



1                   **PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP MEETING MINUTES – January 10, 2023**

2  
3                   **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

4                   Vice Chair Davis called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and  
5 Secretary Loeks called the roll. The following were present: Vice Chair Davis, Secretary Loeks,  
6 Commissioners Roberts, Eavey, and Matson. Also present was Zoning Administrator Lovely,  
7 and three interested persons. Chair Corfman arrived at 5:20 p.m. Absent Commissioner  
8 Buckham.  
9

10                   **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

11                   Jack Gesmundo representing American Village Builders (AVB) presented a tentative re-  
12 phasing plan for the Turning Stone Development off S 6<sup>th</sup> Street, south of Q Avenue. With  
13 construction continuing on homes within phase 1, Mr. Gesmundo stated that they would like to  
14 phase the project in such a way that rearranges phases 2 and 3 to be submitted, reviewed and  
15 approved at once, but would like to start on phase 2 home construction prior to beginning the  
16 public roadway extension connecting to Texas Heights that will be a part of phase 3. Mr.  
17 Gesmundo cited market conditions as a driving factor for the re-phasing, aimed at starting with  
18 the smaller phase two comprised of only 12 units first. AVB is projecting a 40 percent drop in  
19 sales in 2023 due to interest rates.

20                   Mr. Lovely stated that staff reviewed this phasing and determined that there may be a  
21 couple potential approaches. The first being to only issue permits for 6 or 7 homes in phase 2  
22 up to the maximum allowable 50 lots or allow for an emergency access drive to be constructed  
23 in the meantime connecting to Texas Heights that would allow for permits to be pulled beyond  
24 50 lots.

25                   Mr. Loeks suggested that the building permits be limited to 50 until a permanent secondary  
26 connection to Texas Heights is completed.

27                   Commissioner Roberts agreed with Mr. Loeks' suggestion.

28                   Mr. Eavey asked Mr. Gesmundo if they had considered starting phase 3 in which Mr.  
29 Gesmundo responded that they preferred starting with phase 2 with only 12 units due to the  
30 current uncertainty in the market.

31                   There were no other public comments.  
32

33                   **SET AGENDA**

34                   Vice Chair Davis reviewed the agenda. Motion by Loeks, seconded by Matson, motion  
35 carried, to adopt the agenda as presented.  
36

37                   **MINUTES – December 13, 2022, Regular Meeting**

38                   Motion by Roberts, seconded by Loeks, motion carried, to approve the Minutes of the  
39 December 13, 2022, Planning Commission Regular Meeting, as submitted.  
40

41  
42                   **NEW BUSINESS**

43                   2023 Planning Commission Meeting Schedule Amendment

44                   The Commission reviewed the amended meeting schedule for 2023 with Mr. Lovely noting  
45 that he made a mistake with the previous version of the meeting and submittal deadline dates  
46 for the month of February.

47 A motion was made by Loeks, seconded by Eavey, motion carried, to approve the amended  
48 2023 meeting dates and times as presented.

49  
50 Draft Miscellaneous Ordinance Amendments

51 Mr. Lovely briefly went over the draft miscellaneous ordinance amendments and provided  
52 suggested changes.

53 **Section 36-2.2** Definitions.

54 Intent: Amendment to Private Road definition to state that private roads must meet  
55 RCKC and Township Access Management standards.

56 *Amend Private Road Definition*

57 *Road, private* means a private right-of-way or easement approved by the township as part of a  
58 PUD district, OSP project, site condominium development or other permitted development.  
59 Private roads shall meet current Road Commission of Kalamazoo County and Township Access  
60 Management standards.

61 *Discussion:*

62 No concerns from commissioners were voiced. Mr. Lovely moved on to the next section.

63 **Section 36-4.1** Accessory Uses, Buildings, and Structures in the Agricultural, Resource  
64 Conservation, and Residential Districts.

65 Intent: Explore allowing accessory buildings and structures without a principal use for  
66 parcels directly across from a riparian lot. Also explore allowing front yard accessory structures  
67 outside of subdivisions.

68 *Amend Section 36-4.1.1. B Option A*

69 Shall be operated and maintained on the same lot and under the same ownership as the  
70 principal use. An exception to this requirement for accessory buildings and structures can be  
71 applied for non-riparian lots with frontage on a road or street also containing street side riparian  
72 lot frontages, subject to the following standards:

- 73 i. All other accessory building zoning requirements are met, except for lot coverage.  
74 Maximum allowable lot coverage for accessory buildings calculated as a percentage  
75 of side and rear yard areas shall instead be calculated based on the area of the entire  
76 lot.
- 77 ii. The non-riparian lot is under the same ownership and adjacent to the same body of  
78 water as the riparian lot containing the principal use.

