

**MINUTES OF THE
CITY OF ST. CLAIR SHORES
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
MAY 6, 2021**

Present:

Tony Bellestri, Chairman
Steve Scavone, Vice-Chairman
Duane Michno
Thomas Budnick, Secretary
Lee Bertolo
Peter Stellas
Bill Lince
Mark Moffitt, Alternate

Alternates:

Thomas McKenney

Absent:

Also, Present:

Eric Shepherd, City Attorney
Shantelle Hubbard, Recording Secretary
Chris Rayes, Community Director

Call to Order

Chairman Bellestri called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m., roll was called and a quorum was present. The Pledge of Allegiance was said by all. Secretary Budnick instructed the petitioner that it is understood by the Zoning Board of Appeals that their presence here tonight constitutes that they are a legal representative of the petitioner and that each statement of intent, promise and/or pledge, made by the petitioner or agent, either orally or in writing, permitted by ordinance shall be binding upon the petitioner and shall be a condition of set variance if approved.

Case No. 19-2021– Ashleigh Larimer for North Shores Nutrition – 31547 Harper

Re: ONE SISTER SUBDIVISION (L55, P22-23) PART OF LOTS 12 AND 13
DESC AS FOLLOWS: BEG AT THE SW CORNER OF LOT 12; THENCE
N26*17'10"W 71.36'; THENCE NORTH 63*42'50"E 15.64' TO THE POB;
THENCE N26*34'43"W 47.98'; THENCE N63*23'47"E 30.25'; THENCE S26*51'01"E 48';
THENCE S63*26'10"W 30.48' TO THE POB

Location: North of Thirteen Mile Rd, West of Harper

REQUEST: Request for an 8-parking space variance for a restaurant with service over the counter. (*Zoning Ordinance 15.500, Parking*)

Ashleigh Larimer, 22330 Colony, currently they were allocated 12 spaces. Due to the square footage she needs 20 spots. She is a carryout business serving only shakes and teas. She has the hours of operation are Monday through Friday 7 am to 7 pm with the busiest times being 7 – 9 am. The other business on each side of her are open from 10-5. Sixty percent of the 76 hours they are not overlapping in times.

Correspondence: None

Audience Participation: Ann Kaleigh, manager for the dental office next to this facility. She does not understand the variance. Her office varies in hours. We are there sometimes 7, 8 or 9 am. One day they start at 10:00 am. Due to Covid they cannot let patients in the office they have to sit in their cars. She does know if this would make a difference. They have 18 spaces of their own. Eight in the back and 10 in the front. They have 8 employees so that would take care of the back. There are only a total of 34 spaces front and back. Little Caesars starting in the afternoon their customers park all in the front.

They serve non-alcoholic beverages shakes and teas. He stated that it sounds like that they were in business prior to getting the certificate of occupancy. She signed a lease. The lease is contingent on the parking variance.

Vice-Chairman Scavone asked Mr. Rayes to explain what they are asking for. Mr. Rayes stated the use goes by the square footage. The original use had a lessor parking demand than this use does. Based on her use the parking requirement is greater thus the eight-parking variance request. There is 1500 square footage.

She will have tables for decorative purpose. They have call ahead of time and carryout there may be sometimes a 3–5-minute wait. The most at one time they will have 3 employees.

The petitioner stated that she counted 37 spots front and back. They were allotted 12 spaces. Vice-Chairman Scavone because they will not have people sitting, they may have a surplus of 9 spaces. She will have 5 transitional spaces throughout the day what she will be allotted. If she has no sit down in it and its purely in and out. If it was an office use and eight people parked there all the time it would be up to the board to decide what will have more of an impact.

Vice-Chairman Scavone stated that there are a couple Tropical Smoothie Café's in the city he may have seen 7 or 8 people in line. Usually it is two to three people.

Vice-Chairman Scavone stated that he does not see this putting a burden on the lot. The lot doesn't seem to be that full.

Chairman Bellestri asked Mr. Rayes is their consideration given for the cooking area and the bathroom minus the total square foot. Mr. Rayes stated all of the parking requirements are based on an average for the building. If the ordinance was driven by subtracting those spaces the number required would be higher basically to get to the same number. That is the anticipated load. If we, did it by space and they come saying they are only going to use 100 sq. ft. there will never be enough parking so they, do it by gross.

