

**ANDERSON TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
NOVEMBER 3, 2022**

The Anderson Township Zoning Appeals held a regular meeting, duly called, on November 3, 2022, at 5:30 p.m. at the Anderson Center. Present were the following members:

Paul Sheckels, John Halpin, Steve Haber, Paul Sian, and Jeff Nye

Also, present when the meeting was called to order, Sarah Donovan, Assistant Director, Brendan Cloutier, CO-OP, Lauren Gleason, Planner I, and Chris Cavallaro, Planner I. A list of citizens in attendance is attached.

Staff and members of the public were asked to raise their right hand and swear or affirm to the following oath as read by **Mr. Sheckels**: Do you swear or affirm, to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Staff and those testifying replied "yes" to the oath issued by Mr. Sheckels.

Approval of Agenda

The Agenda for November 3, 2022 was approved by unanimous consent with no objections from the Board.

Approval of Minutes

The Minutes for October 6, 2022 were approved by four (4) yeas, one (1) abstain, with no objections from the Board.

Consideration of Case 28-2022 BZA

Ms. Gleason stated that the public hearing was for Case 28-2022. The request was filed by John and Charlotte Nefzger, property owners, located at 6702 Treeridge Drive, (Book 500, Page 300, Parcel 153) zoned "A" Residence.

Ms. Gleason stated that the applicant is requesting a variance request to allow a 6' tall privacy fence to be located in the front, side, and rear yard of 6702 Treeridge Drive where 6' high privacy fences are only permitted in the rear yard, per Article 5.2, A, 9 of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution.

Ms. Gleason stated that the applicant had proposed the construction of a 6' tall wooden privacy fence 87' in length to be located in the front, side, and rear yard of the property. The applicant stated that having a fence would screen the neighboring dogs from constantly barking while they are using their rear yard.

Ms. Gleason stated that the house was constructed in 1989 as part of the Treetops Verde subdivision. The property was purchased by Mr. & Mrs. Nefzger in 2017. The property is located on a private drive off of Treeridge Drive and is shared with two additional homes.

Ms. Gleason To authorize by the grant of a special zoning certificate after public hearing, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall make a finding that the proposed variance is appropriate in the

location proposed. The finding shall be based upon the general considerations set forth in Article 2.12, D, 2, b.

Ms. Gleason stated that staff is of the opinion that the variance would not be substantial. Though a 6' tall privacy fence is only permitted in the rear yard per Article 5.2, A, 9 of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution, if the adjacent property (6706 Treeridge Drive) applied for a 6' privacy fence in the same location a variance would not be required due to the placement of the home on the property.

Ms. Gleason stated the essential character of the neighborhood would not be altered, and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance. The home is located on a private driveway with a total of three (3) homes. The proposed fence will BZA 28-2022 be built along the property line between 6706 Treeridge Drive and 6702 Treeridge Drive (property in question). A 6' privacy fence is allowed in this area for the adjacent property (6706 Treeridge Drive) to the back corner of the house. A large Norway Spruce is located in the side yard area of 6706 Treeridge Drive, which would block the view of the fence from the private drive. The location and orientation of 6706 Treeridge Drive makes the entire rear yard visible from the front yard area of 6702 Treeridge Drive (property in question). It is staff's opinion that the property owner of 6702 Treeridge Drive is attempting to follow the existing fence line location of 6706 Treeridge Drive, where a privacy fence would be permitted, except for a small portion in the side yard.

Ms. Gleason stated the variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage).

Mr. Gleason stated the property owners' predicament could be feasibly obviated through another method other than a variance. Alternative screening options are available such as landscaping.

Ms. Gleason stated the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement may not be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance as there are other methods to ensure privacy between the two properties, however the adjacent property could have a privacy fence in this same location.

Mr. John Nefzger (property owner of 6702 Treeridge Dr.) stated that the main reason to apply for a variance to obscure the visual contact of the neighboring dogs. In particular, one of the dogs will continually bark the entire duration of his family or their guests using the rear yard.

Mr. Nefzger described the fence as being a "no see through" fence and would prevent the dogs from barking. The neighbor has a pool, and a fence would help with keeping the pool and back yard areas of both properties, with a sense of privacy.