79 *Amend Section 36-4.1.1. B Option B*

80 Shall be operated and maintained on the same lot and under the same ownership as the  
81 principal use. An exception to this requirement for accessory buildings and structures can be  
82 applied for non-riparian lots across the road or street from a riparian lot, within 250-feet of the  
83 parcel containing the principal use, subject to the following standards:

- 84 i. All other accessory building zoning requirements are met, except for lot coverage.  
85 Maximum allowable lot coverage for accessory buildings calculated as a percentage  
86 of side and rear yard areas shall instead be calculated based on the area of the entire  
87 lot.
- 88 ii. Said parcel is under the same ownership as the riparian lot containing the principal  
89 use.
- 90 iii. The landowner shall record a deed restriction to the title with the county register of  
91 deeds which must contain the following:  
92 a. Date of approval of the Building Permit by the Building Official and Zoning  
93 Administrator.

- b. Legal description of both properties.
- c. A statement indicating that the in no case shall the two parcels be sold separately unless the accessory building is completely removed, including the foundation.

*Discussion:*

Mr. Lovely explained the difference between Options A and B. Option B limits vicinity of accessory buildings and structures to 250-feet down the street from a riparian lot, whereas Option A allows for accessory buildings and structures across the street from any riparian lot on the same body of water.

Commissioner Roberts expressed concerns over Option B limiting the distance to 250-feet down the street and felt more comfortable with Option A.

Mr. Eavey expressed support for limiting the distance to 250-feet.

Mr. Loeks stated a concern for not having a distance limitation because residents are more likely to take care of their property if it is within eyesight. Maintenance is the primary concern lacking a stronger maintenance code.

Mr. Davis opened up the floor for comments from the public noticing interest.

Joanne Potts shared examples of other surrounding communities not limiting stand alone accessory structures. She indicated that the Township should not limit who can buy and sell a lot with a stand-alone accessory structure.

Chair Corfman asked how other communities regulate accessory structures if they are not located on the same lot as a principal structure.

Mr. Lovely clarified that not all surrounding communities require a principal building on the same lot as an accessory building or structure.

Mr. Davis explained that only non-conforming lots have difficulty selling for the purpose of a principal building because of the size of the lot and coinciding dimensional regulations. The real restriction is that accessory buildings or structures cannot be built on properties without a principal use. He asked Joanne Potts if her preference was for the 250-foot restriction, or no restriction.

Joanne Potts expressed that there should be no restrictions as to who can purchase a property with a standalone barn. If she wants to sell the lots separately, she feels that she should be able to do so without any restriction.

Joanne Becker stated that her daughter owns homes on both Eagle and Crooked Lakes. Hypothetically, her daughter would not be allowed to purchase the property she owns containing only an accessory building if this code were to limit who can own such properties. She thinks the current and proposed restrictions are not fair.

Mr. Lovely clarified that as currently drafted, you would not be able to sell a lot containing a standalone accessory building without demolishing the structure first if the proposed vicinity criteria are not met.

Chair Corfman expressed concerns over property owners living across the street from riparian lots not wanting to live right next to barns as opposed to a single-family residence.

Joanne Potts explained the existence of many similar scenarios surrounding the lakes already.

Commissioner Roberts stated that riparian lots are unique, with unique storage challenges for recreational equipment such as rowboats that currently stay on the riparian lot and often can be seen in peoples' yards.

Mr. Loeks agreed that this has been a problem for years, especially during the winter for docks and boat lifts, etc.

140 Chair Corfman stated that he understands not regulating who you can buy and sell to as  
141 proposed in the current language. He also asked if this would apply to county primary roads and  
142 that this is an important distinction as he would not want to see this along Q Avenue or PQ  
143 Avenue.

144 Mr. Lovely stated that he is working on the new Riparian Ordinance and that public feedback  
145 would be collected in February of this year. If commissioners are not comfortable ruling on this  
146 at this time, it could be tabled and rolled in with the Riparian Ordinance updates in the upcoming  
147 months. The concern being that the process could take some time, even a year to two years as  
148 evidenced by the Corners Business District Amendments. Tabling would give an opportunity for  
149 more input, but would not bring a resolution to Potts' and Beckers' request for some time.

150 Mr. Loeks and Chair Corfman asked if this could be a special exception use.

151 Mr. Eavey stated that conceptually, he cannot understand why we would allow this for lots  
152 across the street from riparian lots, but not a couple blocks away in a location where this might  
153 be more appropriate. He feels that this should be permitted on a broader scale.