Secretary Budnick asked Mr. Rayes if the petitioner wanted to add tables in the future will she have to come back to request additional spaces at that time. Mr. Rayes stated that the square footage used is carryout with some limited seating in it and if they wanted to condition it with no seating, they could do that. She then would have to come back to get additional.

Commissioner Michno asked if the neighbor to the north is vacant. She said that the other building is called State Tax Record Service. He has gone by there a lot and he does not see a problem.

Mr. Shepherd stated to the board that this is non-use variance. Whoever makes a motion of either granting or denying the variance should address the standards for practical difficulty on the motion.

The petitioner asked in regards to the seating and if she were to come back and request a variance at another time. At first with the coming and going and then not having table service. The bar area would have four stools. Would this be covered for carry out for having stools at the bar. Mr. Rayes stated that technically it is part of the parking variance right now because she will have some seating.

Ann Kaleigh asked if they can tell people that they can park there or not. She asked if they can put up parking signs. It is a private parking lot. There is specific language that they can give her so it is enforceable. Secretary Budnick stated that they can ask Little Caesars to use the rear lot. They don't have a rear lot. Nucci Veterinary takes a lot of the parking spaces in the back.

Commissioner Stellas stated that he does not see a definition that defines the fact that this is a special unique petition the area. By granting this variance it will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent to limit the number of people, bars and what not that they can congest an area and therefore he makes a motion to deny the petitioner's request, no one second the motion. Motion withdrawn.

It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Secretary Budnick, to approve the request for an 8-parking space variance for a restaurant with service over the counter. The reason is that he does not feel that this special condition circumstances that was the result from the applicant. The other conditions have been met. Those spots will be made available when they put those signs up. Because the type of business as presented is different than if it were a sit-down place so the parking demands will be less than a restaurant with the same square footage. Limit seating to people waiting for their carry outs or orders. If this changes they will have to come back in front of the board.

A roll call vote was taken.

Ayes: Michno, Budnick, Scavone, Lince, Bertolo, Bellestri

Nays: Stellas

Absent: None

Motion: Passed

Case No. 20-2021– END Studio for Jason and Michelle White – 21100 Walton

Re: MACK AVENUE HOMESITES SUB'N (L8, P64) W 22' LOT 50 & E 28' LOT 51

Location: South of Eleven Mile Rd, East of Little Mack

Zoning Board of Appeals

May 6, 2021

Page 3 of 12

REQUEST: Request for a .75' and 2.33' side yard setback variance for a 2nd story and rear addition. (*Zoning Ordinance 15.481, Schedule of Regulations*)

Elise Dechard, Architect, 1533 Merrick St., Detroit. Jason and Michelle White, 21100 Walton, they have a growing family they are at a point to reinvest in their home. They love the city and neighborhood. They will be here for the long run.

Elise Dechard stated that the project is an addition and renovation of their existing house. In order to fit their growing lifestyle, they want to make it a modern look. The addition has three parts the back addition is a one-story dining room addition and mudroom, second story addition has a master bedroom with a bathroom and a closet, and the front porch will be expanded slightly out. The hardship is that the house is an existing non-conforming in regards to the set back. The house is slightly angled. The east side is 4'3" and 3'10" about the 4'. The west side the driveway side is between 7.5' and a quarter to 7'11". It is slightly less than the existing setback. In order to keep with the existing character of the house in the neighborhood the new addition is in line with the west wall. The new addition extends slightly past the north and south side. The front porch extends out about 1'4" the distance from the side setback is 7'5" it is less than inch off of the existing. The mud room extends 5'4" to the south. Along the back corner it is 8' from the property line because it is angled slightly forward. In order to keep with the existing line of the house the new addition is also slightly non-conforming so matching the existing non-conforming. The front and back are in compliance. The front setback is 25' and the rear setback is 48'5". There is only one variance needed. The rest of the setbacks are in compliance.

Correspondence: Letters from all three neighbors in favor of this request.

Audience Participation: None

Commissioner Lince asked if the new addition will not project any further than the existing footprint of the house. It projects towards the south towards the rear setback not towards the side setback. It is in line with the existing house.

Vice-Chairman Scavone complimented the architect on the plans and did a good job by not encroaching any further and making it more non-conforming. This is an existing non-conforming and they are staying in line with it. He is in favor of this.