Mr. Nye asked Mr. Nefzger if the fence would be placed on the property line or where the existing fence currently is located.

Mr. Nefzger stated that the existing fence had been in place since probably before the current property owner bought the property, at least 20 years, so determining the actual property line has not been established by either property owner.

Mr. Nye asked Mr. Nefzger if the intention was to replace the existing fence with the proposed fence.

Mr. Nefzger answered with 'yes'.

Mrs. Marina Coffin (property owner of 6706 Treeridge) stated that she is in support of the location of the proposed fence.

Mr. Haber stated that the written staff report says the fence would be allowed without a variance and asked what would be considered the side yard?

Ms. Gleason stated that if the neighbor were to apply for a fence permit, only a small portion (side yard) would need a variance for this location.

Mr. Sheckels asked Mr. Nefzger if the fence would be a replacement at the exact same location of the current fence.

Mr. Nefzger answered 'yes'.

The public hearing was closed at 5:48pm.

Deliberation of Case 28-2022 BZA

The board discussed the variance request to allow a 6' tall privacy fence to be located in the front, side, and rear yard of 6702 Treeridge Drive where 6' high privacy fences are only permitted in the rear yard, per Article 5.2, A, 9 of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution.

Vote: 5 Yeas
 0 Nays

Mr. Nye Motioned
Mr. Sian Seconded

Mr. Halpin - Yea
Mr. Sian - Yea
Mr. Nye - Yea
Mr. Haber - Yea
Mr. Sheckels - Yea

Consideration of Case 29-2022 BZA

Mr. Coultier stated that this public hearing was for case 29-2022 BZA. The request was filed by Forest Hills School District, property owner, located at 8471 Forest Rd., (Book 500, Page 112, Parcel 57-) zoned "A-2" Residence.

Mr. Coultier stated that the applicant is requesting a conditional use and variance request for an accessory structure in the front yard area of Ayer Elementary, zoned "A-2" Residential, where accessory structures are only permitted in the rear yard per Article 5.2, A, 7 of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution.

Mr. Coultier stated the applicant is proposing the construction of a 30' x 30' "hip canopy" located in the front yard area of 8471 Forest Road. The accessory structure is made of steel posts and a fabric roof. Currently existing is an artificial grass surface with picnic tables/benches over which this "hip canopy" will be placed. The location of this accessory structure is in the middle grass area of a roundabout with a pathway to walk from the entrance of Ayer Elementary.

Mr. Coultier stated that the property was developed as a school building in 1971

Mr. Coultier stated the history of the property.

- Case 7-2019 BZA – variable message sign approved
- Case 12-2015 BZA – security vestibule, office, pre-K classroom, kickball field, and play area approved
- Various storage sheds
- 1993 – Addition and interior renovations

Mr. Cloutier stated In September of 2022, a similar case was heard by the Board of Zoning Appeals, Case 24-2022, where 2465 Little Dry Run Road (Wilson Elementary) requested a conditional use and variance for an accessory structure in the front yard. The conditional use and variance were granted with three (3) conditions—1. Substantial conformance with plans dated August 12, 2022. 2. Construction shall be completed within two (2) years. 3. Substantial conformance with elevation drawings submitted during the public meeting.

Mr. Coultier stated to authorize by the grant of a special zoning certificate after public hearing, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall make a finding that the proposed conditional use is appropriate in the location proposed. The findings shall be based upon the general considerations set forth in Article 3.4, C, 2 and as well as the designated specific criteria for specific uses contained in Article 5.4, I, 10.