154 Commissioner Roberts commented that she felt that commissioners supporting this on other  
155 lots throughout the Township would not be likely.

156 Chair Corfman expressed that if we allow this for lots across the street from riparian lots,  
157 then we should consider allowing this Township-wide for the sake of equality.

158 Mr. Lovely stated that restricting the buying and selling of lots is not something that he is  
159 interested in taking on and would be very difficult logistically at a local level. Suggestion to focus  
160 on the location of where this would be allowed in a way that does not necessitate regulation on  
161 buying and selling. He sought direction from Commissioners as to how to proceed with this as  
162 the decision is in their hands. Many approaches have been discussed.

163 Vice Chair Davis stated that he supports the idea of equally applying this across the  
164 Township, without special treatment to riparian lots, if we were to move in this direction.

165 Commissioner Roberts mentioned "barndominiums" that were built as a barn but the  
166 minimum living space was provided within the barn to make it a principal building.

167 Mr. Lovely confirmed that this is permissible so long as the minimum floor area is provided.

168 Chair Corfman stated he has concerns for the type or pressure that would be applied to staff  
169 if allowing standalone accessory buildings was approved. He feels that this will get out of  
170 control, but we need to figure out a way to control this in such a way to maintain better  
171 relationships between neighbors.

172 Mr. Eavey and Commissioner Roberts suggested that it may be best to wait to until we can  
173 receive additional input during the Riparian Ordinance updates in the coming months.

174 Mr. Lovely reminded commissioners that the updates will likely take some time, but this can  
175 be the approach so long as commissioners agree.

176 Mr. Matson expressed a concern for maintenance of standalone accessory buildings if the  
177 owner does not live close or across the street.

178 Joanne Becker expressed her interest in completing a text amendment now and not waiting  
179 for the updates to the Riparian Ordinance. If this does not proceed now, what are her options.

180 Mr. Lovely stated that because standalone accessory buildings and structures are currently  
181 prohibited, there are no viable options outside the construction of the aforementioned  
182 "barndominium" – an accessory dwelling unit within an accessory building.

183 After more discussion, Vice Chair Davis recommended that we table this until the Riparian  
184 Ordinance updates to allow for more time to consider this. Commissioners agreed to wait for  
185 further public input and to allow for more time to consider ramifications of allowing some form of  
186 standalone accessory buildings.

187 *Amend Section 36-4.1.2 Front Yard Accessory Buildings and Structures*

188 One front yard accessory building and/or structures are permitted on non-riparian parcels in  
189 the A, RC, R-1, R-1A, and R- 2 zones if the following standards can be met:

- 190 i. The accessory building and/or structures, together, may not exceed 2% of the front  
191 yard building envelope or 900 square feet, whichever is greater.
- 192 ii. The accessory building and/or structures must be setback twice the required front  
193 yard setback for the district where it is located.

194 B. To maintain the traditional residential character and customary front yards found in  
195 subdivisions and site condominiums, front yard accessory buildings and structures are  
196 prohibited on lots within platted subdivisions and building sites within single-family site  
197 condominiums, except as otherwise indicated in Section 36-3.4 (add hyperlink).

198 C. Special Exception Use. An otherwise permissible front yard accessory building or  
199 structure that does not comply with the applicable size or lot coverage requirements may be  
200 permitted as a special exception use if approved by the Planning Commission subject to Section  
201 36-6.3 and if the following conditions are met:

- 202 i. The accessory building and/or structures are setback at least twice the required front  
203 yard setback for the zoning district in which it is located.
- 204 ii. The accessory building and/or structures shall not have a material adverse impact on  
205 surrounding properties.

206 *Discussion:*

207 Mr. Lovely explained that a recent application for a sport court in the front yard along W Q  
208 Avenue was received as part of a building permit application. Based on the current code, this is  
209 not permissible, so the request was denied. The applicant proceeded to share at least five other  
210 locations throughout the Township where this was either permitted or the owner installed the  
211 sport court, and the Township continues to ignore the code violation.

212 Mr. Loeks asked how large the sport courts typically are.

213 Mr. Lovely explained that sizes vary and that a pickleball court is approximately 880 square  
214 feet. The restrictions proposed would be very similar to current front yard accessory building  
215 structures, and outside of subdivisions. The current definitions suggest that sport courts are in  
216 fact accessory structures – recreational equipment that is not allowed in the front yard.

217 Chair Corfman, Vice Chair Davis, Loeks and Roberts were aware that there are numerous  
218 examples of this throughout the township and that this request is generally reasonable.

219 Vice Chair Davis pointed out that there is currently a standalone sport court in his subdivision  
220 and that it appears to benefit the community, his kids and others play on the court often.

