



City of Ann Arbor

Formal Minutes

Zoning Board of Appeals

301 E. Huron St.
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
[http://a2gov.legistar.com/
Calendar.aspx](http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx)

Wednesday, January 27, 2016

6:00 PM

Larcom City Hall, 301 E Huron St, Second
Floor, City Council chambers

A **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Milshteyn called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

B **ROLL CALL**

Milshteyn called the roll.

Staff Present: Matt Kowalski, Jon Barrett

Present: 8 - Alex Milshteyn, Nickolas Buonodono, Heather Lewis,
David DeVarti, Kirk Westphal, Michael Dobmeier, Michael
B. Daniel, and VACANT POSITION 1

Absent: 1 - Candice Briere

C **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Moved by Westphal, seconded by Dobmeier, that the Agenda be
Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Chair declared the
motion carried.**

D **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

[16-0129](#) December 16, 2015 ZBA Meeting Minutes with Live Links

**Moved by Buonodono, seconded by Westphal, that the Minutes be
Approved by the Board and forwarded to the City Council. On a
voice vote, the Chair declared the motion carried.**

E **APPEALS AND HEARINGS**

Public Hearings: Individuals may speak for three minutes. Please state your name and address for the record.

Comments about a proposed project are most constructive when they relate to: (1) City Code requirements, or (2) additional information about the area around the petitioner's property and the extent to which a proposed project may positively or negatively affect the area.

E-1 **16-0130** ZBA15-026; 211 West Davis
Maven Development is requesting three setback variances (R1C, Section 5:28):

1. A variance of 20 feet to allow a 5 foot front setback; 25 feet is required.
2. A variance of 3 feet 7 inches to allow a 1 foot 5 inch front setback; 5 feet is required.
3. A variance of 25 feet to allow a 5 foot rear setback; 30 feet is required.

Matt Kowalski presented the following staff report:

UPDATE

This request was postponed at the December 16, 2015 ZBA meeting in order for the petitioner to address concerns expressed by Board members regarding the front setback distance request. The petitioner responded by increasing the proposed setback from 1 foot 4 inches to 5 feet.

SUMMARY

Dan Williams (Maven Development) is requesting 3 variances from Chapter 55 (Zoning) Section 5:28 (R1C) in order to re-construct an existing non-conforming structure. The structure will be a single-family dwelling upon completion.

- 1) *Front yard setback variance of 20 feet to allow a 5 foot front setback along West Davis.*
- 2) *Side yard setback (west) variance of 3 feet 7 inches to allow a 1 foot 5 inch side setback.*
- 3) *Rear yard setback variance of 25 feet to allow a 5 foot rear setback.*

DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION

The subject 3,840 square foot building is zoned R4C, however single-family structures in the R4C zoning district are subject to the R1C zoning standards (Chapter 55, Section 5:10.8(2) (c). The subject parcel is nonconforming for lot area, subject parcel is 4,965 square feet and the

minimum conforming parcel size for R1C is 7,200 square feet. The building was built in approximately 1910 and is currently vacant. The first historical records dated 1925 indicate that the building was used for a garage to store 20 cars. Other uses after that included car storage and limited warehousing. All documented uses of the building were not permitted uses within the R1C (or R4C) residential zoning district.

The petitioner intends to use this property as a single-family home, which is a conforming use in the R4C District. In order to use the property as single-family, the petitioner would like to re-construct the majority of the existing building. The building would be re-constructed on almost the exact same footprint as the existing building with the exception of the rear and front walls.

The rear wall is currently 1 foot four inches inside the property line and will be moved to 5 feet from the rear property line. The front wall is on the property line and will be moved 1 foot four inches inside the front property line.

A garage and open court yard will be incorporated into the front of the building. The garage will provide two off-street parking spaces; one parking space is required by City Code. The remaining area of the building, approximately 2,400 square feet will be converted to a home including a kitchen, living area, two bedrooms and two bathrooms.