Mr. Rayes stated that it is existing non-conforming and that was the way it was built it may have changed since the time it was built.

It was moved by Commissioner Lince , supported by Vice-Chairman Scavone, to approve the request for a .75' and 2.33' side yard setback variance for a 2nd story and rear addition due to the fact that they will not encroach any more than the existing non-conforming.

A roll call vote was taken.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Absent: None
Motion: Passed

Case No. 22-2021 – Paul Korzetz – 28624 Kimberly Lane

Re: THIELE'S ST. CLAIR ESTATES SUBDIVISION (L38, P19-20) LOT 12

Location: North of Martin Road, East of Little Mack

REQUEST: Request for a 6' rear setback variance for an addition. (*Zoning Ordinance 15.481, Schedule of Regulations*)

Mr. Shepherd stated that Chairman Bellestri recused himself from the meeting. The alternate will take his place. Vice-Chairman Scavone stepped in for this case.

Paul Korzetz, 28624 Kimberly Lane, he is here for a dimensional variance. So, the standard will be his practical difficulty. He handed pictures to the board. There are no houses in the back of the house. He does not have a deep enough lot. This was one of the last few houses built back in 1966. He said that there are three houses one on Michael St., his house and on Winkel. The lots are 105 feet deep.

Correspondence: There were four letters each signed by a neighbor in favor of this request.

Audience Participation: None

Commissioner Stellas stated if he was aware that the six houses behind him their lots are 50' x 100'. Petitioner's lot is 105' feet deep. He stated that all of the other lots vary in size on Winkel St. because the way the subdivision was cut. On Michael Ct. is a shorter street. His lot is in a wide angle. He has more front footage he would have more but it was the way they divided the subdivision up at that time. Commissioner Stellas stated that the average lot is 120' x 50' about 6,000 sq. feet and he has close to 9,500 sq. ft. He has been there for eight years.

Vice-Chairman Scavone commented that this lot is wide in the front narrow in the back. Average lot is 50' x 120'. He meets the other setbacks. It is because of the depth of the lot of 104 feet. If he was on an average lot, he would not be here. It is shallow and narrows to the back.

Commissioner Stellas stated that he feels that this is not a special or unique condition that could be worked on that does not decrease the useability of the property by not granting this variance and that in essence this is a self-created issue.

Commissioner Bertolo and Commissioner Budnick voted "no" and for the same reason as Commissioner Stellas stated.

It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Commissioner Stellas, to

approve the request for a 6' rear setback variance for an addition. This is a dimensional variance and he has an odd shape lot and very shallow. He meets all of the prongs.

A roll call vote was taken.

Ayes: Michno, Moffitt, Scavone

Nays: Stellas, Bertolo, Budnick, Lince

Absent: None

Motion: Failed

Vice-Chairman Scavone stated to the petitioner that he can appeal to the circuit or make changes.

Mr. Shepherd stated that the petitioner can appeal to the circuit court.

Case No. 23-2021– DeAnn Lukas for DAP Properties, LLC. – 25030 Jefferson

Re: LAKE ST CLAIR GARDENS SUB'N NO 1 PART OF LOTS 113, 114 & 115
DESC AS FOL; BEG AT SW COR LOT 113; TH ELY 31.37 FT; TH N'LY
76.5' TO A PT IN N LINE LOT 115, SD PT BEING 55.12 FT FROM NW
COR LOT 115; TH W'LY 55.12 FT TO NW COR LOT 115; TH S'LY 80.10 FT TO POB,
ALSO ALL OF LOTS 116 & 117 LIBER 10, PAGE 65

Location: South of Ten Mile Road, East of Jefferson

REQUEST: Request for variance to allow existing fence in lieu of concrete wall. (*Zoning Ordinance 15.508 Walls*)

DeAnn Lukas, 64 Woodland Shore Dr., Grosse Pte. Shores. She is the owner of the commercial property at 25030 Jefferson as well as the adjacent property at 22429 Lange. Her family has owned the property a little over 50 years. She is here to request a variance to allow a six-foot fence in lieu of the concrete wall. The concrete wall would completely block the use of the existing non-conforming garage. This garage was built in 1992 and she has the permit that was issued from the city at that time. It is an irregular shape piece of property. In 1992 when they built the garage it specially said in the permit documentation the ingress and egress would be from the point of the garage through the commercial lot onto Jefferson. The concrete wall would divide the residential property in two and by doing this they will no longer be able to use the non-conforming existing garage.

