

**Sangamon County, Illinois**  
**ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

The Zoning Board of Appeals met on September 17, 2015, at 7:00 P.M. in the County Board Chamber in the County Complex.

**ATTENDANCE**      (X) denotes present

( X) Chairman Chimento	( X) Committee Member Mares
( X) Committee Member Wulf	( X) Committee Member Herbert
( X) Committee Member Spiro	( X) Alt. Committee Member Lucchesi
( X) Alt. Committee Member Dobrinsky	

**STAFF PRESENT:**

Molly Berns, Senior Planner, Spfld-Sang County Regional Planning Commission  
Steve Keenan, Associate Planner, Spfld-Sang County Regional Planning Commission  
Dwayne Gabb, Assistant States Attorney, States Attorneys Office  
Cyndi Knowles, Zoning Administrator, Sangamon County Zoning

---

Chairman Chimento called the meeting to order.

**Docket 2015-020 for property located at 2936 S. MacArthur Blvd., Springfield, IL. 62704**

**PETITIONER(S):** Chun D. Hu & Yi Lu

**OBJECTOR(S):** None

**PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION:** "B-3" General Business District

**REQUESTING:** A Conditional Permitted Use to allow the sale of packaged liquor and a variance to allow a liquor store property line to be within seventy-one (71) feet of a residential structure.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend denial of the requested CPU. It appears only approximately ten (10) parking spaces are available on the subject property; nineteen (19) are required. Also, much of the current parking area is graveled, making it difficult to tell if ample parking spaces are available. The petitioner should provide evidence that the parking area will be paved, and provide a parking plan to show that the requirements of the zoning ordinance can be met. The petition states additional parking would be provided on the property immediately to the south. However, this property is in the City of Springfield. The City Zoning Administrator has indicated to staff that further zoning relief would be required from the City to allow parking on the adjacent lot to the south to serve the subject property. A parking arrangement would need to be arranged to

not inhibit use of the property immediately to the south. If the parking deficiencies are resolved, staff recommends the closing time be limited to 7:00 pm on Sunday through Thursday, and 8:30 pm on Friday and Saturday per the business plan. This could limit negative impacts on the surrounding area. Recommend denial of the variance request. While the standards of variation appear to be met to allow a packaged liquor store within one hundred (100) feet of a residence, the variance is not needed in the absence of the CPU for packaged liquor sales.

Chairman Chimento stated that last month we asked you to get us some additional information, did you get that done?

Chun D. Hu stated this is from the parking lot company who wants to do this for us but, I talked to Cyndi this afternoon and she said this is not a very clear parking plan. So I draw something just very basic on there with measurement. I have another drawing for the parking lot.

Staff, Cyndi Knowles stated that Ms. Hu needed to be sworn in.

Chun D. Hu was sworn.

Chun D. Hu stated we have big enough space for parking lot.

Committee Member Wulf stated, do we still have a situation where we have a County and Springfield situation? Do we need Springfield approval on the parking entrance and exit prior to us really being able to do anything on this?

Staff, Molly Berns stated that there has been no determination by the City of Springfield. This parking plan still shows the entrance to the parking area to be on the lot to the South. Which the petitioner does own but, is under the jurisdiction of the City of Springfield parking regulations.

Chun D. Hu stated that she explained that this was entrance and exit. Before, we have an entrance and an exit on the building North side. After North side property owner block off the way, we only have one way to go either as entrance or exit. Because of this situation, we bought south side property, so have 2 property line up together. I know South side property under the city. I think we can go in there but not park there. I think City be ok.

Chairman Chimento stated so they would just drive through there, not park there.

Chun D. Hu stated yes, just drive through. Also, we still talking with north side property owner. They allow us to purchase to own.

Chairman Chimento stated, that is a part of this case because you don't have it.

Staff, Molly Berns stated that the question becomes whether the appropriate zoning exists on the parcel to the South that is under the City of Springfield jurisdiction to allow ingress onto a lot that is not under their jurisdiction. It may, in fact, according to the City Traffic Engineer, although we don't have it noted because we do not have documentation. It may be called, as a through lot, according to the City of Springfield. In 17.50.060 B says, each off street parking facility shall be provided with an appropriate means of vehicular access to a street in a forward manner. This does, but it does so through a lot that is under the City of Springfield's zoning regulations. We do not have any sort of documentation from the City of Springfield Zoning Administrator and the Traffic Engineer for the City of Springfield that that would in fact be allowed for ingress to a parking lot that is not in their jurisdiction. There may be some zoning involved with the City in order to use this parcel to the South as an ingress to the parking lot not in their jurisdiction.

