



**Public Hearing and Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting
July 29, 2014**

Having been duly publicized, Mayor Metzger called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.

Present: Commissioners Foreman, Krzysiak, Perry, Scott, Mayor Metzger.
Also Present: City Manager Breuckman, City Clerk Drealan.
Absent: None.

65 Sylvan – Mr. and Mrs. Michael Valentine

Mr. Michael Valentine, petitioner, 65 Sylvan, commented that he is not a property developer and would like to build a home and remain in the City. The proposed design of the property meets the needs of the petitioner, and is not too obtrusive or large. The square footage of the proposed plan is less than the national average. He would like to keep the house lower to the ground instead of a tall, rectangle building. The materials will be natural wood siding, not concrete. He would like to keep the trees on the lot. There are some modern style homes in the City on Devonshire and Amherst. The current property is in disrepair and feels his proposal would be an improvement.

Mr. Tom Strait, architect for the project, commented that the Valentines would like to live in Pleasant Ridge, on a dead-end street, build a home that is compatible with their lifestyles, and next to a city park. The desire is to build an approximately 2,000 square foot home and detached garage. The front yard setback variance is being requested for ease of entering the rear yard and garage. The side yard setback request is being requested so that the driveway can be usable. The neighboring house is 3 feet from the lot line. Safety would be an issue for both of these variance requests. Pleasant Ridge does not have many open areas and the City is built out. Revitalization is important and flexibility is as well. The intent is to construct a new home; he asked what other options the homeowner could take if the variances were denied. The building materials are concrete and foam. This will be used during the building process and then covered.

Mr. Valentine commented this type of construction is considered green and LEED certified. These factors are important to him. If the side yard variance is not granted, there would be no areas to remove snow from his driveway

Mayor Metzger opened the public hearing at 6:15

Mr. Dan Finwall, 67 Maywood stated his mother lives at 70 Maywood, which is behind the proposed house. His mother lives between two very unsightly buildings, the DPW yard and the neighboring house. He read a prepared statement from his mother. The letter indicated her support. He further commented that the lot is small at 65 Sylvan and the house is dilapidated. The proposed construction may be modern looking but feels that the design will fit into the neighborhood. There are some other modern homes in the City. Feels City needs to embrace modern looking housing and the proposal will enhance the community. Feels the variances should be approved.

Ms. Sandra Schemske, 44 Fairwood, commented she feel the current home is in terrible shape and something needs to be done. Her concern about the style of the house means that it would set a precedent. She feels people move to Pleasant Ridge for its historic houses and community feel. All the neighboring porches line up. Reiterated concerns about the modern look of the proposed house.

Mr. Harry Taylor, 51 Fairwood, commented he has no issue with the style of the home, does not mind if the porches line up. He has a property that was reconstructed on his block that is harmonious with the neighborhood. The setback is an issue to him and issues with were the driveway is located.

Ms. Aldy, half owner of 63 Sylvan-lives in Royal Oak, commented she is happy that the existing home is being torn down and rebuilt. She commented that she is against items #a, #b and #c on the agenda. The plans can be reworked to meet these requirements. Her daughter purchased the house next door in March.

Ms. Nancy Crutchfield, 1 Devonshire, questioned why the notices were not mailed to other neighboring streets. She does not want the look of the neighborhood to change and commented the City is fully in a Historic District. Feels it is a big foot house on a small lot. Commented that the owners of 16 Ridge had a similar problem and kept some of the older structure and built the modern structure around it. Asked if the Historical Society has reviewed the plans.

Ms. Schemske questioned if there is a Historical Commission in Pleasant Ridge and if they are reviewing any plans. Stated this type of variance request is a community issue, not a 300 foot issue.

City Manager Breuckman commented as to why the notices are mailed to properties within 300 feet for the meetings and replied about plan review process.

Ms. Amy Goula, 58 Woodward Heights, questioned if the ZBA approved the plans, could anyone get the same variances. She had questions about the side yard setback and the driveway. Feels that the front yard setback may not be appropriate, due to the aesthetics of the neighboring properties. These variances may change the feel of the community.