The existing single-story building is non-conforming for three of the required four setbacks as the building occupies the majority of the square-shaped parcel. There is currently zero setback for the front (West Davis) and one foot five inch setback for the west side and one foot four inch setback for the rear. At this point, it has not been determined the exact extent of what will be replaced, however it has been determined that enough of the structure will be replaced that it will exceed the changes permitted under Chapter 55, Section 5:87 (Structure non-conformance). As such, the petitioner is required to seek variances in order to re-construct the building with a slightly modified footprint.

Standards for Approval - Variance

The Zoning Board of Appeals has all the power granted by State law and by Section 5:99, Application of the Variance Power from the City of Ann Arbor Zoning Ordinance. The following criteria shall apply:

- (a). That the practical difficulties are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the person requesting the variance, and result from conditions*

which do not exist generally throughout the City.

The structure is legal non-conforming and was constructed in 1910 before zoning regulations were adopted. It had been historically used as a garage and storage building. The structure was constructed occupying the majority of the parcel with little or no minimum setbacks to the property line. The subject parcel is non-conforming for lot size (4,965 square feet, minimum R4C lot size is 8,500 square feet) and is a relatively shallow (65 feet deep) square shape.

(b). That the practical difficulties which will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.

The existing structure is in need of restoration and replacement of many structural elements. Any re-use of the building will likely require extensive restoration and ZBA permission. The small size and shallow depth shape, limit the buildable area of the parcel.

If the variances are not granted, the petitioner could try and repair and re-use the existing walls, but would be limited to a replacement value of less than 75% of the appraised value of the structure. Any re-use of the building for a non-conforming use would require ZBA approval to allow re-establishment of a non-conforming use.

(c). That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this Chapter, the individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.

Approval of the variances will result in the re-construction of an existing non-conforming structure. The structure was constructed in 1910 before any zoning standards were established and has been an established part of the neighborhood street presence since that time. The proposed single-family use is a conforming use in the R4C district and should be less detrimental to surrounding properties than the previous non-conforming uses.

(d). That the conditions and circumstances on which the variance request is based shall not be a self imposed hardship or practical difficulty.

The existing building is a legal non-conforming structure and was constructed before zoning standards were established. The existing single-story building is non-conforming for all required setbacks, except the east side, as the building occupies the majority of the parcel. The building could be demolished and a new single-family home could be constructed on the parcel.

(e). A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure.

The variances are being requested in order to re-construct a non-conforming structure. The structure was reduced in size slightly, to reduce the front and rear variances that are being requested. The petitioner is planning on re-using historical structural elements which necessitate a similar size to the original structure.

QUESTIONS BY BOARD TO STAFF:

Lewis asked if the plans showed 5 or 6 six feet.

Kowalski said it was 5 feet.

DeVarti asked if it was a requirement for the applicant to install a sidewalk along the front of the building.

Kowalski said he wasn't sure it was a requirement for a single-family house.

DeVarti said City Council has a policy to try to infill sidewalks and it was an issue for him.

Kowalski said if it is a requirement, it would be noted at the time of building permit submittal and the applicant would be required to install sidewalks at that time.

Westphal asked why this parcel was not zoned industrial or something more fitting for the use, and now is a nonconforming lot zoned R4C.

Kowalski said he didn't know, but believed it went back to the 1960s. He said his research on the parcel showed that historically the use has been residential and since the adjacent uses are all residential the feeling would have been to zone it R4C, probably with the thought that when the car garage use goes away, it would have to become a single-family house

which is consistent with the neighborhood.

Westphal asked if there was any mention in the Master Plan to maintain this as an industrial use.

Kowalski said no.

Westphal said it would be reasonable to say that it was intended to become more compatible with the neighborhood when the structure reaches its end of life, something more fitting with the neighborhood would replace it.

Kowalski said he believed the intent was for it to become more similar to the uses around it.

PRESENTATION BY PETITIONER:

Dan Williams, Maven Development, 544 Detroit Street, Ann Arbor, owner and applicant was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

DeVarti enquired about the project being built next door.