Mr. Cloutier stated the Specific Criteria. *Schools, public and private, having a curriculum equivalent to that ordinarily given in public elementary and high school, provided no rooms are regularly used for housekeeping or sleeping rooms – (h), (l), (o,i), (p,iii), (s);*

Mr. Cloutier stated the *vehicular use area shall be located and designated so as to minimize impact on the neighborhood. Compliant – no vehicular access required, or proposed to be modified*

Mr. Cloutier stated *measures shall be taken to minimize the impact of potential nuisances such as noise, odor, vibration, and dust on adjacent properties. Compliant – no additional noise generated outside that of normal operations during the school day, no additional odors, vibrations, or dust.*

Mr. Cloutier stated the *landscaping shall be installed in accordance with one of the following buffers: (i) Boundary Buffer of 10 feet with 3.3 canopy trees and 10 shrubs per 100 l.f. Compliant –the existing buffer is not proposed to be modified.*

Mr. Cloutier stated the *signage shall be regulated as follows: (iii) Subject to sign standard in Article 5.5, F, 4. Compliant – no new signage is being proposed.*

Mr. Cloutier stated that *all exterior lighting shall be directed away from adjacent residential properties. Compliant – no new lighting is being proposed.*

Mr. Cloutier stated Article 2.12, D, 8, a, **Spirit and Intent:** The proposed use and development will comply with the spirit and intention of the Zoning Resolution and with District purposes by meeting the conditional use standards. **The proposed structure will be used for academic purposes throughout the school year primarily by students and teachers.**

Mr. Cloutier stated **No Adverse Effect:** The proposed use and development will not have an adverse effect upon adjacent property, or the public health, safety, and general welfare. **The proposed structure will not impede on surrounding properties and will not have any additional nuisances such as lighting or noise more than is normal of a normal school day.**

Mr. Cloutier stated **Protection of Public Services:** The proposed use and development will respect natural, scenic, and historic features of significant public interest. **No changes will be made to the surrounding natural environment and the structure will be located 150' away from the nearest property line.**

Mr. Cloutier stated **Consistent with Adopted Township Plans:** The proposed use and development shall, as applicable, be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objective of the Township's Comprehensive Plan and/or Zoning Resolution: **The project is consistent with the following goals of the "Quality of Life" chapter in the 2022 Comprehensive Plan Update, which states: "Residents will maintain a high quality of life that includes quality schools, entertainment, and cultural activities, health care, religious offerings, and a diverse park, open space, and recreation system."**

Mr. Cloutier stated **Due to its location on the property, the structure will not affect anything surrounding it in a significant way and will be in accordance with the Township's Comprehensive Plan.**

Mr. Cloutier stated to authorize by the grant of a special zoning certificate after public hearing, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall make a finding that the proposed variance is appropriate in

the location proposed. The finding shall be based upon the general considerations set forth in Article 2.12, D, 2, b.

Mr. Coultier stated that staff is of the opinion that the variance would not be substantial due to its distance from adjacent properties. The structure will be 150' away from the nearest property line and there is a buffer of trees and vegetation surrounding the property

Mr. Coultier stated that the essential character of the neighborhood would not be altered, and adjoining properties would not suffer any substantial detriment. While the proposed shade structure would be slightly visible from Forest Rd and Pamela Dr intersection, due to the distance at which the proposed structure would sit (395' from this intersection), there would be minimal visual impact from this distance. In addition, there would be minimal visual impact to adjacent properties with the closest being 150', as well as trees and vegetation surrounding the property.

Mr. Coultier stated that the variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.

Mr. Coultier stated that the property owner's predicament cannot be feasibly obviated through some method other than a variance. Due to the shape of the lot, the property has frontage on two streets (Forest Road and Eight Mile Road) which also means there are two front yard areas. The rear yard area, where accessory structures are permitted, is currently the location of sports fields, leaving no/few options to add the proposed shade structure accessory structure in a location that isn't considered a front yard area.

Mr. Coultier stated that staff is of the opinion that the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed by granting the variance based on the minimal visual impact to surrounding properties and nearest intersection, as well as the substantial distances to surrounding properties. In addition, there are many existing trees vegetation surrounding the property creating a buffer to adjacent properties.

Mr. Coultier stated the aforementioned conditional use request should be evaluated on the following criteria from Article 5.4 of the Zoning Resolution: 1. Spirit and intent. The proposed use and development shall comply with spirit and intention of the Zoning Resolution and with purposes. 2. No adverse affect; the proposed use and development shall not have an adverse affect upon adjacent property, or public health, safety and general welfare. 3. Protection of public services; the proposed use and development should respect, to the greatest extend practicable, any natural, scenic and historic features of significant public interest. 4. Consistent with adopted plans; the proposed use and development shall, as applicable, be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objective of the Township's Comprehensive Plan and/or Zoning Resolution.