Committee Member Mares stated, so my question would then be, we have been through this 3 times now, have we talked to the City of Springfield with regards to...it appears we keep coming back on a monthly basis...I don't see where we have gained a lot of ground.

Staff, Molly Berns stated I believe the petitioner was advised to talk to the City of Springfield to find out what would be required and if fact, if a petition was going to be required, to file that. Then we could wait for that appropriate action at the County level. Staff does not have the authority to act on behalf of the petitioner. The petitioner would have to go forward with that action.

Committee Member Mares stated so, this evening, what has changed since 30 days ago.

Chairman Chimento stated, just this drawing.

Committee Member Mares stated, so my recommendation would be that you go before the City of Springfield to see if you can get a joint recommendation to be able to share their ingress or egress to your property to be able to do this. As much as we enjoy having you here on a monthly basis, I don't see in the last few months where we have moved forward. Maybe with the help of staff, we could make a recommendation that you could take to the City of Springfield. It is a unique situation that you have property that is right on the border of Sangamon County and the City of Springfield. It would appear that we are willing to help you on the Sangamon County side but, you need to get approval from the City of Springfield.

Committee Member Spiro asked if the City was holding up because of our not granting it.

Staff, Molly Berns stated, no, after the case was first before this board, I placed a call to the City's Zoning Administrator, to explain to him that a petitioner...at the time you were talking about using part of that for parking and so I did advise him that she may be coming in to see him. As of last evening, no, we are back here tonight.

County Board Member Jason Ratts asked Chun D. Hu, that gentleman in the black suit up there just gave you a lot of great information, did you understand what he said?

Chun D. Hu stated, most of it.

County Board Member Jason Ratts stated, I see a language barrier, we are trying to get you in the right direction and you are not following through. You may need some help from someone who understands and could explain to you in your language to help you understand.

Chairman Chimento asked where we stand, 3 months is it, isn't it on continuance.

Staff, Dwayne Gab stated, it has been our policy to go 3 months. However, I did give staff an opinion earlier that if it was agreed upon by all parties that it could be continued further. I believe that the petitioner does have the right to have her petition heard. If she were to ask for additional time, I think it could be done by agreement. If she would need relief from the City, we are looking at the least 90 days out I believe.

Committee Member Mares asked if she asks, and we grant a continuance, would it be for 30 days and still not have a resolution.

Staff, Dwayne Gab stated, once again, we are talking if it is agreed upon by both parties or not. I do not see where the other party is asking for that time so I can't say where to go at this point.

Committee Member Wulf asked if it would be possible for the petitioner to withdraw at this point.

Staff, Dwayne Gab stated yes, in all probability if it is denied at the County Board level it could only come back before the 6 months if there is a substantial change in circumstances. We would have to see what would happen.

Staff, Cyndi Knowles stated that there is the possibility that if Matt McLaughlin from City Zoning and Lori Williams from Traffic were to put in writing that no zoning relief would be needed or that a petition would be required may help with this matter as well.

Committee Member Wulf stated that our dilemma right now is we either continue the petition, deny it or withdrawing it. We understand what you can do, the problem is the time frame which is something that is not granted to us right now.

Chun D. Hu stated she has 2 questions. 1: If the north side of the property, we own it, so have entrance and exit to the north, its ok?

Chairman Chimento stated you have to have 1 way in and 1 way out.

Chun D. Hu stated yeah, before we do that. If that property belong to us we can use that, so it ok for this place.

Staff, Molly Berns stated that at this point we do not know if there is enough room for 2 cars to pass.

Staff, Cyndi Knowles stated that if you would have to use a separate parcel for part of the egress or ingress then it would require zoning relief as well in order to have access onto this parcel rather it is County or not.

Chairman Chimento asked if that was the same parcel to the north. Isn't that all one piece?

Staff, Cyndi Knowles stated it is a separate parcel.

