

White Oak Township
Zoning Board of Appeals Hearing
29, 2022

August

The August 29, 2022 Zoning Board of Appeals hearing was called to order by Acting Chairperson Judy McManaman at 6 p.m. In attendance were: Judy McManaman-Acting Chairperson, Jeffrey Steckelberg-Vice Chair, Denver Doxtator, John Roger Graf, Richard Morrison, Bob McManaman-alternate, Tom Brimhall-Zoning Administrator, Leela A. Vernon, Clerk, John Iocco representing Consumers Energy, Joe Lawson representing Consumers Energy, Steve and Sally Bauder, Zac Clark, Attorney representing the Bauders, and Leslie Abdo, Attorney representing White Oak Township. Ms. McManaman led us in the Pledge of Allegiance. The members of the board introduced themselves.

Tom Brimhall took the floor to explain the reason the application for land split was denied. He explained that the Livingstons property already did not meet the 4 to 1 ratio required by our Ordinance and if the land split was to proceed, the new ration would be approximately 4.78 to 1.

Joe Lawson from Consumers took the floor to explain the need for the Variance. They are asking for a lot line adjustment not a land split. For the new facility they need a little more real estate.

Richard asked Consumers to explain the launcher and specific operation. There is an existing line was put in the 1940's. That line needs to be replaced but in order to do that the existing line needs to remain in place. In order to construct the new line the pipeline needs to be increased in size which would require the launcher.

Judy asked if there was an option to lease the additional footage. The response was that they prefer to own in order to allow safety measures, i.e. fencing. There were questions regarding the future of the land owned by the Livingstons since it is a non-conforming parcel and would not be allowed to build outbuildings or if they wanted to tear down their existing house and re-build. Leslie Abdo, White Oak Township's attorney cited section 5.5 in our Ordinance which addresses this issue.

After more discussion, Judy went through the 5 findings that are listed in our Ordinance.

#1-There is a practical difficulty or difficulties applicable to the property involved that do not apply in general to other properties or class of uses in the same district or zone. – The ZBA agreed that this does not apply. It is specific to that property.

#2-That such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone and vicinity. – The ZBA agreed that people need natural gas.

#3-That the granting of such variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located. – The ZBA did not see anything detrimental to the public welfare.

#4-That the granting of such variance will not adversely affect the purposes or objectives in this Ordinance. – The ZBA felt that the granting of this variance would not adversely affect the purposes or objectives in our Ordinance.

#5- In consideration of all appeals and all proposed variations to this ordinance, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall, before making any variations from the Ordinance in a specific case, first determine that

proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, or unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area, or in any other respect impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of White Oak. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to give or grant the Board the power or authority to alter or change the Zoning Ordinance or the Zoning Map, such power and authority being reserved to the Township Board of The Township of White Oak in the manner provided by law.” – The ZBA determined that this does not apply in this situation.

Richard brought to the attention of the board Section 4.10. ESSENTIAL PUBLIC SERVICE FACILITIES. Which states, “Essential public service facilities reasonably necessary for the furnishing of adequate service by public utilities or departments or commissions, or for the public health or safety or general welfare, but not including buildings other than such buildings as are primarily enclosures or shelters of the above essential public service equipment shall be permitted as authorized and regulated by law and other ordinances of the Township of White Oak in any use district, it being the intention hereof to exempt such erection, construction, alteration and maintenance from the application of this Ordinance.”

The floor was open to public comment. Bob McManaman had some concerns about the location of the pipeline. Public comment was closed.

A motion was made by Acting Chairperson, Judy McManaman to grant the Variance to Karla and Wyck Livingston to split the required amount of land (see attached diagrams) to sell to Consumers Energy. Denver Doxtator seconded the motion. Roll call vote as follows: Roger Graf – Yes, Jeff Steckelberg – Yes, Richard Morrison – No, Denver Doxtator – Yes, Judy McManaman – Yes. The request for Variance for the land split submitted by Karla and Wyck Livingston has been approved with a 4-1 vote.

