



# City of Ann Arbor

301 E. Huron St.  
Ann Arbor, MI 48104  
<http://a2gov.legistar.com/Calendar.aspx>

## Meeting Minutes Zoning Board of Appeals

---

Wednesday, October 23, 2013

6:00 PM

City Hall, 301 E. Huron Street, 2nd Flr.

---

### A CALL TO ORDER

*Vice Chair Zielak called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.*

### B ROLL CALL

*Vice Chair Zielak called the roll.*

**Present:** 7 - Candice Briere, Wendy Carman, Perry Zielak, Ben Carlisle, Sally Petersen, Nickolas Buonodono, and Evan Nichols

**Absent:** 2 - Alex Milshteyn, and Heather Lewis

### C APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**A motion was made by Councilmember Petersen, seconded by C. Briere, that the Agenda be Approved as presented. On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.**

### D APPROVAL OF MINUTES

[13-1314](#)

Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Minutes of August 28, 2013

**A motion was made by Nichols, seconded by Buonodono, that the Minutes be Approved by the Board and forwarded to the City Council. On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.**

### E APPEALS AND HEARINGS

E-1 [13-1315](#)

ZBA13-020; 911 Sunnyside Blvd  
Joseph Primeau is requesting one variance from Chapter 55(Zoning) Section 5:57 (Averaging an Existing front setback line), of 5 feet 9 inches for expansion of an existing residential structure into the front setback; 27 feet 9 inches is required (Averaged Front Setback).

*Matt Kowalski presented the following staff report.*

**SUMMARY:**

*Joseph Primeau is requesting one variance from Chapter 55(Zoning) Section 5:57 (Averaging an Existing front setback line), of 5 feet 9 inches for expansion of an existing residential structure into the front setback; 27 feet 9 inches is required (Averaged Front Setback).*

*DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION:*

*The subject parcel contains a 1,700 square foot, single-family dwelling constructed in 1930. The parcel is zoned R1D (Single-Family) and is located on Sunnyside Boulevard, just west of South Seventh Street. The existing setback measures 32 feet to the main house and 22 feet to the existing uncovered porch. The porch measures 5 feet by 9 feet 2 inches or approximately 50 square feet. The parcel is conforming for lot area; the required minimum lot area for R1D is 5,000 square feet and the parcel is 6,750 square feet.*

*The petitioner is proposing to cover the 50 square foot front porch which faces Sunnyside. There will be no increased size and the porch will not be enclosed. The front setback to the porch will remain 22 feet. The porch roof addition will match the rooflines of the structure and will be supported by columns.*

*Although the required front setback is 25 feet for the R1D zoning district, the averaged front setback at this location results in a required front setback of 27 feet 9 inches. The total encroachment of the house after the porch roof addition will remain at 5 feet 9 inches.*

*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 subject parcel is a conforming lot in the R1D Zoning District (required is a minimum lot size of 5,000 square feet; parcel is 6,750 square feet). The existing house was built in the 1930's before current zoning setbacks. The house, including the uncovered porch, was built 22 feet from the front property line. The R1D required setback is 25 feet; however the averaging of adjacent parcels adjusts the setback to 27 feet 9 inches. The subject parcel is a rectangular lot and is 50 feet wide at the front property line.*

*(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 variance is being requested in order to cover an existing front porch. If the variance is not granted, the existing porch can continue to be used and/or a ground level patio could be built, but not covered in the same location.*

*(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.*

*If the variance is approved, the structure will be consistent with a number of houses in the neighborhood. Although covering the existing porch does require a variance, it will not extend farther into the averaged front setback, it is minimal in total size (50 sq ft), and will not be enclosed. This should minimize the impact to the surrounding neighborhood. The porch will not be extended any closer to the side property line or*

*adjacent neighbors.*

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

*The house was built in the 1930's before current zoning standards were established. The house, including the front porch, was built 22 feet from the front property line and does not currently comply with 25 foot front setback of the R1D district, or the averaged front setback based on neighboring properties of 27 feet 9 inches.*

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

*The variance, if approved, will permit construction of a covering over an existing front porch within the average front setback. The unenclosed porch will have columns supporting it, but should have a minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood. A covered front porch would be consistent with some porches in the neighborhood.*

*Although an uncovered front patio could be built without the need for a variance, the size and encroachment of the covered front porch is minimal.*

#### **QUESTIONS BY BOARD TO STAFF:**

*Carman questioned the existing setback measurement, noting discrepancies in the application with the staff report.*