County Board Member Greg Stumpf stated, from what I am hearing, if we move forward with this, the recommendation without having the proper zoning on the north property from the City of Springfield, our recommendation would be no because, it is not properly zoned on the north side. You have to take care of business with the City of Springfield and then come back to us and hopefully expect a positive yes vote. Excuse me, the south property. If she withdrew and took care of business with the City of Springfield, she could come back next month. I know in the City of Springfield it is going to be a few month process then you could come back here or you could still go forward now but I would suggest that without the proper zoning it would not be a good outcome. Do you understand?

Chun D. Hu stated yeah, I thank you for extension to talk to City.

Chairman Chimento stated that we think you should get a professional engineer and have him get a good drawing with measurements. There are no measurements on this.

County Board Member Greg Stumpf stated from what I understand tonight Mrs. Lu would need to either move forward or withdraw.

Committee Member Wulf stated, it may will be that there is nothing that she needs from the City, we just don't know.

Staff, Molly Berns stated that is correct.

Committee Member Wulf stated she could go to the City, explain to them what she wants to do and they may say well that is ok. Get a letter or have the City contact Molly and clear that with us and you can come back and refile. That really is your best option.

Chun D. Hu stated yeah think that is best choice, go talk to City.

Staff, Molly Berns asked if that is your intent to withdraw tonight.

Chun D. Hu stated yes.

**Was withdrawn on record by petitioner Chun D. Hu**

**Docket 2015-031 for property located at 2611 Cantrell Rd., Illiopolis, IL. 62539**

PETITIONER(S): John & Brenda Bruntjen

OBJECTOR(S): None

PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION: :I-2” General Industrial District

REQUESTING: “A” Agricultural District

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommend approval. While agricultural usage is exempted and thus allowed in the I-2 district, the property is better suited for an agricultural classification given that it is under cultivation and that there is a residence on the subject property.

Mr. & Mrs. Bruntjen were unable to attend.

County Board Member David Mendenhall spoke on their behalf.

No additional testimony was given.

**Committee Member Wulf makes a motion to recommend approval as staff recommended.**

**Committee Member Spiro seconds the motion.**

**Motion carries 5/0/0**

**Docket 2015-032 for property located at 12005 Ackerman Rd., Virden, IL. 62690**

PETITIONER(S): Cathy Bettis

OBJECTOR(S): None

PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION: “A” Agricultural District with a variance for one parcel less than 40 acres.

REQUESTING: “A” Agricultural District with a variance for one parcel less than 40 acres and a variance to allow two (2) parcels less than five (5) acres.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommend approval. The petitioner wants to subdivide to allow a relative to place a manufactured home on the new parcel. The County Board established a mixed trend of development in the area with previous votes, e.g. Zoning Cases # 2008-01 (establishing a dog kennel), 2009-61 (variances) and 2013-042 (variance). Staff believes the mixed trend of development warrants the variance request. Given the trend toward smaller lots in the area, the variance request would result in one (1) new residence and one (1) existing residence. The Standards of Variation are met.

Cathy Bettis was sworn.

Cathy Bettis stated she wants to put another home on 5 acres.

Chairman Chimento asked what kind of home.

Cathy Bettis stated a manufactured home.

Chairman Chimento asked who was going to live there.

Cathy Bettis stated possibly my son.

Chairman Chimento stated so you are not for sure.

Cathy Bettis stated either my son or myself.

Chairman Chimento asked if anybody had any questions...hearing none. County Board....hearing none. Any objectors...hearing none.

**Committee Member Herbert makes a motion to recommend approval as staff recommended.**

**Committee Member Mares seconds the motion.**

**Motion carries 5/0/0**

**Docket 2015-033 for property located at In the 16,600 – 16, 700 Block of Henkel Creek Rd., Divernon, IL. 62530**

PETITIONER(S): Paul Thomas Cody, Successor Trustee of the Mary Jane Cody Declaration of Trust Dated 12/06/00

OBJECTOR(S): None

PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION: “A” Agricultural District

REQUESTING: “A” Agricultural District with a variance to allow two (2) parcels less than forty (40) acres.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommend approval. The variance will allow a division of the subject property into two (2) equal halves, north and south. The division will help settle a trust in the family. The property is and will continue to remain farmland. The Standards of Variation are met.