Next, the ZBA has been asked to interpret SECTION 9.3. PERMITTED USES AFTER SPECIAL APPROVAL. (I) Public and private stables and riding academies provided that any building used as a stable shall not be located nearer than sixty (60) feet to any property line and not nearer than one hundred (100) feet to any dwelling unit. And (N) Outdoor recreational uses, institutional or community recreation centers. 1. Motocross tracks and course for use by two (2) or four (4) wheel motorized vehicles owned by residents of the property, subject to conditions concerning, but not limited to, noise, dust, situs, and hours of operation to be established at time of permit approval.

The wording on section (N) on the Township Website differs from what is in the current Ordinance and therefore, the attorney for the Bauder’s rescinded the request for interpretation of that section.

Tom Brimhall: Let’s start out with section 9.3 that is under consideration-Permitted uses after special approval. Subsection (I) Public and private stables and riding academies provided that any building used as a stable shall not be located nearer than sixty (60) feet to any property line and not nearer than one hundred (100) feet to any dwelling unit. So we need to go into definitions after that. Riding Academy – A school where horsemanship is taught and practiced. Horsemanship – The art of riding, training, and handling horses. Stable (public) – An establishment used for the breeding, rearing and housing of more than 2 horses, ponies, or similar animals, and including riding academies and stables to which the public is admitted for a fee to ride/and or board horses. Recreational – Of or related to recreation (amateur, nonprofessional and unpaid-from online thesaurus. Rodeo – A public performance featuring bronco riding, calf roping, steer wrestling and bull riding. The exception that we have goes back quite a ways. I have prepared a summary.

Leslie: Where did these definitions come from?

Leela: The definition of Stable, Public came from our ordinance, the rest came from the internet.

Leslie: I want to be sure that it's clear that these definitions are not from the ordinance. So What the applicant is asking us to do is to review the list of special land uses in the AG district and determine whether their proposed intended use is would fall within either section 9.3 (i) or section 9.3 (N) which is outdoor recreational areas. So they provided and we will give them an opportunity to speak whether or not what they want to do falls within either of those definitions in the ordinance. Public stables are defined in the definition section and that is something that the ZBA should look at as well. And consider whether or not outdoor recreational uses applies in the grander course of the purpose of the AG district.

Tom: Dave Mullins did some research and put together this list of definitions because the definition of rodeo is not in our ordinance.

Zac: To be 100% accurate team roping is not a rodeo event, but that's neither here nor there.

Leslie: Obviously, it's part of the role of the Zoning Administrator that he can provide his staff report comments and thoughts on the interpretation request.

Tom: So the question is does competitive/exhibition rodeo type events fall within 9.3 (I) or (n). (N) specifically talks about motorized vehicles, it doesn't say anything about horses.

Leslie: For recreational uses, there's a caveat underneath it that talks about motocross tracks for use by 2 and 4 wheel vehicles. The one piece of language that I would direct the ZBA to in that subsection is that it does state that these tracks and courses even though they are permitted as part of the recreational use section, it's for the use of those vehicles owned by the owners of the property not for those bringing motorized vehicles from other who don't reside on that property.

Zac: questioned section 9.3 (N). He stated that what is in our currecnt ordinance is not what is on our website.

Leslie: Copies of the current zoning ordinance are always available in the Clerks office.

Zac: Section 9.3 (n) is more specific to motocross tracks. So Steve and Sally would like to hold roping events in the summer. It's a competition, there's a little bit of money exchanged. It's not a for profit business by any means, it's really a hobby. There's a pending special use application but in an effort to be efficient, it's the ZBA's job to interpret the ordinance, not the Township board so we put this application in for interpretataion for you all to determine whether this meets the Public Stable definition and we already know the definition states an establishment used for the breeding, rearing and housing of more than 2 horses, ponies, or similar animals, and including riding academies and stables to which the public is admitted for a fee to ride/and or board horses. These roping competitions people pay a small entry fee and they rope. I have horses myself and have been around them my whole life. All the public stables I've seen will have horse shows, they are no different than this.

Tom: The shows you are talking about, do they have roping?

Zac: No, I think the roping is insignificant if you were showing a horse in a class with a judge.

Tom: So Steer roping would be acceptable there?

Zac: It's a horse show, the roping part is insignificant. It's a horse competition.

Tom: It's my understanding that you cannot have these types of events at the local fair grounds because they would not allow unhaltered animals.