*Kowalski agreed that there was a typographical error in the Description which changed the existing setback to 30.2 and thereby making the necessary variance request of 7 feet 9 inches into the front setback.*

#### **PRESENTATION BY PETITIONER:**

*Joseph Primeau, 911 Sunnyside Boulevard, property owner, was present and explained the application, and verifying the setback and submitted porch plans.*

#### **PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Noting no public speakers the Vice Chair declared the public hearing closed.*

#### **LIST OF EXHIBITS PRESENTED:**

*Vice Chair Zielak noted that the Board had received the following letters in support of the request:*

*Sally Oey, 922 Pauline Boulevard, Ann Arbor.*

**Motion made by Carman, Seconded by C. Briere, in Petition ZBA13-020; 911 Sunnyside Boulevard, that the Zoning Board of Appeals grant a variance of 7 feet, 9 inches, from the required averaged setback of 27 feet, 9 inches, arising from Chapter 55, Section 5:57 (Averaging Existing Front Setback), to allow construction of a roof and support columns and railings, over a 50 square foot front porch, where the porch itself will not be enclosed, per submitted plans, and based on the following findings of facts:**

- a) Given the safety concerns with the existing problems of the porch and with people falling off the existing porch.**
- b) The variance, will result in substantial justice being done.**

- c) The circumstances of the variance request are not self-imposed.
- d) The variance request is the minimum necessary to achieve reasonable use of the front porch.

*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 Vice Chair declaring the motion carried. Approved 7-0. Variance Granted.**

**Yeas:** 7 - Briere, Carman, Zielak, Carlisle, Councilmember Petersen, Buonodono, and Nichols

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Milshteyn, and Lewis

**E-2**     [13-1316](#)

ZBA13-021; 730 Heather Way  
Ed Davidson is requesting one variance from Chapter 55(Zoning) Section 5:26 (Single-family, R1A), of 18 feet for expansion of an existing residential structure into the rear setback; 50 feet is required.

*SUMMARY:*

*Ed Davidson is requesting one variance from Chapter 55 (Zoning) Section 5:26 (Single-family, R1A), of 18 feet for expansion of an existing residential structure into the rear setback; 50 feet is required.*

*DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION:*

*The subject parcel is located on Geddes, just west of Heatherway. The parcel contains a 3,103-square foot, single-family dwelling constructed in 1981 in Ann Arbor Township. The parcel is conforming for lot size (20,020 sf; required is 20,000 sf) and zoned R1A (Single-Family). The existing house encroaches into the required rear setback 7 feet. The required rear setback is 50 feet, and the house is set back 43 feet from the rear property line. Although considered a 'rear' yard according to the zoning code, the 'front' of the house faces this area due to the driveway from Heatherway and garage location.*

*The petitioner is proposing to remove an existing 12 foot by 15 foot deck and construct a 12 foot by 15 foot enclosed sunroom addition in the same location at the rear of the house. This addition will be constructed over the existing basement foundation. The lot has an angled rear lot line, which causes the setback distance to decrease closer to the area of the proposed addition. The proposed addition will be next to the rear section of the house which already extends into the rear setback 7 feet. The proposed sunroom will extend the building encroachment an additional 9 feet to a distance of 32 feet at its closet point. The maximum encroachment of the house will be 18 feet into the rear setback. The new addition will not be visible from the street and will not be any closer to the side property lines than the existing 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 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 house is a legal non-conforming structure and was constructed in Ann Arbor Township in 1981. The house was built closer to the rear (south property line) of the property and is non-conforming due to a 7 foot encroachment into the rear setback. The subject parcel has an angled rear setback line which results in a triangular section of the existing house encroaching into the rear setback. The parcel conforms to the minimum lot area and width requirements of the R1A Zoning District.*

(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 variance is being requested for the proposed 180 sq ft addition to the rear of the house. The sunroom addition will replace a deck which is covering the roof and foundation of the basement. The foundation walls are elevated approximately 3 feet above grade at this point. If the variance is not granted, the petitioner could not construct an addition over the exposed basement roof and foundation.*

(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 variance will result in an addition to the existing structure that will encroach a maximum of 11 feet further into the rear open space than the existing structure. If the variance is approved, the addition should not have a negative impact on surrounding structures. The proposed sunroom is 31 feet from the closest (west) side property line. The addition is not visible from a public street and the parcel has extensive mature landscaping producing a visual buffer to adjacent properties.*

(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 house is a legal non-conforming structure and was constructed under the jurisdiction of Ann Arbor Township. A section of the basement foundation and corner of the house encroach into rear setback. The location of the house within the rear setbacks prohibits any addition to the rear without ZBA action.*