Paul Cody was sworn.

No additional testimony was given.

**Committee Member Mares makes a motion to recommend approval as staff recommended.**

**Committee Member Wulf seconds the motion.**

**Motion carries 5/0/0**

**Docket 2015-034 for property located at 3255 & 3285 Hennepin Rd., Springfield, IL. 62707**

PETITIONER(S): Virginia Bleisner & Ernest Bleisner, Jr.

OBJECTOR(S): One, in writing.

PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION: “A” Agricultural District

REQUESTING: A rezoning from “A” Agricultural District to “I-1” Restricted Industrial District and a variance to allow the parking area to remain gravel rather than paving to allow a fencing contractor’s office, shop and yard for both parcels, Parcel 1: a variance to allow two (2) principal uses (a single-family residence and fencing contractor’s office, shop and yard) on one (1) parcel and a variance to allow a single-family residence in the “I-1” Restricted Industrial District and, Parcel 2: a variance to allow two (2) principal uses (a manufactured home and a fencing contractor’s office, shop and yard) on one (1) parcel and a variance to allow a manufactured home residence in the “I-1” Restricted Industrial District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommend denial of the requested rezoning to I-1. The LESA score of 153 indicates the property is marginal for agricultural usage. Given the current uses of the parcels, it would be economically unfeasible to convert the property to agricultural uses. The area has a mixed trend of development, with residences located along both Hennepin and Tozer. Staff believes the list of allowable uses in the I-1 district might be too intense given the character of the area and that there is a clear line between the Agricultural zoning west of Hennepin and the I-2 zoning east of Hennepin.

Recommend approval of a use variance to allow a fencing contractor's business with outdoor storage of fencing materials in the Agricultural district on the subject property with the following conditions: (1) all outside storage of fencing materials and/or business-related vehicles is located behind a solid fence, (2) no retail store or showroom that is accessible to the public is allowed, and (3) the business ceases operations by 8:00 PM. The parcels east of Hennepin and across from the subject property are zoned I-2 General Industrial District. The subject property is also very near the landing path for Abraham Lincoln Capital Airport. Therefore, staff finds there are mitigating circumstances to warrant a use variance. If a use variance is approved, it negates the need for a variance to allow a residence the I-1 classification.

Recommend approval of the requested variance to allow two (2) principal uses on Parcel 1, i.e. a single-family residence and a fencing contractor's office, shop and yard; and a variance to allow two (2) principal uses on Parcel 2, i.e. a manufactured home and a fencing contractor's office shop, and yard. Given the recommended approval of a use variance to allow the fencing business with outdoor storage on the subject property, the variance request is warranted.

Recommend denial of the requested variance to pave the parking area. The petition did not provide evidence to warrant the requested variance. Staff has concerns with vehicular circulation and meeting the Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] will be met if lot is not paved. The Standards of Variation are not met.

Ernest Bleisner, Jr. was sworn.

Ernest Bleisner stated that he is filing so that his son's fence business can remain on the property.

Chairman Chimento asked if there were 2 properties involved.

Ernest Bleisner stated yes. One kinda wraps around the other.

Chairman Chimento stated that he saw the fence, does it all sit behind the fence?

Ernest Bleisner stated yes, there is a fence about even with the one shed, the property goes on past that.

Chairman Chimento asked if we are zoning both pieces.

Ernest Bleisner stated yes. The mobile home is on one piece on approximately one acre and the other piece of ground kinda wraps around it. There is road frontage to the north and to the south on the 5 acre tract.

Chairman Chimento asked if there were any questions.

Committee Member Wulf asked if he had read the recommendation of staff.

Ernest Bleisner stated yes, on the parking, is that what you are referring to?

Committee Member Wulf stated no. I am referring to the denial of the I-1.

Ernest Bleisner stated yes, I read that.

Committee Member Wulf asked if he had a problem with the use variance as opposed to the rezoning.

Ernest Bleisner stated that he wouldn't have a problem with it. I don't know how the neighbors would feel, one neighbor may.

Committee Member Wulf stated, I don't know what your neighbor has to do with it at this point. This is your request, either rezoning or use variance and the staff has recommended a use variance.