Zac: No, you could have this at the local fairgrounds.

Sally: They don't have the equipment.

Tom : What equipment is that?

Zac: you need a very specialized roping arena with cattle shoots and holding pens to sort and move cattle. To that extend there are not many facilities available. In fact there are none that we know of that are not privately owned in the state of Michigan.

Tom: Steve, you've been holding these events in Brooklyn. Haven't you?

Sally: That's a whole different thing. Since we were not allowed to have these events we had to have them at someone else's privately owned residence.

Tom: The way I interpret this is Steve can have the roping events for himself, but not for others. He can't bring people in from outside the area to do this.

Leslie: So the application included requests under both the Public and private stable as well as the outdoor recreational uses. Did you mean in light of that Subsection (i) that you relying just on public and private stables subsection not the outdoor recreational uses? Did you withdraw subsection (N) from your request.

Zac: Yes

Leslie: So the board will be making it decision based solely on the public and private stable section, not the outdoor recreational use section,

Zac: Yes

Roger: In AG district there are people who are bringing up animal abuse issues. Now if you're throwing rope around a steer and yanking it off its feet that could be considered abuse.

Zac: It's a different roping event than that. It's team roping, where there's 2 people on horses. One person ropes the steer by the horns, the other ropes the feet. So it's little different that calf roping.

Roger: Do you know how an animal struggles against that? You have a rope around two of its legs but there are still 2 legs to thrash around. What happens if you miss and just get one foot?

Zac: I would disagree. The intent is to rope both of their back feet. They put their feet down and step out of the rope. It's a 5 second penalty if you miss and just get one foot. 500-600 lb. steers they're pretty hefty, they cost a lot of money, and they are well cared for.

Judy: Did I hear you say that these events are not for profit?

Steve: Yes

Judy: You charge a fee though for people to come in and compete.

Zac: There is a fee. There would be a net loss, roping is an expensive hobby and it's a money losing endeavor however you look at it. Part of the fee is paying for the cattle.

Jeff: If money is being exchanged, then it's a business.

Zac: The association set up to compete for points not for dollars. Part of the fee pays for the cattle.

Denver: So you're renting cattle?

Sally: We lease the cattle.

Denver: For that one event, that one day?

Leslie: Do other people bring their cattle or horses onto your property?

Steve: Horses, Yes

Leslie: So there are some horses that come on just for that particular day?

Steve and Sally: Correct

Denver: How many different events are offered at one weekend?

Sally: Just the roping

Denver: Not pole, or barrel racing.

Sally: That's something different. We haven't done that.

Denver: So it's just strictly for the roping?

Sally: Yes

Tom: How many people do you have at these events?

Zac: 30, 35, maybe 40.

Tom: It says on your application you expect on average about 40 trailers.

Zac: I said 40 contestants.

Tom: So there could be several people in each truck? Would you estimate 60 people then?

Zac: I think that's high.

Tom: I'm looking at an ad from 2021. It says entry fee is \$100. That is not a nominal fee.

Zac: That was a once a year one weekend event. The entry fee covers 6-7 different events.

Sally: My tech is Michigan Youth and its for kids 18-2 years of age. They participate in their age group they just have fun with each other. There are no adults that participate other than bringing their children.

Steve: For us, everything is donated that weekend.

Roger: Does anyone bring campers in?

Sally: No, they have their horse trailers and they may have sleeping quarters that they sleep in if they stay overnight. Not campers.

Leslie: So people stay overnight after the event on the property?

Sally: Yes, if they come from a long distance away.

Leslie: They'll stay in their trailers after the event?

Sally: Yes, they have generators if they need electricity or whatever.

Richard: So, if I don't know anything about this concept at all, can you make it concise and tell me if you were to do it this Saturday, what that would look like? Give me some idea of what would happen.

Sally: You would have people bringing their horses, they come up and decide who's going to rope with who, and then there's each individual talent levels, Each teams gets call out and they rope their cow. They are timed. At the end of that specific level whoever has the lowest time and the fastest catches on the cattle will win that level.

Zac: Then people hang out for a little bit and the go home.

Judy: Is there any monetary prize to winning? Or is it just points?