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

*The variance is being requested for a proposed 12 foot by 15 foot addition (180 square feet) constructed over an existing basement foundation. The addition will extend a maximum of 9 feet further into the rear open space than the existing structure and will be 31 feet from the closest side property line. Due to the angle of the rear property line, the encroachment decreases from the maximum of 9 feet along the length of the addition.*

QUESTIONS BY BOARD TO STAFF:

None

PRESENTATION BY PETITIONER:

Robert Clark, Four Seasons Sunrooms, 6055 Jackson Road, was present on behalf of the property owner, and explained the application.  
Ed Davidson, 730 Heather Way, owner was also present.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Noting no public speakers the Vice Chair declared the public hearing closed.

**LIST OF EXHIBITS PRESENTED:**

Vice Chair Zielak noted that the Board had received the following letters in support of the request:

Teresita-Doyle (Techy), 769 Heather Way, Ann Arbor.  
BM Yashar, 740 Heather Way, Ann Arbor.

**Motion made by Carman, Seconded by Petersen, in the case of Petition ZBA13-021; 730 Heatherway, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby grants a variance from Chapter 55, Section 5:26 (R1A One-Family) of 18 feet from the required 50 foot rear setback, to construct a 12 foot by 15 foot enclosed sunroom addition, per submitted plans, based on the following findings on fact and standards for approval:**

- a) The alleged practical difficulties are the peculiar shape of the lot.
- b) That the hardship is causing a practical difficulty; there is a room below the area that has a flat roof that is already in existence and the roof leaks, which is why they want to build something over it, to stop the leaking.
- c) The variance, if granted, will not significantly affect surrounding properties, since the lot is heavily wooded and is the backyard rather than the front yard.
- d) The circumstances of the variance request are not self-imposed.
- e) The variance request is the minimum necessary to achieve reasonable use of the structure.

**BOARD DISCUSSION:**

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

**On a voice call, the vote was as follows with the Vice Chair declaring the motion carried. Approved: 7-0. Variance Granted.**

**Yeas:** 7 - Briere, Carman, Zielak, Carlisle, Councilmember Petersen, Buonodono, and Nichols

**Nays:** 0

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Milshteyn, and Lewis

**E-3**      [13-1317](#)

ZBA13-022; 2020 Camelot  
Gary Turner is requesting one variance from Chapter 55(Zoning) Section 5:57 (Averaging an Existing front setback line), of 7 feet for expansion of an existing residential structure into the front setback; 30 feet is required (Averaged Front Setback).

**SUMMARY:**

Gary Turner is requesting one variance from Chapter 55 (Zoning) Section 5:57

*(Averaging an Existing front setback line), of 7 feet for expansion of an existing residential structure into the front setback; 30 feet is required (Averaged Front Setback).*

**DESCRIPTION AND DISCUSSION:**

*The subject parcel contains a 2,144 square foot, single-family dwelling constructed in 1961. The parcel is zoned R1C (Single-Family) and is located on Camelot, east of Packard. The existing setback measures 30 feet to the main house and 22 feet to the existing uncovered deck. This existing deck measures 8 feet by 10 feet or 80 square feet. The parcel is conforming for lot area; the required minimum lot area for R1C is 7,500 square feet and the parcel is 16,128 square feet.*

*The petitioner is proposing to remove the existing uncovered deck and construct a new covered, but not enclosed, front porch measuring 7 feet by 29 square feet or 203 square feet. The front setback to the porch will be 23 feet. The porch roof addition will match the rooflines of the structure and will be supported by columns.*

*Although the required front setback is 25 feet for the R1C zoning district, the averaged front setback at this location results in a required front setback of 30 feet. The total encroachment of the house after the porch addition will be 7 feet.*

**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 subject parcel is a conforming lot in the R1C Zoning District (required is a minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet; parcel is 16,128 square feet). The existing house was built in the 1961 before current zoning setbacks. The house, including the uncovered porch, was built 30 feet from the front property line. The R1C required setback is 25 feet, however the averaging of adjacent parcels adjusts the setback to 30 feet. The subject parcel is a rectangular lot and is 50 feet wide at the front property line.*

*(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 variance is being requested in order to construct a useable covered front porch. Due to the location of the existing structure at the averaged front setback line of 30 feet a porch could not be constructed on the front of the structure without a variance. A ground level patio could be built, but not covered in the same location.*