Correspondence: None

Audience Participation: None

Commissioner Lince wanted to know what raised the red flag on this. Mr. Rayes stated that she has a new rental tenant in that building. The petitioner stated that she has had many tenants. Two years she had a very short-term tenant and the wall came up and she was given a 3-year extension. Now she is required to have the wall.

Mr. Rayes stated this is a commercial property that abuts residential property to the east of her lot. It would be a separation between commercial and residential and every one in the city has to put up a concrete wall.

Vice-Chairman Scavone asked if there use to be a garage attached to the house. Did it have a pass through? The petitioner stated that there still is a garage attached to the house and it is in the back as well. From there they would have to go through the commercial lot to get out.

Vice-Chairman Scavone stated that at one time they had a driveway through lot. The little addition looks like it was a garage. When they purchased the property, it was like that. He said at one point it looks like someone blocked access to the yard. The issue here is the wall. If it is there only access to the back. Can they allow an opening in the wall so they have access? Mr. Rayes stated that she can.

Mr. Rayes stated that it appears that the garage is not built on the property that the house is on. It is on commercial property not on the residential lot. The permit states that she built the garage on the same property as the house but it is not it is on the commercial property. This is not permitted by ordinance. When they submitted their site plan it says that the garage is on the residential lot. When they gave her permit it was to build the garage on residential not commercial property. The information states 137' but the drawing for the permit says 158'. The permit and what they built is not the same. The information given to the city does not coincide with the facts as to why they gave them the permit. The drawing that was given is incorrect. She did not build according to the permit. The garage is not used for commercial. It appears that the information given was incorrect. Recommendation to table it until next month so he can take a look at it. We are not talking about inches they are talking about 20'.

Commissioner Michno asked that she stated that if they put a fence up will this allow the use of the garage. She stated to the board that the garage is not used. She said the garage that they don't use is the very small garage up to the house and closer to the house. The large 21' x 24' garage built in 1992 that was permitted and signed off by the city it is residential and the tenant uses it.

Commissioner Stellas stated that he thinks that this should be tabled. The garage in question is in the commercial area. The wall will go in front of the garage which will definitely block it off. He believes that someone better than the board should determine as to the validity of that thing.

Secretary Budnick asked Mr. Rayes in the future if they allowed the fence to remain if the commercial property was sold would the new owner be required to put up the wall at that time or is it only the use of the facility. Changing owners could trigger it. The motion would have to be worded such that could happen.

It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Commissioner Stellas, to table the request for variance to allow existing fence in lieu of concrete wall.

A roll call vote was taken.

Ayes: Michno, Stellas, Lince, Budnick, Scavone, Bellestri

Nays: Bertolo
Absent: None
Motion: Passed

Case No. 24-2021– Dr. Sheabra Simpson – 19718 Sussex

Re: GORDON ROCK SUB'N NO. 4 (L35, P18-19) ALL THAT PART OF THE W 18' OF LOT 84 ALL OF LOT 85, AND THE E 19.3' OF LOT 86, LYING S OF A LINE DESCRIBED AS: BEGINNING AT A POINT IN THE N LINE OF LOT 84, SAID POINT BEING 6' W OF THE NE CORNER OF LOT 84, AND ENDING AT A POINT S 71°17'29" W 200'

Location: North of Martin Road, East of I-94

REQUEST: Request for 15' rear yard variance for a new deck

Dr. Sheabra Simpson & Michael Hughes, 19718 Sussex, SCS, that she would like to extend the existing deck. It is an odd shape lot at the end of the cul-de-sac. It does not allow much in the yard. No room to entertain. Only asking for 12'. Mr. Hughes stated that variance would allow them to entertain and to be able enjoy their back yard.

Correspondence: None

Audience Participation: None

Commissioner Lince asked Mr. Rayes if this is existing non-conforming. Mr. Rayes stated it is not but she lives on the cul-de-sac at the end of the block and that if her house was in line with the neighboring homes, she would not need the variance. Her house is pushed back about 20'.