Sally: Its points

Zac: Sometimes there are awards. Usually not monetary.

Denver: What are the hours of your events because I noticed you have lights?

Sally: We only use the lights in the fall when it gets dark but they are never left on. Usually the roping starts between 9-11 a.m. and a lot of times they are done by 5-7p.m. at the latest. Sometimes they are done by 3.

Richard: There are apparently 2 attorneys involved and there was a motion filed with the court is this the proper venue for this?

Leslie: There is a pending case, the Township has filed a complaint against the Bauder's alleging that these events are in violation of the zoning ordinance. There is a current order preliminarily adjoining the Bauder's from using that property for that purpose while the case is litigated. There's been no decision on the merits yet. The Bauder's did submit an application for a Special Use Permit to authorize use of the property for these types of events, relying on the public stable use which is a use that is allowed with a special use permit within the zoning ordinance. After discussions between attorneys, the Bauders made the decision to file this request for an interpretation. If it is not a permitted special use as a private or public stable within the zoning ordinance then the Planning Commission obviously cannot consider the application because it would not be permitted in that zoning district. What the ZBA needs to do is determined whether or not what they want to do falls within the definition of public or private stable based on the scope of the ordinance.

Richard: Are we interfering with the court process?

Leslie: NO

Sally: We are trying to avoid going to court. We just want to be able to use our arena. Right now we are not able to have friends over to ride. Right now only Steve and I are allowed to ride in it.

Judy: I think having friends over to ride in the arena is different from the events in question.

Zac: The Michigan court of appeals is very clear that when the ZBA is interpreting an ordinance if there is any ambiguity it's interpreted in favor of the property owner if doubt exists. I believe it meets the definition of public or private stable.

Richard: What is the definition of a public stable, in your mind?

Judy: Let me read the definition of a public or private stable. "An establishment used for the breeding, rearing and housing of more than 2 horses, ponies, or similar animals," Which I don't believe applies in your case, "and including riding academies and stables to which the public is admitted for a fee to ride/and or board horses." So there's 2 components to that.

Tom: Were talking about horses that come in from outside the area. That's the part that puts them outside the definition of public stables. If you had a public stable you would board the horses there.

Leslie: What the ZBA needs to keep in mind is a public stable encompasses the activities of breeding, rearing, and housing of the horses. The riding academies and boarding is ancillary to the primary active verbs here which are breeding, rearing and housing.

Public Comment: Bob McManaman – Are these sanctioned events. And what was the age range?

Sally: 2-18 Yes

Judy: So this event is sanctioned, are the rest of them? You said this one was just one weekend a year.

Zac: Occasionally they are sanctioned, but not all.

Tom: But you keep track of points for all these events.

Zac: Yes for all the sanctioned ones.

Judy: Re-read the definition of **Stable, Public**. She stated that they are not breeding, rearing or housing animals that do not belong to them. The public is not paying a fee to ride or board horses. They are paying a fee for things other than what is in our definition.

After a little more discussion a motion was made by Acting Chairperson Judy McManaman that the proposed use of "Roping Events" **does not** fall within the definition of Stable (Public). Seconded by Jeffrey Steckelberg. Do you agree with the motion on the table? A roll call vote follows: Roger-Yes, Richard-Yes, Jeff-Yes, Denver-Yes, Judy-Yes. The motion passed unanimously. Therefore, it is not a permitted use and they are not eligible for a Special use permit.

Next on the agenda is the Application for variance submitted by Steve and Sally Bauder. The application states, "I am formally requesting a nonuse setback variance from the requirements of section 4.40. Specifically, section 4.40 (D) provides that "special training or exercising corrals shall not be located within 100' of the lot line." Currently, the riding and roping arena at 4881 Swan Rd. is less than 100' from both the North and East lot lines. In the application section 16.5 (F) was cited stating that the Zoning Board of Appeals has the authority to make specific variations or modifications to the Ordinance....

Leslie: What the ZBA would be permitted to approve here is, the variance only as to the riding of the horses that are being kept on the property, not for these particular events as they've determined that it is not a permitted special use in that district but they can still consider the variance to the extent that there are uses of the riding arena that would be permitted in that zoning district.