Mr. Valentine, petitioner, commented he would like to push the house closer to the park on the side so that they driveway can be usable, wide and safe, and create space between the houses. He commented that the current front yard setback is 30 feet, which would make his house 16 feet back from the other properties. He wants the front of the house to match all the other houses on the street. Some of the other houses have enclosed structures with stick out from the rest of the house. The house will look funny if it is setback to the 30 feet. If the side yard setback variance is not granted, the driveway will be on the lot line between the two houses.

Mr. Tom Strait, architect, commented that a variance of three foot to the side yard is being requested so that a car can safely open the doors in the driveway. If a fence is constructed on the lot line, a car door may not be able to open.

Conversation was held between the petitioner and audience members.

Mayor Metzger requested comments from the audience be directed to the ZBA members at the podium.

Mr. Taylor questioned if the house is going to sit forward from the neighbor's property.

Ms. Debbie Kries, 61 Sylvan questioned if the neighbors have a porch that sticks out and is the petitioner lining up with her porch with the front of the proposed construction.

City Manager Breuckman commented the front yard setback requirements in the R1-C district is 30 feet. No existing house on the east side complies with this provision and they are grandfathered in. The front porch is allowed to encroach into the front yard setback 8 feet. The proposed house would line up with the neighbors porch. When variances are requested the homeowner must show practical difficulty or a hardship to the requirements. The neighborhood compatibility requirement does not have to meet the hardship. He read the requirements in order for a variance to be granted. The question is - is it possible to change the proposal in order to meet the requirements. The applicant's plans note that a 13.76 foot front yard setback is proposed "to match existing," however; the proposed 13.76 foot setback would match the existing setback to the edge of the front porch, which was enclosed at some unknown date in the past. This means that the setback for the existing house actually measures 19.5 feet. The setback for the neighboring house to the west at 63 Sylvan is 19.74 feet.

The new house is proposed with an 11 foot setback from the west property line, and a 2 foot setback from the east property line, for the side yard setback. The ordinance requires a 5 foot setback on one side and a total of 13 feet combined. The existing house at 65 Sylvan has a 7.71 foot setback from the east property line and a 17.73 foot setback from the west property line. The neighboring house at 63 Sylvan has a 3.17 foot setback from the common property line between 63 and 65 Sylvan, making it a legal nonconformity. Approval of the requested variance would create a non-conformity where none currently exists. An alternative that would allow for the preservation of the tree would be to reduce the size of the house, or reconfigure the house to eliminate the need for the lot coverage variance request.

The proposed house has a footprint of 1,651 square feet and the proposed garage has a footprint of 528 square feet. The combined lot coverage is 2,179 square feet. The maximum allowed lot coverage in the RIC district is 30%, and the existing lot has an area of 5,971 square feet, so the maximum allowed lot coverage is 1,791.3 square feet. The applicant could meet the lot coverage requirements and maintain the square footage; the plans would need to be revised in order to do so. The need for the requested lot coverage variance could be eliminated by reworking the plans. The proposed house has a total area of approximately 2,050 square feet, but the ground floor covers 1,651 square feet. The ground floor area could be reduced and the upper story floor area increased which would allow for a house with an equivalent total area by less lot coverage. Further, complying with the setback requirements or reducing the front yard setback variance could also reduce the lot coverage, potentially bringing the proposed house into compliance with the maximum lot coverage requirement. This can be done in two ways, reduce the size of the garage or reduce the amount of floor area.

For the neighborhood compatibility request, the proposed house can best be described as a shed-style house. The shed style is a variant of modern architecture, and was popular in the 60's and 70's. The proposed house features irregular shed-style rooflines with no overhangs, a lack of any symmetry, and horizontally-oriented windows. There are 8 neighborhood compatibility criteria. There are 3 issues in this case and they are the following:

Building entrances. The houses along Sylvan, and throughout Pleasant Ridge, feature front doors that face the street (with a few exceptions). If the building did not comply with this criteria alone, it is Staff's opinion that it would not be enough to make a finding that the building was not compatible. However, given that the building does not comply with many of the criteria

staff made the finding that the house did not comply with the neighborhood compatibility requirements.

Building placement on the lot, including setbacks and distances between buildings. The proposed house does not comply with this requirement; however, this will be resolved by approval or denial of the three dimensional variance requests.