Ernest Bleisner stated the use variance would be ok so long as he can keep his business there and operate in the manner he has.

Committee Member Wulf stated there are a number of conditions attached to this that would have to be followed. , the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of the staff recommendation, you need to read that.

Ernest Bleisner stated ok. The parking, is that what you are talking about? There never has been a retail store there. The outside material is stored behind the fence or in a building. The business has never operated past 8 pm.

Committee Member Wulf stated so you would have no objections to the variance with the restrictions as opposed to the I-1?

Ernest Bleisner stated no sir.

Committee Member Mares stated, it seems to me to be a little ambiguous that we would require paved parking when there will be no retail on the premises.

Staff, Molly Berns stated that is something for consideration but, it is up to the Zoning Board of Appeals and ultimately the County Board to weigh your petition. That is with the evidence that is presented tonight of whether or not the staff recommendation is warranted or should perhaps be amended.

Chairman Chimento asked if the area to be paved is in front of the garage.

Staff, Cyndi Knowles stated that normally that would be for any parking area for the business itself and the employees.

Chairman Chimento asked how many employees does he have.

Ernest Bleisner stated 2 at the most. 1 primary and 1 part time.

Chairman Chimento asked if they come out there and park before they go to work.

Ernest Bleisner stated, can never find 2 employees with a driver's license so...he does have to have 1 employee with a license and yes, he does park there.

Committee Member Herbert asked, if we have to require paving, do we not also have to require so many spots for parking.

Staff, Cyndi Knowles stated that at your discretion, you can wave that the parking not be paved however, they number of parking spaces would still exist, it just wouldn't be paved.

County Board Member Greg Stumpf stated now that the issue of how many employees are there, the zoning doesn't stop how many employees there are. He could end up having 50 employees so how can you get away from the ADA bathrooms and/or parking?

Staff, Molly Berns stated that the bathroom stuff is public health and not applicable to zoning at this point. Certainly it would be a consideration but not at this determining factor. In terms of the parking, unless the use variance has a restriction placed on it as to the number of employees, then that is the only way to limit that. In terms of your scenario where he would be fortunate enough to have his business grow by 20 employees then yeah...

County Board Member Greg Stumpf stated or if they would sell the property and another company would come in within the 2 years someone else with a carpentry business here...

Staff, Molly Berns stated it would have to be a fence business, not a contractor's shop because he was very specific about it being a fence business.

Ernest Bleisner stated, for what it is worth, I have lived there all my life and I have no intentions on selling.

County Board Member Annette Fulgenzi stated, I have a question about the current restrictions that are in there. It is my understanding that there is no public portion, that it is restricted to the public cannot visit this property, so it would only be for the office and the employees. It would be kind of precarious I would think to grow to that volume under that kind of scenario at this location.

Ernest Bleisner stated that he has been in business for over 12 years and has never had more than 2 employees.

Chairman Chimento asked if there were any other questions...hearing none. Are there any objectors...hearing none.

Staff, Molly Berns stated I believe you have one in writing.

Chairman Chimento asked if he needs to read it.

Staff, Molly Berns stated that you just need to acknowledge it.

Chairman Chimento stated that we have an objection letter signed by Lucille Murry.

Committee Member Mares asked if staff has looked at or made a decision regarding this objection.

Staff, Molly Berns stated I did read and look at the objector's objection. If you look at the objector's objections, it does not change the underlying staff recommendation. If you look at the airport being across the street and it being zoned I-2. Several of the properties to the north and south have been purchased by the Airport Authority for future expansion of the airport. This is, by nature of the airport being across the street, a mix use area. The objector is requesting that it remain agricultural, which it will.

Chairman Chimento read the staff report.

Committee Member Wulf stated he would like to offer an amendment and recommend that the denial of the requested variance to pave the parking area be granted. There is no evidence that there will be any retail store or showroom. Which, in my point of view, the economic requirements need no return at all because there will be no public parking there. The plight of the owner is due to circumstances unique to the property, it is not generally applicable to other property in the area is the fact that there is to be no outside or retail business there. It does make it unique in that the variation will not alter the essential character of the neighborhood. It does not impede the air, light or property. There will be no increase in traffic or be a detriment to property value in any way. Again, there will be no impact on the area as it exists today.