Lewis commented that at the previous meeting there was a lot of discussion about the bow-string trusses; however, the plans did not include much detail about them.

Williams said their main concern is to be able to preserve the bow-string trusses, adding that their Architect Marc Rueter has explained they are a significant feature of their time period so they have designed this project around their preservation and incorporation.

Lewis asked about the conceptual plans showing large chunks cut out.

Williams said the presented plans were not a guarantee that they would add a rear deck, but were intended to present how a loft space could be used in a downtown setting. He said since you don't have a large backyard, Rueter was trying to create active space such as a deck or front patio. He said the conceptual plans are floor plans showing the loft space above, and the incorporation of the bow-string trusses.

Lewis said the plans were confusing as to the location of trusses.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Noting no public speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

LIST OF EXHIBITS PRESENTED:

Carl and Victoria Hueter, 817 S Seventh, Ann Arbor; Opposed

Moved by DeVarti, seconded by Buonodono, in Petition ZBA15 026; 211 West Davis Street, Variance: Based on the following findings of fact and in accordance with the established standards for approval, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby GRANTS the following variances from Chapter 55, Section 5:28 (R1C):

- 1) Front yard setback variance of 20 to allow a 5 foot front setback along West Davis.**
- 2) Side yard setback (west) variance of 3 feet 7 inches to allow a 1 foot 5 inch side setback.**
- 3) Rear yard setback variance of 25 feet to allow a 5 foot rear setback.**

(a). That the practical difficulties are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the person requesting the variance, and result from conditions which do not exist generally throughout the City.

(b). That the practical difficulties which will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.

(c). That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this Chapter, the individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.

(d). That the conditions and circumstances on which the variance request is based shall not be a self imposed hardship or practical difficulty.

(e). A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The members of the Board took into consideration the presented petition

and discussed the matter.

Moved by DeVarti, seconded by Buonodono, to postpone taking action until the next meeting.

On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Item Postponed.

Yeas: 8 - Chair Milshteyn, Buonodono, Lewis, DeVarti, Councilmember Westphal, Dobmeier, Daniel, and POSITION 1

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Briere

E-2 **16-0131**

ZBA15-028; 1901 Austin Avenue

Thomas and Margaret Brennan are requesting three variances from Chapter 55 (Zoning), Section 5:27 (R1B, Single-Family):

1. A front setback (Oak Lane) variance of 9.2 feet for a requested front setback of 20.8 feet; 30 feet is required.
2. A front setback (Austin Avenue) variance of 2 feet for a requested front setback of 28 feet; 30 feet is required.
3. A rear setback variance of 5.9 feet for a requested rear setback of 34.1 feet; 40 feet is required.

Matt Kowalski presented the following staff report:

SUMMARY

Thomas S. and Margaret A. Brennan are requesting 3 variances from Chapter 55 (Zoning):

1. *A variance from Section 5:27 (R1B Single-Family) of 9 feet 3 inches from the required front setback of 30 feet.*
2. *A variance from Section 5:27 (R1B Single-Family) of 2 feet from the required front setback of 30 feet.*
3. *A variance from Section 5:27 (R1B Single-Family) of 5 feet 10 inches from the required rear setback 40 feet.*

DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION

The subject parcel is an 11,325 square foot corner lot (Austin Avenue and Oak Lane) and zoned R1B (Single-family). The existing

single-family home was built in 1954 and is non-conforming for front setbacks along Austin Ave and Oak Lane and the rear setback.

The request is discussed in detail below:

The petitioner is proposing to demolish the existing home and build a new single-family residence using the existing foundation for a 2,750 square foot Tudor style home. The current zoning requirements were established after the home was built.

If the variance is granted, the applicant will be required to submit a building permit application for the demolition of the existing structure and construction of the new house.

Standards for Approval - Variance

The Zoning Board of Appeals has all the power granted by State law and by Section 5:99, Application of the Variance Power from the City of Ann Arbor Zoning Ordinance. The following criteria shall apply:

(a). That the alleged hardships or practical difficulties, or both, are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the person requesting the variance, and result from conditions which do not exist generally throughout the City.