Architectural compatibility with surrounding properties in the same neighborhood. This is the primary criterion on which the proposed house does not comply. As noted above the proposed house is a shed-style building. As a modern style of architecture the house clearly does not match the traditional style of the nearby houses on Sylvan and elsewhere in Pleasant Ridge. However, staff would advise that style should not be the determining factor in whether or not a house is compatible with surrounding properties. Compatible does not mean the same thing as similar, consistent, or other such terms. Compatible means that the house will fit in to the overall neighborhood context, even if it is a different and non-traditional style.

Does a determination of neighborhood compatibility, the key consideration is whether or not the building will contribute to and respect the fundamental character of the streetscape in Pleasant Ridge. In other words, that the proposed building relates to the public realm of the street in a similar manner as the other existing houses in the neighborhood. We have a streetscape in Pleasant Ridge that is attractive to people. Traditional architecture is defined by its relationship to the form of the human body, and emphasizes symmetry and vertical proportions. This creates a warm and inviting streetscape that is a comfortable place for people. By contrast, streetscapes that are dominated by machine-based architecture, such as streets that are dominated by garage doors, feel much less warm and inviting, and tend to repel rather than attract people. This is not to say that modern architectural styles cannot contribute to the street – they can, so long as they are sympathetic to the characteristics of traditional architecture that developed over the course of millennia.

For instance, traditional houses will typically have approximately 15%-35% transparency on the front façade – that is, the front building wall will contain openings for doors or windows. This specific proposal, the proposed house has about 11% of the front building façade or about 13% transparency if only the lower façades are considered.

It is possible to alter the proposed house to meet the neighborhood compatibility requirement while still retaining the shed-style architecture. Some suggestions are as follows:

- Increase the transparency on the front façade, with vertically orientated windows,
- Reorient the front door to face the street
- Add overhangs or other elements to provide a more sheltering feeling to the house
- Provide vertical orientation to building elements and openings on the front façade

In his opinion, these points need to be considered in order to approve the variance. Sample motions have been provided to the ZBA members.

Commissioner Scott questioned if the mud room area in the front of the proposed house is appropriate in terms of a setback requirement.

Manager Breuckman stated if this area were a porch it would be fine. Because the mudroom is enclosed, it does not comply. It is fundamentally part of the structure and does not comply with the front yard setback requirement.

Commissioner Krzysiak questioned if the homeowner revised the proposed plans, would the neighborhood compatibility requirement need to be reconsidered.

Manager Breuckman commented that if the homeowners revised the plans to meet the neighborhood compatibility requirement based on the City Administration recommendations, the plans it would not have to be reconsidered by the ZBA

Commissioner Krzysiak questioned if the ZBA could set a boundary to the neighborhood compatibility. For example, could the ZBA determine the number of windows that the petitioner would need to comply with that provision.

Manager Breuckman commented that the petitioner would need to submit revised plans for City Administration review. If those plans did not comply with the neighborhood compatibility requirement, the petitioner could come back for an appeal. The ZBA could not provide guidance for what that body would like to see.

Mr. Valentine commented that neighborhood compatibility is highly objective and feels he should not have to keep coming back for consideration. Questioned if he is building a house for staff or for the people that are living there. There is a significant cost to keep revising plans and if he has to keep going back and forth with staff, the property will remain as is.

Commissioner Krzysiak commented he understands the petitioners point and the frustration with the City's ordinance. The job of the ZBA is to represent the community in these types of decisions. Appreciates the comments from neighbors. Pleasant Ridge is a historical community but does not have to be frozen in time. There are advances that can be built into new homes that keep the character of the community.

Manager Breuckman commented that the style of home the petitioner has selected can be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. There should not be an endless loop of revisions. He suggested a meeting with the City staff, the petitioner and the petitioners architect in order to brainstorm ideas for the neighborhood compatibility component.

Mr. Valentine commented that if he reconfigured the structure, he would have to make the house much taller in order to meet his square footage requirements. Feels a taller, skinnier structure would not be compatible with the neighborhood. The proposed structure is low. He would rather not have to design the structure taller.

Commissioner Krzysiak commented he appreciates the petitioners view. He also commented that there are currently height restrictions in the ordinance as well that would have to be adhered to. If the petitioner met the requirements in the ordinance, he would not have to come before the ZBA.