**Committee Member Wulf makes a motion to recommend denial of the "I-1" Restricted Industrial District but, in the alternative, grant a use variance to allow a fencing contractor's business without outdoor storage of fencing materials in the Agricultural District with the following conditions: (1) all outside storage of fencing materials and/or business related vehicles is located behind a solid fence, (2) no retail store or showroom that is accessible to the public is allowed, and (3) the business ceases operations by 8:00 PM, and grant a variance to allow the parking area to remain gravel rather than paving to allow a fencing contractor's office, shop and yard for both parcels and, or Parcel 1: a variance to allow two (2) principal uses (a single-family residence and fencing contractor's office, shop and yard) on one (1) parcel and, for Parcel 2: a variance to allow two (2) principal uses (a manufactured home and fencing contractor's office, shop and yard) on one (1) parcel..**

**Committee Member Mares seconds the motion.**

**Motion carries 5/0/0**

**Docket 2015-035 for property located at 16267 Berlin Tower Rd., New Berlin, IL. 62670**

PETITIONER(S): Megan & Mindi Smith

OBJECTOR(S): None

PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION: “A” Agricultural District with a variance to allow one (1) parcel less than forth (40) acres and a variance to allow the lot depth to be greater than two and one-half (2.5) the lot width.

REQUESTING: For Proposed Lot 2 “R-1” Single Family Residence District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommend approval. While the LESA score of 218 indicates the property is suitable for agricultural uses, staff believes the fact that the site has been a homestead for a number of years combined with the new residence constructed immediately to the southeast of the subject property decreases the likelihood that the subject property will revert to productive agricultural usage. Further, the County Board, in Zoning Case # 2011-052, approved a rezoning in the general are with a similar LESA score.

Mindi Smith was sworn.

No additional testimony was given.

**Committee Member Spiro makes a motion to recommend approval as staff recommended.**

**Committee Member Herbert seconds the motion.**

**Motion carries 5/0/0**

**Docket 2015-037 for property located at In the 5,600 Block of Boarman Rd., Pawnee, IL. 62558**

PETITIONER(S): Thomas & Cindy Boarman & Stephen Boarman

OBJECTOR(S): None

PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION: “A” Agricultural District

REQUESTING: “A” Agricultural District with a variance to allow two (2) parcels less than forty (40) acres and a variance to allow the lot depth to be greater than two and one-half (2 ½) times the lot width for both parcels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommend approval. The requested variance will allow a division into two (2) equal halves, east and west. The property is and will continue to remain farmland. The division is requested to settle an estate. The Standards of Variation are met.

Thomas Boarman was sworn.

No additional testimony was given.

**Committee Member Mares makes a motion to recommend approval as staff recommended.**

**Committee Member Wulf seconds the motion.**

**Motion carries 5/0/0**

**Docket 2015-038 for property located at in the 600 Block of Covered Bridge Rd., Glenarm, IL. 62536**

PETITIONER(S): Stephen & Deborah Copp

OBJECTOR(S): None

PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATION: “A” Agricultural District

REQUESTING: Proposed Lot 1: “A” Agricultural District with a variance to allow the lot depth to be greater than two and one-half (2 ½) times the lot width and a variance to allow one (1) parcel less than five (5) acres; and for Proposed Lot 2: a rezoning from “A” Agricultural District to “R-1” Single-Family Residence District.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Recommend approval of the requested rezoning and variance. The LESA score of 145 indicates the subject property is acceptable for non-agricultural development. The general area is a mixture of single-family residences, cropland, timber, and floodplain. Pertaining to the variance, the request is necessary to facilitate a land split. The current owner would like to sell the western portion of the property, i.e. Proposed Lot 2, as a buildable parcel. The petitioner would buy the eastern four (4) acres of the subject property to keep as timber land from the current property owner. The Standards of Variation are met.

Stephen Copp was sworn.

No additional testimony was given.

**Committee Member Mares makes a motion to recommend approval as staff recommended.**

**Committee Member Wulf seconds the motion.**

**Motion carries 5/0/0**

Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

*Cyndi Knowles*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

Minutes of September 17, 2015  
Full record of minutes available upon request in the Zoning Department