221 Chair Corfman stated that he struggles with a sport court meeting the definition of an  
222 accessory structure.

223 Mr. Lovely further explained his interpretation and commissioners agreed. He encouraged  
224 that the Planning Commission consider their interest level and that he could refine the criteria  
225 and present a cleaner draft ordinance at one of the upcoming meetings.

226 Mr. Loeks stated that we should consider allowing this in subdivisions if there is enough  
227 room on the lot.

228 After more discussion, commissioners agreed to table the review until a future meeting, and  
229 to also consider a definition for sport courts specifically.

230 Mr. Lovely stated that he would work on the draft ordinance and present updates to  
231 Commissioners at an upcoming meeting with minimal agenda items.

232  
233

234 **Section 36-5.9** Accessory Management

235 Intent: Modified to clarify the requirements for access connectors and public/private roads.  
236 Concrete curb and gutter to be required for all per Commissioner comments at the December  
237 13, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting.

238 *Amend Section 36-5.9.5.A.vii*

239 All access connectors will be paved with hot mix asphalt or concrete. Concrete curb and  
240 gutter shall be required to match current Road Commission of Kalamazoo County concrete curb  
241 and gutter specifications. Continuation of bituminous valley gutter to the nearest intersection, if  
242 present on an existing access connector, may be approved by the Planning Commission.

243 *Amend Section 36-5.9.7 and 36-5.9.7.b.i*

244 Roads. The Planning Commission may determine if the arrangement of roads must continue  
245 existing roads from adjoining areas into the proposed condominium development. Where  
246 adjoining areas are not developed, the arrangement of proposed condominium roads may be  
247 extended to the subject parcel(s) boundary for the future projection extension of roads as long  
248 as the design discourages use by through traffic. Permanent dead-end roads must be limited to  
249 1,320' in length for adequate fire and emergency vehicle access. The Planning Commission  
250 may waive these standards, subject to the applicant demonstrating that adequate public safety  
251 access will be provided and approval from the Texas Township Fire Department. All proposed  
252 roads must be constructed to current Road Commission of Kalamazoo County standards.  
253 Concrete curb and gutter shall be required for all public and private roads. Continuation of  
254 bituminous valley gutter to the nearest intersection, if present on an existing road or street, may  
255 be approved by the Planning Commission. Private roads may be allowed by the Township if  
256 they will not adversely affect public health, safety or welfare. In determining whether private  
257 roads are allowable, the Township must require the following:

258 b. The private road must be constructed to Road Commission of Kalamazoo County design  
259 and geometric standards with the following exceptions:

260 i. Design standards mean roadbed and other construction-related details and standards  
261 that shall follow Road Commission of Kalamazoo County design standards. Concrete  
262 curb and gutter shall be required for all public and private roads. Continuation of  
263 bituminous valley gutter to the nearest intersection, if present on an existing road,  
264 may be approved by the Planning Commission.

265 *Discussion:*

266 Mr. Matson pointed out a location where "streets" were still present, instead of "roads".  
267 Subject to that change, commissioners agreed with the proposed amendments.

268 **Section 36-5.12** Stub Roads and Cul-de-sacs

269 Intent: Modified to clarify the requirements for access connectors and public/private roads.  
270 Concrete curb and gutter to be required for all per Commissioner comments at the December  
271 13, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting.

272 *Amend Section 36-5.12.2.A.i*

273 Be constructed to current Road Commission of Kalamazoo County and Township Access  
274 Management standards, and end at the boundary of the platted or condominium subdivision;  
275 and

276 *Amend Section 36-5.12.2.A.i*

277 Be constructed to current Road Commission of Kalamazoo County and Township Access  
278 Management standards, and end at the boundary of the platted or condominium subdivision;  
279 and