Mayor Metzger commented that the proposed structure currently has a second floor.

Mr. Strait, architect, commented that the proposed house looks like one story but is actually two story. The second floor is not continuous to the front of the home. It was designed this way to be more compatible with the surrounding properties. The structure can be relocated on the lot and the only variance that would be required would be the lot coverage. The structure could be shift

over 2 or 3 feet. It would be a sacrifice on the driveway but there would not be a side yard requirement. If the petitioner were fortunate enough to get the front yard setback variance, it could be built, but would have to comply with the aesthetic values.

Background conversation was held regarding the lot coverage requirement.

Mayor Metzger commented that public comments should be made at the podium.

Commissioner Krzysiak commented that he would not like this meeting to turn into a back and forth between neighbors and requested that members of the audience should make their comments at the podium.

Mr. Finwall stated he had additional comments, but he would rather sit than stand at the podium.

Commissioner Krzysiak commented that he appreciated Mr. Finwall's comment, however to maintain order, comments should be made at the podium.

Mr. Finwall commented he understood, but is not feeling well and would like to sit. He further commented given the condition of the existing property that the neighbors have put up with for years, he feels that the ZBA should kill the petitioners plan because of setbacks, a few 100 feet here or there. The current driveway at 65 Sylvan almost touches 63 Sylvan now. There is only a sliver between the fence and driveway now. The ZBA should be trying to work with the petitioner to enhance that neighborhood. He does not want a rental property there, he wants the house to be fixed up, torn down. He encourages the ZBA to work with the petitioner. The proposed garage is a regular garage at the back of the lot behind his garage. There currently is a tree lined property line. The petitioner is using a cedar material and there are all the trees in the area. The City allowed a monstrosity on Ridge Road where there was an old house. It looks like Soldier Field where there is old and new, it just doesn't work. The petitioners plan is not like that. There was an old house on Ridge Road; 800 square foot house with this 5,000 square foot Miami Vice looking modern house behind it, the proposal for 65 Sylvan is nothing like that. He would like something to be done in that area. There are little leaguers playing next to the current 600 square foot house with a tree growing through the living room. Feels the petitioner is a great guy, has a great family, and would encourage the ZBA to work with him.

Commissioner Scott commented he understands Mr. Finwall's comments and the ZBA wants to help the petitioner build a house that works on his lot. The challenge is that the proposed house will be in the City longer than the public, so the house needs to be compatible and works with the neighborhood and is a good representation of Pleasant Ridge for years to come. It is not the intent to impede the petitioner from building a house on his property, but the house needs to meet certain requirements.

Commissioner Foreman commented there has been much discussion about the style of the house, shifting the house on the lot, making it taller and other suggestions. The ordinance has constraints are for a reason. It is a weighty decision. There are three variances and a neighborhood compatibility issue. The petitioner knew about these requirements and the structure could have been designed to comply. The changes to the plan should not be a surprise to the petitioner. He further commented that the ZBA will consider the information given to make its determination. He would love to see the property improved, but there are certain parameters that have to be looked at.

Mr. Valentine commented that he feels the zoning ordinance is too restrictive for a new construction in the City. The Pleasant Ridge Zoning Ordinance is not flexible enough for the average family needs and a decent size construction. If the City would like to grow the

community and attract younger people, the ordinance makes that highly restrictive. He does not want to spend the money to comply with the ordinance to construct something that is pretty small. He is not going to invest much of his life savings to do that when he can build something that he wants up the road. He has options to do that. The ordinance is not flexible, but they tried to minimize the variances requested. They tried to proposed something that is not large and in your face. He tried to use natural materials, but following the ordinance as written is difficult. At some point he will need to sell it, so the proposed structure would have to have a market value. The key is investment; the ordinance inhibits investment in the community.

Mr. Strait, builder, commented this house is the petitioners dream. Some people may not like it. Criticizing the house is criticizing the homeowner. This is difficult because this is personal. The petitioners love the house, and there will be other people that love it. The material, no matter whether you like it or not, you can't disagree with the materials that are being proposed.

Mayor Metzger commented that the materials are not in question. It is the design that triggered the review.