Tom: I don't have an accurate site plan but the hand drawn one I have shows 25'.

Sally: We submitted all kinds of professional site plans.

Tom: I saw the site plan, the one I got was so small I could barely read it, and there were no dimensions on it.

Leslie: What is the variance you are requesting? How many feet?

Zac: I don't know specifically.

Denver: The corral in question, how close is it to the dwelling?

Leslie: That's not an issue. So what you are asking for is approximately a 70'-80' variance from the north and east property lines?

Zac: Yes

Sally: Is it that way with all fences too?

Leslie: This is specifically for the housing and exercise facility.

Zac: I think that the uniqueness of this situation is the fact that the neighboring parcel is 66 acres and the nearest house is 1500' away. It butts up to a cornfield and the owner is in favor of it being there. The existing contours of the land make it difficult to move. There is a utility pole there that would need to be moved. Those are the extraordinary circumstances that make this a special case.

Tom: Is this a utility pole that the Bauder's put in or for electricity?

Zac: For electricity.

There was some discussion about the contour of the land and the location of the pole.

Tom: Our ordinance has been in effect since 1992. These setback requirements have been in effect for 30+ years. They should have consulted the local Zoning Ordinance before building the arena or holding events.

Sally: We came up here for the taxes. They had us as Residential instead of Agricultural. We sat with whoever and was talking with them and we asked them if it was ok to put this arena up. And they said that they didn't care at all as long as we didn't have any mud bogs.

Leela: They came to the Board of Review and asked them about this. The Board of Review does not have the authority to approve this.

Steve: We were directed to go see the Planning Commission to see about getting a special land use permit. It was 5 years before it became an issue and so it was brought to our attention. If we were wrong I feel we were misdirected. We never thought we were in the wrong.

Judy: Is a permit required to build a corral?

Tom: It is technically not required.

There was some discussion to try to give the Bauder's direction on moving the arena to adhere to the Zoning Ordinance. Their lawyer stated that moving the arena would not allow for roping. He stated that is the reason for the application for variance.

Richard: Where is this in relation to the road, the corral?

Tom explained where the corral is located on the property. The ZBA examined the contour map.

Richard: So the arena is not near Swan Rd.

Zac: No, it is not.

Tom: There is potentially a place they could move the arena to that would not violate the setback requirement.

Zac presented a photo showing the lay of the land

Zac: I understand the intent of the ordinance I understand it all, there's a 66 acre field next to it, 1300 ' from the nearest house it would seem to me to be an appropriate situation for that variance. Especially when you consider the 5 criteria for granting a variance in my opinion this would be a reasonable request.

Richard: I look at the first condition a little differently. I think if you make an exception, you are saying he's an exception but nobody else can get that same exception. I'm uncomfortable with that.

Zac: You mean the exception in the conditions?

Richard: What it says is would you apply the same standard to everybody's property and the answer has to be yes. The next guy that comes along and wants to put in an arena he says I don't want to do it the way the Township wants it done so he just puts it in, and here we are again. It can be a repetitive thing, why would we approve it for one and not the other, when the language is such that we abide by the language.

Zac: I agree that the language is the sole process for the variance in the first place. And when you go over the 5 factors required to grant a variance one by one In my opinion I think this situation meets those.

Richard: Number 4 says you're changing the intent of the ordinance.

Zac: I think the intent of it would be so someone doesn't put a riding arena on the property line right next to the neighbor's house. I'm not sure what other justification there would be that you could have a pasture there, but you can't have a riding arena there.

Jeff: We didn't create the problem. By putting the arena where you did without adhering to the setbacks in the ordinance, you created the problem. We do have ordinances and they are there for a reason. It's like the speed limit, if you go 80 miles an hour on M-52, but what happens when you get caught? You get a ticket. The rules are the rules.

Richard: I did some reading this afternoon from the American Planning Association Michigan Chapter "Zoning Board of Appeals Toolkit." Section V, page 39, "Determine the validity of the difficulty or hardship. Property owners have certain rights to enjoy the use of the property within the limits of the

ordinance. They are not, however, entitled to special privileges simply because compliance with the ordinance is inconvenient. The function of the ZBA is to uphold the provisions of the ordinance; it is not to allow someone to find a way around the ordinance to avoid an inconvenience." I do believe that no one is entitled to special privileges simply because compliance with the ordinance is inconvenient.