*(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.*

*If the variance is approved, the structure will be consistent with a number of houses in the neighborhood. Although a covered front porch does require a variance, it will*

*not be fully enclosed and is minimal in total size (203 sq ft). This should minimize the impact to the surrounding neighborhood. The porch will not be extended any closer to the side property line or adjacent neighbors.*

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

*The house was built in 1961 before current zoning standards were established. The house was constructed 30 feet from the front property line with no useable front porch. Although there is a small stoop existing at the front door of the house, any addition to the front including a porch would require a variance.*

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

*The variance, if approved, will permit construction of a covered front porch within the average front setback. The unenclosed porch will have columns supporting it, but should have a minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood. A covered front porch would be consistent with some porches in the neighborhood.*

*Although an uncovered front patio could be built without the need for a variance, the size and encroachment of the covered front porch is minimal.*

**QUESTIONS BY BOARD TO STAFF:**

*Carman asked if the neighboring house facing Kimberley had also been included in the averaging.*

*Kowalski said, yes.*

**PRESENTATION BY PETITIONER:**

*Gary Turner, Community Builders LLC, 227 Miles # 2, Ypsilanti, builder, was present and explained the application.*

*Kyle and Christine Pellar-Kostbar, owners were also present to respond to enquiries.*

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

*Noting no public speakers the Vice Chair declared the public hearing closed.*

**LIST OF EXHIBITS PRESENTED:**

*Vice Chair Zielak noted that the Board had received the following letters in support of the request:*

*James and Molly Walker, 2050 Camelot Road, Ann Arbor.*

*Petition of support signed by nine (9) neighbors on Camelot Road and Kimberley Road. (See complete file)*

**QUESTIONS BY BOARD TO PETITIONER:**

*Carlisle asked about the intent of the covered porch.*

*Turner said it was intended to be a front covered porch to protect the front entrance as well as create the atmosphere of a front porch which is consistent to neighboring*



lots as well as adjacent lots. He said in the future they might add a barrier free access ramp to the side.

Carman said she had a problem with the request, more so than with the other requests, since the porch covers the whole front of the house. She said adding a porch to the front of the house won't cause any difficulties and will make the house look better and make the house look like the other houses on the block, but she would like it to be a minimal size and not stretching out along the whole width of the house. She said she understands that the request is something that they desire, but it is not the minimal intrusion into the front yard that would get them a covered entry into their house. She said it is a little 'much'.

**Motion made by C. Briere, Seconded by Carman, in Petition ZBA13-022; 2020 Camelot Road, the Zoning Board of Appeals hereby grants a variance from Chapter 55, Section 5:57 (Averaging Existing Front Setback) of 7 feet, from the required setback of 30 feet, per submitted plans, based on the following findings of facts and standards for approval:**

- a) The alleged practical difficulties are peculiar to the property and result from conditions which do not exist generally throughout the City; the existing house was built prior to current zoning requirements.
- 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) The variance, if granted, will not significantly affect surrounding properties; the structure would be consistent with other houses in the neighborhood and the proposed porch will not be extended any closer to the side property line or adjacent neighbors.
- d) The circumstances of the variance request are not self-imposed.
- e) The variance request is the minimum necessary to achieve reasonable use of the structure.

*BOARD DISCUSSION:*

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

*Carman stated that she did not believe that the request met the standards since it is not the minimal that it could be, providing them with relief. She added that it was not like the other porches of the neighbors that are smaller.*

*The Vice Chair clarified procedural issues, noting that all motions are made in the affirmative, with the vote determining the outcome.*

*Petersen said that she believed the minimal standards are based on reasonable use and not necessarily what the neighbors consider reasonable use for their porches. She referred to the application for the petitioner's intended use of the proposed front porch. She questioned the Board on what determines 'reasonable use' for the owner, versus what is considered 'reasonable use' throughout the neighborhood.*

*Carman responded that what it really means is that you cannot use your house unless you get this variance. She added that if you go to court that is the argument that you have to make; that you have such a serious problem with your lot that you cannot make use of it to the zoning category that you have, without the requested variance.*

*Nichols asked Carman if she would like to see a porch that didn't span the entire*

width of the front of the house.

Carman responded that the issue was not that she didn't think the proposed porch was an attractive front porch, but rather, that it did not meet the standards; not the minimal intrusion into the front setback and still have a nice use of their house. She added that one could argue that they couldn't have any, but she made clear that she was not making that argument. She said having a way of getting into your house without having the rain pour all over you, is something that we all would like to have, and everyone else in their neighborhood has it, so it seems like a just request on the applicant's part. She said giving them a larger intrusion into the front setback, by giving them a larger portion than even their neighbor has, seems to her that it wouldn't meet the standard.