Mr. Strait, builder, commented he understood. He further commented that every home on that street has vinyl siding, and the petitioner could use vinyl siding. Just because you don't like it is not a reason to deny it.

Commissioner Foreman agreed and commented that the reason it was denied was more than neighborhood compatibility. There are three other variances at issue here.

Commissioner Perry commented that neighborhood compatibility is not a personal point of view. There are points made by the City Manager which outlined why the plans were denied based on neighborhood compatibility.

Mr. Strait, builder, commented he needs exact parameters and he can design the structure. He does not want to spend endless hours going back and forth with City staff and the petitioner making changes.

Commissioner Krzysiak commented he did not want the back and forth between the City and the petitioners, which is why he requested clarification from the City Manager regarding a meeting between the City staff and the petitioners. There are three other specific ordinances that are being requested. He does not want to get tied with the neighborhood compatibility issue.

City Manager Breuckman commented that he is style neutral. He is not criticizing the style of the proposed house. He is looking at how the shed style house will fit into the community. There needs to be a two way conversation between the City and the petitioners. He laid out some of the criteria for this plan to be approved based on the neighborhood compatibility requirement.

Commissioner Scott commented the neighborhood compatibility is not the petitioner's big issue. The larger issues are the other variances. The basic structure of the home and the area it covers is an issue. By responding to the other variance requests, the neighborhood compatibility request can be worked on.

Mr. Valentine commented that the front yard setback would make the structure be quite a ways back from the rest of the structures on the street.

Manager Breuckman commented the City has granted variances in the past to match the established building line. This is where the question of precedence comes into play. He is comfortable recommending the 10.5 foot front yard variance to meet that established line.

Mr. Strait, architect, commented that he would like some clarification regarding the percentage of lot coverage. The petitioner can increase the height and increase the volume of the proposed structure and comply with the lot coverage requirement. Feels it is a tradeoff. The second comment is that this is a unique site because it abuts the park. Could comply but the driveway is narrowed. They are requesting the side yard variance to construct the driveway as proposed, due to a safety factor. If the variance is not granted, the structure will be shifted over, if the petitioner would agree to that.

Mayor Metzger commented that the idea of going up would allow the side yard setback to be satisfied without going toward the neighbor's house.

Mr. Strait, architect, commented that there does not have to be a change to the design, it could be moved over as proposed to comply with the side yard setback requirement. If the petitioner decided they wanted to go up in height, the interior would need to be reconfigured. The structure would be changed to a complete two story structure, and may not fit with the adjacent neighborhood. It is a tradeoff.

Assistant City Manager Pietrzak commented the variances belong to the property, not the homeowner. If the next owner tears the house down, the new build could be built with these variances in mind.

Commissioner Foreman commented each variance are not independent factors. The first three variances are the most important. The neighborhood compatibility issue seems like it can be worked out. Is not sure what discussions took place prior to the ZBA.

With no further comments or discussion, Mayor Metzger closed the public hearing at 7:28 p.m.

Front Yard Setback Variance

14-3113

Motion by Commissioner Foreman, seconded by Commissioner Perry in the matter of the request for a variance of 16.24 feet from the 30-foot minimum front yard setback requirement of Section 26-12.1, to permit a 13.76 foot front yard setback for the proposed house at 65 Sylvan, the Zoning Board of Appeals approves a variance to permit a 10.4 foot front yard setback for the proposed house at 65 Sylvan, to be in line with the existing structures the Zoning Board of Appeals with the following findings and subject to any applicable conditions:

1. Special or unique conditions and circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not generally applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same district. Specifically, that an established building pattern exists on the street that supports a lesser front setback.
2. A literal interpretation of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of the ordinance, and the requested variance is the minimum necessary. Specifically, the existing setback for houses on the street creates an established building line with a front setback of about 19.5 feet. The setback for the existing house on the site is 19.6 feet, supporting a variance of 10.4 feet.

3. The special conditions and circumstances do not result from the actions of the applicant. The building pattern that exists along the street is a long-standing situation that existed long before the applicant purchased the property.
4. The granting of the variance will be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance by allowing a new building at an established building line.
5. The variance will not be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the general welfare by allowing a front setback consistent with neighboring properties.
6. The spirit of the zoning ordinance shall be observed, public safety secured, and substantial justice done.