Secretary Budnick asked about the steps coming out in the back is it considered in with the setback. Mr. Rayes stated that 25' is required because of the attached garage instead of 35'. Steps in the center of the deck in the rear are not allowed. The steps are allowed on the side of both ends of the deck. This would encroach into the 15'. Because it is multiple steps not just one. She stated that she can modify it.

Vice-Chairman Scavone asked the petitioner that on the app that they want to build a 12' x 32' then a letter stating that the deck is 8' only add 4'. She said that the deck that drops down will be 12' x 12'.

Vice-Chairman Scavone asked if they went to the other direction, she would not need a variance. She explained why she cannot put it on the side. She wouldn't be able to exit from her house. Mr. Rayes stated to Vice-Chairman Scavone that they are not allowed to have an accessory structure on the side yard.

Commissioner Stellas asked when did they moved in original. She stated that the house was built and she is the original owner in 2002. He stated that the fact that they been there a few

years and does this deck become a necessity to live? She explained why she would like the variance for the deck.

Commissioner Bertolo asked Mr. Rayes if she did a cement patio will she would need a variance. Mr. Rayes stated that it would not make practical sense to have access without building the steps. If she built a stair case off of the deck, she would still a variance to get downstairs. Mr. Rayes stated that for a cement patio on the grade she would not need a variance.

Mr. Rayes asked the petitioner if the dimension is to the white fence line or the property line. The petitioner stated to the white fence. She has two feet beyond that. Mr. Rayes stated that the drawings don't identify the 2 feet behind the white fence. So, she would be closer to the 25' setback.

Mr. Shepherd reminded the board that this is a non-use variance so the standard use is practical difficulty. The back wall of the garage is in line with their house.

Mr. Rayes stated that she would need 13' variance.

Vice-Chairman Scavone voted "nay" to be consistent that the board turned down a variance for 6' tonight on a very similar lot a short lot that had the same depth as this one and he thinks that it can be designed in a different way.

Commissioner Stellas voted "nay" stating that he feels that this does not meet the standard for practical difficulty and that this is self-created. There is not special unique conditions that exist particularly to this land that would make this deck a necessity and by not granting this it would not mean that the house is unlivable.

It was moved by Commissioner Lince, supported by Secretary Budnick, to approve the request for 13' rear yard variance for a new deck due to the fact of the odd shape lot, end of the cul-de-sac and it is a short lot only 104 ft.

A roll call vote was taken.

Ayes: Lince, Budnick, Bertolo, Bellestri

Nays: Michno, Stellas, Scavone

Absent: None

Motion: Passed

Case No. 25-2021– The Kroger Co. of Michigan – 22801 Harper

Re: ASSESSOR'S PLAT NO. 5 (L14, P20-21) LOTS 4-6 EXC THE S 418.5'; ALSO HARPER AVENUE SUBDIVISION (L8, P51), LOTS 11-25 AND LOTS 29-44; ALL TOGETHER WITH ALL ADJ VAC STREETS AND ALLEYS EXC THAT PART TAKEN FOR HARPER AVE

Location: South of 9 Mile Rd, West of Harper

REQUEST: Petition to request for variance to allow the outdoor sale of seasonal products.
(Zoning Ordinance 15.263, Sec 35.37 (1), General Requirements)

Keith Goy, 22801 Harper, manager of the Kroger store and Nine Mile and Harper. They want to sell outdoor products located on the porch in front of the store. It would not be permanent. There are pictures in the packet. This would not impede foot traffic. They will not block the fire lane.

Correspondence: None

Audience Participation: None

He would like to have this throughout the year for the holidays.

Secretary Budnick asking if this would be like the 6 months for three years.

Mr. Rayes stated that he did not ask for more than one year. He is new to the process they get one six consecutive months per year.

Secretary Budnick explained the process to the petitioner. He would consider doing a one year. Mr. Rayes recommend one year because this is the first year.

Vice-Chairman Scavone agreed with Secretary Budnick. We have had problems in the pass with the Marter Kroger Store and the Nine Mile Kroger store. They have a lot more room. The layout is good. It will not force the pedestrians into traffic. They will not block the fire lane.

