCrodden, Hall, Hasman, Veras, Rose

Nays: None

**MOTION CARRIED**

**REPORT OF COUNCILMEMBER VERAS**

Mrs. Veras reported that at the last Council Meeting all the recommended variances from the Board of Zoning Appeals were passed by City Council.

**REPORT OF MAYOR HRUBY**

No Report.

Motion by Mrs. Veras, seconded by Mr. Hasman to close the Regular Meeting at 8:38 p.m.

**MOTION CARRIED**

**THE BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

**DENNIS ROSE, CHAIRMAN**

**KATHLEEN ROBERTS, VICE CHAIRWOMAN**

**BRUCE MCCRODDEN, SECRETARY**

Public Hearings and Regular Meeting recorded by Gina Zdanowicz