Mr. Coultier stated that the aforementioned variance requested should be evaluated on the following criteria: 1) The property in question would yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance. 2) The variance was substantial. 3) The essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance. 4) The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer,

garbage). 5) The property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restrictions. 6) The property owner's predicament can be feasibly obviated through some method other than a variance. 7) The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Heather Holly, Principal of Ayers Elementary School, 8471 Forest Rd., stated that the shade structure is vital for the students and activities that take place throughout the school day.

Andy Barlow, 3460 Oakmeadow Ln., General Manager of Playground Equipment Services, stated that his company will be providing the shade and construction of the structure at the school.

The public hearing was closed at 6:02pm.

Deliberation of Case 29-2022 BZA

The Board discussed the request of a conditional use and variance request for an accessory structure in the front yard area of Ayer Elementary, zoned "A-2" Residential, where accessory structures are only permitted in the rear yard per Article 5.2, A, 7 of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution.

Vote: 5 Yeas
0 Nays

Mr. Nye Motioned
Mr. Sian Seconded

Mr. Halpin - Yea
Mr. Sian - Yea
Mr. Nye - Yea
Mr. Haber - Yea
Mr. Sheckels - Yea

Consideration of Case 30-2022 BZA

Ms. Gleason stated that the public hearing was for Case 30-2022. The request was filed by Pinakin and Anju Bhakta, property owners, located at 7735 Stoneleigh Lane, (Book 500, Page 212, Parcel 341), zoned "B" Residence.

Ms. Gleason stated that the applicant is requesting a variance request to allow a 15'x15' addition, covered deck, in the rear yard area with a 26.43' rear yard setback where a 35' setback is required per Article 3.5, C, 2, c of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution.

Ms. Gleason stated that the applicant is proposing the construction of an attached covered outdoor deck (addition), size 15' x 15', in the rear yard area.

Ms. Gleason stated that this home was built in 2016 as part of the Hunter's Run at Anderson subdivision. The property was purchased by Mr. & Mrs. Bhakta in December of 2018. In June 2018, the Board of Zoning Appeals heard Case 8-2018 where 7723 Stoneleigh Lane (Hunter's Run at Anderson Subdivision (immediate neighbor to the north of the current applicant)) requested a variance to allow a rear yard setback of 24' for a 14' x 21' addition (placing roof over existing patio), where a setback of 35' is required. The variance was granted with three (3) conditions—1. Construction shall be started within 1 year and completed within 2 years of the date of this decision. 2. Substantial conformance with plans dated April 23, 2018. 3. That the addition is to remain open permanently and that there will be no other addition added to the rear of the home.

Ms. Gleason stated that in October 2022, the Board of Zoning Appeals heard Case 27-2022 where 7711 Stoneleigh Lane (Hunter's Run at Anderson Subdivision (three (3) houses north of the current applicant) requested a variance to allow a rear yard setback of 20' for a 15' x 18' addition (elevated partially covered deck), where a setback of 35' is required. The variance was granted with five (5) conditions — 1. Vegetative screen shall be maintained in the rear yard and replaced on a 1 for 1 basis (if one dies it shall be replaced by the same or similar type of tree/vegetation). 2. Neighborhood Home Owners Association approval shall be provided to staff to have on file with the Case. 3. Construction shall be started within one (1) year and completed within two (2) years. 4. Substantial conformance with the plans dated September 9, 2022. 5. That the addition is to remain open permanently and that there will be no other addition added to the rear of the home.

Ms. Gleason stated that to authorize by the grant of a special zoning certificate after public hearing, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall make a finding that the proposed variance is appropriate in the location proposed. The finding shall be based upon the general considerations set forth in Article 2.12, D, 2, b.

Ms. Gleason stated that staff is of the opinion that the variance could be substantial. While currently built at a setback of 35', the addition would bring the house 26.43' from the rear property line, whereas all the houses (except the previously approved variances) on Stoneleigh Lane have been constructed near or at the 35' setback.