Front Setback Variances: The existing average setback along Austin Avenue is approximately 17 feet. The next door neighbor has a setback of approximately 5 feet. The planned setback on Austin Avenue is 28 feet. Additionally, there is a variance request along Oak Lane which is a narrow street adjacent to the subject property which further restricts the property with a double frontage corner lot.

Rear setback variance: A variance request of 5'10" at the rear of the property is required as the owners intend to use the existing foundation and its current location.

(b). That the alleged hardships or practical difficulties, or both, which will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.

If the variances are not granted the property owners will have a reduced building envelope and the existing foundation would not be able to be re-used for the new house. A reduced square footage structure may not

be in harmony with the rest of the neighborhood.

(c). That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this Chapter, the individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.

The petitioner is proposing to re-use the existing foundation for a new house. The new building will not be any closer to adjacent houses than the existing house. Although the new house will be two stories high compared to the single story existing house, a two story house is more consistent with the neighborhood character. If the variances are not granted, a new smaller home could be constructed with a new foundation. By granting the variances requested the owners can utilize the existing foundation, therefore eliminating the need to pour a new basement, walls and eliminating waste to the landfill. Additionally, according to the owners, the existing home has mold in the ceiling system.

(d). That the conditions and circumstances on which the variance request is based shall not be a self imposed hardship or practical difficulty.

The home was originally built in 1954 prior to the existing zoning regulations which were established in the 1960's, thus creating a practical hardship that was not self imposed.

(e). A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure

If the three variances are granted the impact will be minimal as the owners will be using the existing foundation and a new footprint will not be created, thus eliminating any new impervious surface. The proposed Tudor style will be in harmony with the existing neighborhood.

QUESTIONS BY BOARD TO STAFF:

Westphal asked if the amount of living space was changing from the existing.

Kowalski said the proposed house would be 2,700 square feet.

Westphal asked if the garage area was being changed to living space.

Kowalski said he didn't believe so, because they would still have a garage.

PRESENTATION BY PETITIONER:

Tom and Peggy Brennan, 1901 Austin Avenue, Ann Arbor, owners and applicants were available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Brennan said the first floor foot print would be smaller than the existing one because of the back porch that they would be moving backwards to bring it into conformance. He said they would be moving the garage from its current location to Oak Lane, adding that all of their work is being done on a sustainability basis and they are trying to get rid of a long driveway and make a shorter driveway onto Oak Lane. He explained that they are trying to save as much of the existing basement, foundation, and concrete floor, as they can.

Dobmeier asked if the jut out was the sunroom.

Brennan said yes.

Lewis asked if they would be reducing the amount of square footage on the first floor.

Brennan said yes.

DeVarti said he was impressed about the applicant's narrative on reaching out to the neighbors and inviting them over to share the plans. He asked if they had provided feedback.

Brennan said they have been in communication from the beginning and all the neighbors are pleased that the architectural style is a 1 ½ story Tudor-cottage style that would be coming into alignment. He explained that the man who had built the house was a famous bio-chemical engineer who had lived in the house for over 60 years and they showed him the plans of the new proposed house and he said it was a much better improvement over what was currently there. He said they are used to working with neighbors and they are committed to making the community better and he is standing here tonight personally because he wants to be accountable for doing this as well as to the community around them.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Wayne Colquitt, 1908 Austin, Ann Arbor, stated he wanted to support the efforts of the Brennans and expressed how kind it was for them to invite all the neighbors to see pictures of their plans. He said the new place will fit better into the neighborhood and he supported the request.