**On a voice call, the vote was as follows with the Vice Chair declaring the motion defeated. Vote: 4-3. Variance Denied.**

**Yeas:** 4 - Briere, Zielak, Carlisle, and Councilmember Petersen

**Nays:** 3 - Carman, Buonodono, and Nichols

**Absent:** 2 - Chair Milshteyn, and Lewis

**F UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**G NEW BUSINESS**

**H REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

**I PUBLIC COMMENTARY - (3 Minutes per Speaker)**

*Christine Pellar-Kosbar, 2020 Camelot, Ann Arbor, said that they have petitions and have paid money just to be allowed to be here. She asked what has to happen; what do you want?*

*Carman responded that sometimes you can't do what you want to do. She said it is your job to come to us and ask for relief in the minimal amount possible to make use of your property, adding that is the law.*

*Christine asked what the Board would consider minimal.*

*Carman said her vote is only one vote, and they have to convince everybody.*

*Christine said, okay, how much?*

*Carman said they could work with staff to come up with a lesser...*

*Christine said they did, that's how they got to the Board now.*

*Carman said, and he told you nothing about the rules?*

*Gary Turner, Gary Builds Construction, 227 Miles # 2, Ypsilanti, said the basis of this application is that the one house in the area on that street, that makes the setback that they are required to adhere to, on the averaging, is the one house that is actually not in congruent on that street; the one house that, even though it is on the corner to Kimberley [Road], and then the house across the street is also on the corner to*

Kimberley [Road], and the house across the street acts like it faces Camelot Drive, it kind of matches the feeling of Camelot [Drive]. The one house that isn't congruent with the rest of that area is the reason why it seems like we are asking for a variance to the averaging, but with that site plan, it shows pretty clearly that what we are really asking meets the averaging and isn't really an encroachment of the average, if you don't include the one house on Kimberley [Road]. He said he thinks it is a flaw in the averaging, of the zoning system that isn't really addressed and that is the intent of us coming in front of the board. So that the issue of the length of it [porch] on the house and depth, really in my mind, was more of a minimal issue as to the way that the zoning treats front setbacks, when another street intersects on the corner. I guess, what's the point? So, we are a little shocked that the size of the width along the house is the reason why it is rejected, which doesn't affect encroachment into the setback.

Carman said, so understand that every square foot is encroachment into the setback.

Turner said, right, but my point being that, when you don't include the one house that actually has a side yard that is affecting our front yard setback we are not really encroaching the averaging; it works out for what we are asking.

Christine Pellar-Kosbar said we are just covering; the distance isn't anymore than the depth that it already goes out. It's not like this porch will go out further.

Daniel R. Davis, 2015 Independence Blvd, said he is a neighbor of the applicant [2020 Camelot], and apologized for not speaking out earlier, since he was not familiar with the process. He said, My wife and I are very much in favor of the improvement to the house, to the setback. He said, we know the Pellar-Kosbars well, we know how they use the house, and there is an existing deck there that connects to the driveway and the walkway out to the street, and there is household traffic there, neighbors visiting. He said his wife and he both feel that it improves the esthetics of the area and is in keeping with the street and is in no way an extension that they are unfamiliar with. There are other houses on that street and on our street [with Independence obviously having a slightly different character]. He said they would have absolutely no opposition and indeed would see it as a benefit to the neighborhood and it does actually make it more livable. He apologized for not bringing his comment at the appropriate time and said was willing to put it in an email, noting that perhaps that should have been done before.

He said his second issue, was in asking, How does one move forward from here and what would the next step be to consider these types of changes? He said he says that as sympathetic neighbors who are in similar stages of their lives, where you have to make certain decisions before the kids go off to college, otherwise there will be no opportunity for easily, ten or fifteen years, depending on who goes where and how much it costs.

## **J      ADJOURNMENT**

Vice-Chair Zielak reminded the public that any qualified party who is aggrieved by the decision of the Board can appeal this decision to the Washtenaw County Circuit Court on a timely basis and can also contact City staff for any further clarification on that issue.

**A motion was made by Buonodono, seconded by Councilmember Petersen, that the meeting be Adjourned at 7:04 p.m. On a voice vote, the Vice Chair declared the motion carried.**

*Community Television Network Channel 16 live televised public meetings are also available to watch live online from CTN's website, [www.a2gov.org/ctn](http://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](http://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](http://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.*