Ms. Gleason stated that the essential character of the neighborhood could be substantially altered. There is a screen of Norway spruce trees, approximately 10'+ tall planted on the rear property line, which provide an effective separation between this property and the rear adjoining property, but the addition may be slightly visible to their rear neighbors (2032 Foxbrook Pl.). While the shingle roof will be the same color as the existing roof on the home, the style and aesthetic details of the proposed structure are unclear as multiple options are provided for the facade. In addition, the two (2) other variances that have been granted in this neighborhood (Case 8-2018 and Case 27-2022) have had conditions that the addition is to remain open permanently, whereas this proposed addition is partially enclosed. While this is not a requirement or factor in consideration of additions in the Zoning Resolution, this appears to be part of the character of the neighborhood.

Ms. Gleason stated that the variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage).

Ms. Gleason stated that the property owners' predicament would not be feasibly obviated through another method other than a variance. Their existing home is already 35' from the rear property line, the required rear yard setback, leaving no additional room to build an addition to the home in the rear.

Ms. Gleason stated that the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement may not be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance. There are homes on the west side of the street of Hunter's Run, all constructed near the 35' required rear yard setback and are experiencing the same circumstances. The subdivision to the west, Foxbrook Place, is also zoned "B", however these lots are larger. While variances were granted in 2018 for 7723 Stoneleigh Lane (rear yard setback was 24'), and in 2022 for 7711 Stoneleigh Lane (rear yard setback was 20'), the elevations proposed for this Case (30-2022) are not clear if it will go with the existing character of the neighborhood due to unclear design of the proposed addition and because the proposed addition is to be half closed (unlike the two other variances granted). Staff recommends that the character of the neighborhood be maintained with the existing rear yard setback of 35' in the "B" Zoning District on Stoneleigh Lane.

Ms. Gleason stated that the aforementioned variance requested should be evaluated on the following criteria: 1) The property in question would yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance. 2) The variance was substantial. 3) The essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance. 4) The variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage). 5) The property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restrictions. 6) The property owner's predicament can be feasibly obviated through some method other than a variance. 7) The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.

Pinakin Bhakta, 7735 Stoneleigh Ln., property owner stated his intention and reasoning for applying for a variance is to protect him and his family from direct sunlight and heat, while being able to enjoy the space.

Mr. Nye stated that similar variances just to the north and south of the subject property have conditions that the exterior walls remain open, and asked Mr. Bhakta if his proposal included a half wall on the sides.

Mr. Bhakta stated that railings can be built in lieu of half walls.

Mr. Nye stated that if Mr. Bhakta were to build railings instead of a half wall, it would be more palatable to him.

Mr. Sian asked if the Homeowners Association (HOA) has seen the plans and have made any recommendations.

Mr. James Bettner, property owner of 7723 Stoneleigh Lane, representative of the HOA (Treasurer) agrees with Mr. Bhakta and his desire to screen the porch from direct sunlight and heat.

Mr. Bettner stated how much he and his family enjoy the room addition on the rear of his house that was approved by the BZA for a variance in 2018.

Mr. Bettner stated from an HOA perspective that they are inclined to approve, but have not approved the plans yet, and are still speaking with Mr. Bhakta about the final drawings/plans.

Mr. Bettner stated that the HOA needs a final decision on the materials and the drawings. The HOA needed a better understanding of what "open" meant. They believed that "open" meant not to have windows. The HOA needs more extensive details of the final design of the structure in which would be required by the Hamilton County Building inspection. Lastly, all permits provided by the county, would need to be completed and approved before a final decision is made by the HOA.

Mr. Sian asked Mr. Bettner what his role is in the HOA.

Mr. Bettner answered he is the Treasurer.

Mr. Haber asked is the decision contingent on the timing of things? Are they required to get a permit prior to HOA approval?

Mr. Bettner answered that the way the HOA is worded, is that they will grant approval contingent on BZA and County requirements.

Mr. Haber stated he would like clarification as to what is meant by "open" and "not open".

Ron Strong, contractor for 7735 Stoneleigh, described the finish of the final project and stated that the final product will look like the neighbor's directly to the north of 7735 Stoneleigh Lane.