Noting no other public speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

LIST OF EXHIBITS PRESENTED:

Inge and David Miller, 1125 Fair Oaks Parkway, Ann Arbor; Support Moved by Westphal, seconded by DeVarti, in Petition ZBA15 028; 1901 Austin Avenue, Variance: Based on the following findings of fact and in accordance with the established standards for approval, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby GRANTS the following variances from Chapter 55, Section 5:27 (R1B):

1. **A variance from Section 5:27 (R1B Single-Family) of 9 feet 3 inches from the required front setback of 30 feet.**
2. **A variance from Section 5:27 (R1B Single-Family) of 2 feet from the required front setback of 30 feet.**
3. **A variance from Section 5:27 (R1B Single-Family) of 5 feet 10 inches from the required rear setback 40 feet.**

(a). That the practical difficulties are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the person requesting the variance, and result from conditions which do not exist generally throughout the City.

(b). That the practical difficulties which will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.

(c). That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this Chapter, the individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.

(d). That the conditions and circumstances on which the variance request is based shall not be a self imposed hardship or practical difficulty.

(e). A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The members of the Board took into consideration the presented petition and discussed the matter.

On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Variances Granted.

Yeas: 8 - Chair Milshteyn, Buonodono, Lewis, DeVarti, Councilmember Westphal, Dobmeier, Daniel, and POSITION 1

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Briere

E-3 [16-0132](#)

ZBA16-001; 730 Spring Street

Dawn Zuber is requesting a front yard setback variance from Chapter 55, Section 5:57 of 2.5 feet to allow a 16.8 feet front setback, 19.3 feet is required. (Averaged Front Setback)

Matt Kowalski presented the following staff report:

SUMMARY

Dawn Zuber, is requesting a variance from Chapter 55 (Zoning), a variance from Section 5:57 (R2A Two-Family) of 2 feet 6 inches from the averaged front setback of 19 feet 4 inches.

DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION

The subject parcel is 730 Spring Street, the lot is 8,581 square foot and is a legally established parcel and zoned R2A (Two-family). The existing single-family home was built in 1925 and is 840 square. The current porch has a setback of 18 feet 10 inches. This is a buildable lot according to the zoning code.

The request is discussed in detail below:

The petitioner is proposing to tear down the existing front porch and build a new front porch that is deeper and wider than the current porch. The new porch will measure 8 feet by 23 feet 8 inches. The home is currently

undergoing an extensive renovation.

If the variance is granted, the applicant will be required to submit a building permit application for the proposed changes and alterations to the existing structure.

Standards for Approval - Variance

The Zoning Board of Appeals has all the power granted by State law and by Section 5:99, Application of the Variance Power from the City of Ann Arbor Zoning Ordinance. The following criteria shall apply:

(a). That the alleged hardships or practical difficulties, or both, are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the person requesting the variance, and result from conditions which do not exist generally throughout the City.

The averaged setback would require a front porch that would be less than 6' in depth. The applicant states that a porch of this required depth would be out of character for the neighborhood as other properties in the vicinity have porches that are closer to the right of way. The house was constructed before zoning standards were established.

(b). That the alleged hardships or practical difficulties, or both, which will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.

The proposed porch could be constructed without a variance; however, the current setback requirement of 18 feet 10 inches would restrict the planned renovations and alterations to the home.

(c). That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this Chapter, the individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.

Although structures within 100 feet have an average setback of 19 feet 4 inches the surrounding neighborhood is a unique mix of structures with varying setbacks, some with setbacks less than the setback requested and some with greater setbacks. The addition of a new covered porch is a positive aesthetic addition to the house and would be in character to the proposed renovations. The front porch is consistent with many structures

in the surrounding neighborhood.

(d). That the conditions and circumstances on which the variance request is based shall not be a self imposed hardship or practical difficulty.

The applicant states that the home was built in 1925 when the current zoning regulations were not in place. The current zoning requirements put the home in a non-conforming status.

(e). A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure

A variance of 2 feet 6 inches from an averaged setback of 19 feet 4 inches is being requested in order construct a new porch while preserving the character of the dwelling along with the existing neighborhood. The depth of the proposed porch will be 8 feet which is consistent with other porches in the neighborhood.

QUESTIONS BY BOARD TO STAFF:

None

PRESENTATION BY PETITIONER:

Dawn Zuber, 44685 Fenwick Drive, Canton, Architect and applicant was available to respond to the Commission's enquiries.