Sally: And at this point it is just the distance between the property, is that what you are talking about?

Richard: The setbacks are in the ordinance so we go by the setbacks. They apply to all of us.

Leslie: I think what Tom was trying to figure out if there was a way to get around the concerns that they have with making the corral smaller without needing the variance, such as moving the arena on one end so that you could use it for its intended purpose without necessarily violating the setbacks. Or is there is a lesser variance that could be granted that otherwise accomplishes the scope of what they are seeking to do. You need to treat this property as if the arena had not been built yet. You have to treat it as if it were a blank slate.

Judy: Is this a situation where they could request an amendment? Such as, for corrals or arenas that there is a lesser setback for properties that abut vacant land. I know the intent was to keep corrals and arenas away from homes. Do they have a way to request an amendment that would say there needs to be a 100' setback unless it abuts vacant land?

Leela: But who's to say that it will always be vacant land.

Denver: Is there a possibility of buying some of that adjoining farmland?

Steve: It's a possibility.

Sally: Would that solve the issue of being able to use the arena?

Leslie: I think it would be best if you purchase adjoining land to do a lot line adjustment instead of land splits.

Tom: The neighboring property would have to be split and then combined with the Bauders property.

Sally: My next question is, if this was to be done would we be able to do our events? Are you just saying yes to one problem and no to the other?

Leslie: Right now, we are considering the variance as to using the exercise corrals for the horses you board and keep on the property. The ZBA's decision was that the events are not permitted in that district. So the variance would apply to the exercise corral with the horses you currently board and keep on the property.

Tom: If you are considering purchasing land from an adjoining landowner, be careful not to violate the 4 to 1 ratio or some other problem that might arise.

Judy: Public comment is now open. There were none.

Public comment is closed.

Judy: We have to look at the 5 findings that we need to apply. .

#1-There is a practical difficulty or difficulties applicable to the property involved that do not apply general to other properties or class of uses in the same district or zone. – The ZBA agreed that this is not

a unique situation and they need to adhere to the rules other neighboring properties in the township need to adhere to. This situation was self-created.

#2-That such variance is necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone and vicinity. – The ZBA agreed that this does not apply.

#3-That the granting of such variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located. – The ZBA agreed that this does not apply.

#4-That the granting of such variance will not adversely affect the purposes or objectives in this Ordinance. – The ZBA felt that the granting of this variance would adversely affect the purposes or objectives in our Ordinance. The request to change the setbacks over 70 feet is not a small variance. The corral could be located or moved elsewhere on the property without violating the setback.

#5- In consideration of all appeals and all proposed variations to this ordinance, the Board of Zoning Appeals shall, before making any variations from the Ordinance in a specific case, first determine that proposed variation will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, or unreasonable increase the congestion in public streets, or increase the danger of fire or endanger the public safety, or unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area, or in any other respect impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township of White Oak. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to give or grant the Board the power or authority to alter or change the Zoning Ordinance or the Zoning Map, such power and authority being reserved to the Township Board of The Township of White Oak in the manner provided by law.” – The ZBA determined that this does not apply in this situation.

A motion was made by acting Chairperson Judy McManaman, seconded by Jeffrey Steckelberg, “Motion to deny the variance from the setback requirement in section 4.40 of Zoning Ordinance for a special horse training corral. Roll call vote as follows:

John Roger Graf – Nay

Richard Morrison-Yes

Jeffrey Steckelberg-Yes

Denver Doxtator-Nay

Judy McManaman-Yes

Motion to deny the Variance has passed with a 3-2 vote.

Public Comment: Bob McManaman, “this was a learning experience. The 3-2 vote shows that the township wants to work with you.

Sally: Thank you.

The Board read the minutes from the June 30, 2022 hearing. Richard made the motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Roger. Motion carried 5-0.

Judy made the motion to adjourn the hearing, seconded by Jeffrey. Motion carried 5-0.

Meeting adjourned at 8:41 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Leela A. Vernon, Clerk/recording secretary for the Zoning Board of Appeals
White Oak Township