Mr. Sheckels stated that he was not on the Board of Zoning Appeals when Case 8-2018, 7723 Stoneleigh Lane was issued a variance.

Mr. Bettner stated that case 27-2022 BZA, 7711 Stoneleigh Lane, has a completely open addition as approved by the BZA. 7723 Stoneleigh Lane has fixed screens installed, which would be compliant with "open" status.

Mr. Sheckels stated that having a screen installed or no screen would both qualify for an open concept.

Mr. Nye believes that having a waist high wall would still qualify the addition as being "open" and was curious about the house to the immediate south and its addition design.

Mr. Bettner stated that the same company which constructed his addition, completed the addition located at 7741 Stoneleigh Lane.

Mr. Sheckels asked Mr. Bettner if the HOA would be accepting of a 36" panel around the bottom of the addition.

Mr. Bettner answered, 'yes'.

Mr. Sian asked Mr. Bettner if the approval from the HOA would come before or after the decision from the BZA.

Mr. Bettner stated that the HOA would probably grant permission either way if the Board of Zoning Appeals were to meet again in a future meeting for Case 30-2022.

Mr. Sheckels explained to Mr. Bhakta that the Board can move into Executive Session and provide a vote this evening or offer to postpone a vote until next month.

Mr. Bhakta stated that he is prepared for the Board to vote this evening.

Mr. Nye stated that he believes if the Board were to vote this evening, the case would not be granted, and for a proper vote, he suggests Mr. Bhakta to supply the Board with updated and finalized plans of the addition.

Mr. Nye motioned for a five minute recess to allow Mr. Bhakta to discuss his final plans with Mr. Strong and Mr. Bettner.

Mr. Sheckels seconded the motion

Unanimous vote to enter recess.

Mr. Strong stated that they are proposing a hardy plank, horizontal siding for the bottom section with hand split shakes that will go into the gables that will match the surrounding houses. The height of the walls will be about 40 inches.

Mr. Sian motions to enter executive session.

Mr. Haber seconds the motion.

The public hearing was closed at 7:01pm.

Deliberation of Case 30-2022 BZA

The Board discussed a variance request to allow a 15'x15' addition, covered deck, in the rear yard area with a 26.43' rear yard setback where a 35' setback is required per Article 3.5, C, 2, c of the Anderson Township Zoning Resolution.

Vote: 5 Yeas
 0 Nays

Mr. Nye Motioned
Mr. Sian Seconded

Mr. Halpin - Yea
Mr. Sian - Yea
Mr. Nye - Yea
Mr. Haber - Yea
Mr. Sheckels - Yea

Decision and Journalization of Case 28-2022 BZA

Mr. Haber moved, and Mr. Sian seconded to approve the variance request in Case 28-2022 BZA with conditions.

Vote: 5 Yeas
0 Nays

Mr. Halpin - Yea
Mr. Sian - Yea
Mr. Nye - Yea
Mr. Haber - Yea
Mr. Sheckels - Yea

Decision and Journalization of Case 29-2022 BZA

Mr. Haber moved, and Mr. Sian seconded to approve the conditional use and variance requests in Case 29-2022 BZA with conditions.

Vote: 5 Yeas
0 Nays

Mr. Halpin - Yea
Mr. Sian - Yea
Mr. Nye - Yea
Mr. Haber - Yea
Mr. Sheckels - Yea

Decision and Journalization of Case 30-2022 BZA

Mr. Haber moved, and Mr. Sian seconded to approve the conditional use in Case 30-2022 BZA with conditions.

Vote: 5 Yeas
0 Nays

Mr. Halpin - Yea

Mr. Sian - Yea

Mr. Nye - Yea

Mr. Haber - Yea

Mr. Sheckels - Yea

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, December 1, 2022, at 5:30 p.m. at the Anderson Center.

The meeting was adjourned at **7:27pm**.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul Sheckels, Chair

PLEASE PRINT - THANK YOU

ADDRESS:

6702 Treeridge Dr.

7735 Stoneleigh Ln

3460 Oakmeadow Ln.

7723 GUNLEIGH LN

8471 Forest Rd.

8544 Summit

6706 Treeridge Dr.