Zuber said they would like to come out a bit further and have a setback of 16 feet 10 inches, adding that the neighbors have traditional front porches that are useable and they would like to make this porch useable also.

DeVarti asked about the renovation plans.

Zuber explained that the whole existing room would be removed and they would be building up with a steeper pitch, a little thicker second floor structure because there is no second floor structure, just an attic.

DeVarti asked if a new basement would be added under the new rear addition, if it would be within setbacks.

Zuber said yes, noting that a bedroom would be added, and that they had set it in somewhat on the side to be within the side yard setbacks. She

said they have no rear yard setback issues.

Milshteyn asked about the plans that showed the address to be 703, asking if that was intended to be 730 Spring Street.

Zuber said, yes, that it was an oversight on her part.

PUBLIC HEARING:

John Swerdlow, 729 Spring Street, Ann Arbor, said he was in support of the project, adding that porches are all throughout the Water Hill neighborhood and he felt this proposed porch would be a great addition to the neighborhood. He said it was perfect that the chain link fence had come down in preparation for the front porch.

Noting no other public speakers, the Chair closed the public hearing.

LIST OF EXHIBITS PRESENTED:

Darren McKinnon, 809 Daniel Street, Ann Arbor; Support

Moved by Dobmeier, seconded by Buonodono, in Petition ZBA16-001; 730 Spring Street, Variance: Based on the following findings of fact and in accordance with the established standards for approval, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby GRANTS the following variance from Chapter 55 (Zoning), a variance from Section 5:57 (R2A Two-Family) of 2 feet 6 inches from the averaged front setback of 19 feet 4 inches.

(a). That the practical difficulties are exceptional and peculiar to the property of the person requesting the variance, and result from conditions which do not exist generally throughout the City.

(b). That the practical difficulties which will result from a failure to grant the variance, include substantially more than mere inconvenience, inability to attain a higher financial return, or both.

(c). That allowing the variance will result in substantial justice being done, considering the public benefits intended to be secured by this Chapter, the individual hardships that will be suffered by a failure of the Board to grant a variance, and the rights of others whose property would be affected by the allowance of the variance.

(d). That the conditions and circumstances on which the variance

request is based shall not be a self imposed hardship or practical difficulty.

(e). A variance approved shall be the minimum variance that will make possible a reasonable use of the land or structure

BOARD DISCUSSION:

The members of the Board took into consideration the presented petition and discussed the matter.

On a voice vote, the vote was as follows with the Chair declaring the motion carried.

Variances Granted.

Yeas: 8 - Chair Milshteyn, Buonodono, Lewis, DeVarti, Councilmember Westphal, Dobmeier, Daniel, and POSITION 1

Nays: 0

Absent: 1 - Briere

F UNFINISHED BUSINESS

G NEW BUSINESS

H REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

16-0133 Various Correspondences to the ZBA

Received and Filed

I PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)

(Please state your name and address for the record and sign in.)

J ADJOURNMENT

Moved by DeVarti, seconded by Buonodono, to adjourn the meeting at 7:05 p.m. On a voice vote, the meeting was unanimously adjourned.

Community Television Network Channel 16 live televised public meetings are also available to watch live online from CTN's website, www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>).

Live Web streaming is one more way, in addition to these listed below, to stay in touch with Ann Arbor City Council and board and commission actions and deliberations.

- Video on Demand: Replay public meetings at your convenience online at www.a2gov.org/government/city_administration/communicationsoffice/ctn/Pages/VideoOnDemand.aspx
- Cable: Watch CTN Channel 16 public meeting programming via Comcast Cable channel 16.

The complete record of this meeting is available in video format at www.a2gov.org/ctn, on "The Meeting Place" page (<http://www.a2gov.org/livemeetings>), or is available for a nominal fee by contacting CTN at (734) 794-6150.

Alex Milshteyn
Chairperson of the Zoning Board of Appeals

Mia Gale
Recording Secretary