Commissioner Michno stated to Mr. Goy that the plans do not match what is set up at the store. Explaining the plans to Commissioner Michno. At the south east corner of the building there are bags of rocks and dirt out. Mr. Rayes stated that if it is bagged material, it can only be with the other products. They have to tell us all of stuff that they are putting outside and put it in a plan. Mr. Goy stated that they can scale things up. If there are no complaints, they can ask for additional time next year. Mr. Rayes asked Mr. Goy as to why the bagged rocks and dirt are located over there. Mr. Goy stated that it helps people to drive their car over there to pick up those products. It is a very low traffic area. He would like to keep them safe when loading their vehicle.

Commissioner Michno stated that they can put that area in the plans. Asked Mr. Rayes if the board can approve a second area. He stated that it has to be in the motion.

Chairman Bellestri stated from the glass to the cement is about 20 feet. There are two lanes.

It was moved by Secretary Budnick, supported by Vice-Chairman Scavone, to approve the request for variance to allow the outdoor sale of seasonal products in the patio zone as requested. And to allow a secondary area on the southeast corner of the building as stated at tonight's meeting, and not to encroach into foot traffic pushing them out into car traffic. It would be May 5th to November 6th only for the 2021 season. And a site plan that identifies where and what he actually has.

A roll call vote was taken.

Ayes: Budnick, Scavone, Stellas, Lince, Michno, Bellestri

Nays: Bertolo

Absent: None

Motion: Passed

Other Business:

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM APRIL 1, 2021 ZBA MEETING

Page 5 of 19, paragraph 4, line 1 - Reads *“Vice-Chairman Scavone stated that the practical difficulty here is they have granted many more than a couple feet based on Lake St. Clair and the high water.”*

It should read *“Vice-Chairman Scavone stated that the practical difficulty here is that they have granted many variances of a couple feet.”*

Page 5 - The motion reads: *“It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Vice-Chairman Scavone, to approve the request for a five-foot total height variance for a new house.”*

It should read: *“It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Vice-Chairman Scavone, to approve the request for a two-foot total height variance for a new house”*

Page 7 of 19 last paragraph, it reads: *“Commissioner Michno stated to the petitioners to maintain those lots carefully.”* **It should read:** *“Commissioner Michno stated to the petitioners to maintain those locks carefully.”*

Page 7 of 19, The motion at the end of the page reads - *“It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Secretary Budnick, to approve the request for a permanent use variance to allow a mobile imaging unit within an O-1 Office District for the period of one year and this will be for three days a week Friday, Saturday and Sunday and to maintain those lots.”*

It should read - *It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Secretary Budnick, to approve the request for a use variance to allow a mobile imaging unit within an O-1 Office District for the period of one year and this will be for three days a week Friday, Saturday and Sunday and to maintain those locks.”*

Page 12 of 19, second paragraph, it reads: *“A lot of the houses on Jefferson do not meet that.”* **It should read:** *“Many of the houses on Jefferson do not meet that.”*

Page 12 of 19, Motion read: *It was moved by Vice-Chairman Scavone, supported by Secretary Budnick, to deny the request for one-foot side yard setback variances on the north and south sides of property for a second story balcony on a new house.”*

It should read: *“It was moved by Vice-Chairman Scavone, supported by Secretary Budnick, to deny the request for one-foot side yard setback variance because the petitioner withdrew the request.”*

Page 19 of 19, 4th paragraph read: *“Vice-Chairman Scavone stated he is talking about Switchulis house a couple months ago he made the motion but why he made the motion that house it’s not the side, not the front and not the rear setback it was all about the garage in the front. The last three or four homes that were built on this street that they approved all had the same footprint as this house maybe not as long. The garage in the front and side entry garage. It was more about conformity with the neighborhood.”*

It should read: *“Vice-Chairman Scavone stated he is talking about Switchulis house a couple months ago he made the motion but why he made the motion that house it was all about the garage in the front. The last three or four homes that were built on this street that they approved all had the similar footprint as this house. The garage in the front with a side entry garage. Vice-Chairman Scavone felt it was conforming with many of the neighboring newer homes on the street.”*

It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Commissioner Bertolo, to approve the April 1, 2021, ZBA meeting minutes as amended.

**Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: None
Motion: Passed**

Audience participation: None

Adjournment:

It was moved by Commissioner Michno, supported by Commissioner Bertolo, to adjourn the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

**Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: None
Motion: Passed**