Approved: Yeas: Commissioner Foreman, Perry, Scott, Krzysiak, Mayor Metzger.
Nays: None.

Lot Coverage Variance

14-3114

Motion by Commissioner Krzysiak, seconded by Commissioner Scott, in the matter of the request for a variance of 387.7 square feet from the maximum lot coverage requirement of Section 26-12.1, to permit a total lot coverage of 2,179 square feet (36.4%) for the proposed house and garage at 65 Sylvan, the Zoning Board of Appeals denies the request with the following findings and subject to any applicable conditions:

1. No special or unique conditions or circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not generally applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same district.
2. A literal interpretation of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would not deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of the ordinance. There is no different between the subject lot and other lots along Sylvan in the RIC district.
3. The special conditions and circumstances do result from the actions of the applicant, and as such are self-created. Alternatives do exist which would allow the site to comply with the maximum lot coverage standard of the zoning ordinance.
4. The granting of the variance will not be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. The variance will allow for a house with greater lot coverage than otherwise required, and is not in keeping with ordinance requirements or the character of the neighborhood.
5. The variance will be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the general welfare by increasing stormwater runoff and a feeling of congestion on the property.
6. The spirit of the zoning ordinance will not be observed, and substantial justice will not be done by providing a special benefit to the applicant that is not enjoyed by other properties in the zoning district, and which will promote future requests for similar variances that undermine the spirit of the zoning ordinance.

Denied: Yeas: Commissioner Krzysiak, Scott, Foreman, Perry, Mayor Metzger.
Nays: None.

Side Yard Setback Variance

14-3115

Motion by Commissioner Perry, seconded by Commissioner Scott, in the matter of the request for a variance of three feet from the five foot minimum side yard setback requirement of Section 26-12.1, to permit a two foot side yard setback for the proposed house at 65 Sylvan, the Zoning Board of Appeals denies the request with the following findings and subject to any applicable conditions:

1. No special or unique conditions or circumstances exist which are peculiar to the land, structure, or building involved and which are not generally applicable to other lands, structures or buildings in the same district.
2. A literal interpretation of the provisions of the zoning ordinance would not deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same district under the terms of the ordinance. There is no different between the subject lot and other lots along Sylvan in the RIC district.
3. The special conditions and circumstances do result from the actions of the applicant, and as such are self-created. Alternatives do exist which would allow the site to comply with the minimum side yard setback requirement of the zoning ordinance.
4. The granting of the variance will not be in harmony with the general purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. The variance will allow for a house with a lesser side setback than otherwise required, and is not in keeping with ordinance requirements or the character of the neighborhood.
5. The variance will be injurious to the neighborhood or otherwise detrimental to the general welfare by reducing the amount of light and air along the side of the house.
6. The spirit of the zoning ordinance will not be observed, and substantial justice will not be done by providing a special benefit to the applicant that is not enjoyed by other properties in the zoning district, and which will promote future requests for similar variances that undermine the spirit of the zoning ordinance.

Denied: Yeas: Commissioner Perry, Scott, Foreman, Krzysiak, Mayor Metzger.
Nays: None.

Neighborhood Compatibility Variance

14-3116

Motion by Commissioner Perry, seconded by Commissioner Foreman, in the matter of the request for an appeal of the administrative finding that the proposed house does not comply with the neighborhood compatibility requirements of Section 26-12.3, the Zoning Board of Appeals denies the appeal with the following findings and subject to any applicable conditions:

1. The administrative decision was correct and the house as proposed is not compatible with the established character of the surrounding neighborhood.

2. The design of the proposed house can be adjusted to bring it into compliance with the neighborhood compatibility requirements. Specifically, the proposed house could be revised including, but not limited to, the following ways:
- Increase the transparency on the front façade to between 15% and 35%, preferably above 20%.
 - Reorient the front door to face the street.
 - Add overhangs or other elements to provide a more sheltering feeling to the house.
 - Provide vertical orientation to building elements and openings on the front façade.

Denied: Yeas: Commissioner Perry, Foreman, Krzysiak, Scott, Mayor Metzger.
 Nays: None.

With no further business or discussion, Mayor Metzger adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Mayor Kurt Metzger

Amy M. Drealan, City Clerk