280

281 *Discussion:*  
282 Commissioners briefly discussed and agreed with the proposed amendments.  
283 **Section 36-6.1 Site Plan Review**  
284 Intent: Modified to clarify the requirements for access connectors and public/private roads.  
285 Concrete curb and gutter to be required for all per Commissioner comments at the December  
286 13, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting. Clean up proposed for two separate sections to match  
287 authorities granted in Table 36-6.1.6.  
288 *Amend Section 36-6.1.4.B.i.b*  
289 Roads, either public or private, and access connectors serving more than one structure, or  
290 ten dwelling units must be constructed to the current Road Commission of Kalamazoo County  
291 and Township Access Management standards.  
292 *Amend Section 36-6.1.6*  
293 Conformity to an Approved Site Plan. Development of the subject parcel shall be in complete  
294 conformity with the approved site plan and any amendments thereto approved by the Planning  
295 Commission or Zoning Administrator in accordance with authorities granted in Table 36-6.1.1. A  
296 building permit must be obtained, and onsite construction commenced within 12 months of site  
297 plan approval. No site work shall be undertaken until a building permit has been issued. If  
298 substantial progress has not been made within 12 months of issuance of a building permit, the  
299 site plan shall become void, and the developer shall make a new application for approval before  
300 proceeding. Substantial progress is defined as completion of footings and foundation wall to  
301 grade elevation. If a site plan becomes void, the site shall be restored to preconstruction  
302 conditions. The Planning Commission is authorized to require a deposit of security in  
303 accordance with Section 36-6.1.8 as a condition of site plan approval to assure that conditions  
304 on the site are restored in the event an approved site plan becomes void. The Planning  
305 Commission may grant a 12- month extension of the previous approval if requested prior to the  
306 expiration of the site plan and if it finds that the approved plan continues to meet current Zoning  
307 Ordinance standards.  
308 *Amend Section 36-6.1.7*  
309 Amendment to Site Plan. A proposed amendment or modification to a previously approved  
310 site plan may shall be submitted for review by the Planning Commission or Zoning  
311 Administrator in accordance with authorities granted in Table 36-6.1.1.  
312 **Section 36-6.2 Site Condominium Plan Review**  
313 Intent: Modified to clarify the requirements for public/private roads. Concrete curb and gutter  
314 to be required for all per Commissioner comments at the December 13, 2022, Planning  
315 Commission Meeting.  
316 *Amend Section 36-6.2.4.B.i*  
317 Roads  
318 *Amend Section 36-6.2.4.B.i.d*  
319 All roads, public and private, must be constructed to the current Road Commission of  
320 Kalamazoo County standards. Concrete curb and gutter shall be required for all public and  
321 private roads. Continuation of bituminous valley gutter to the nearest intersection, if present on  
322 an existing road, may be approved by the Planning Commission.  
323 *Amend Section 36-6.2.4.B.e.2.A*  
324 Design standards mean roadbed and other construction-related details and standards that  
325 shall follow Road Commission of Kalamazoo County design standards. Concrete curb and  
326 gutter shall be required for all private roads. Continuation of bituminous valley gutter to the

327 nearest intersection, if present on an existing road, may be approved by the Planning  
328 Commission.

329 **Section 36-6.2A** CBD Mixed Use Site Condominium Plan Review

330 Intent: Modified to clarify the requirements for access connectors and public/private roads.  
331 Concrete curb and gutter to be required for all per Commissioner comments at the December  
332 13, 2022, Planning Commission Meeting.

333 *Amend Section 36-6.2A.5.C.i*

334 Roads, either public or private, and access connectors, must be constructed to the current  
335 Road Commission of Kalamazoo County and Township Access Management standards.

336 **Section 16-84** Township board review; preliminary plat; final approval

337 Intent: Modified to clarify the requirements for public/private roads. Concrete curb and gutter  
338 to be required for all per Commissioner comments at the December 13, 2022, Planning  
339 Commission Meeting.

340 *Amend Section 16-84.a.2*

341 All roads and streets shall require concrete curb and gutter constructed to current Road  
342 Commission of Kalamazoo County Standards.

343 *Discussion:*

344 Commissioners briefly discussed and agreed with the proposed amendments.  
345

346

Draft Sign Ordinance Amendment

347 On September 23, 2022, the Township's Attorney forwarded a memo outlining the ways in  
348 which the current Sign Ordinance needs to be brought into compliance with the United States  
349 Supreme Court's decision in Reed v Town of Gilbert. If a sign ordinance treats political speech  
350 differently from other forms of non-commercial speech, such ordinance will be deemed  
351 unconstitutional. The memo is currently classified as Attorney-Client Privilege/Confidential and  
352 was distributed to Planning Commissioners on November 22, 2022, for reference. The  
353 Attorney's recommendation to the Township is to amend the ordinance to impose content-  
354 neutral restrictions that are uniformly applied to all non-commercial signs. In lieu of the  
355 Attorney's memo, I have attached a syllabus of the case, including opinions of the court.

356 Mr. Lovely presented the draft ordinance amendments and presented information to  
357 commissioners regarding differences between the commercial and non-commercial speech and  
358 correlated that to how this applies to signs. He shared that a lot of the changes shown in the  
359 current draft are not absolutely necessary based on the Attorney's recommendation. Some  
360 changes are necessary and others are optional in an effort to come up with an ordinance that is  
361 content neutral for commercial and non-commercial signs.

362 *Discussion:*

363 Chair Corfman asked if Mr. Lovely could draft a second version showing only necessary  
364 changes, rather than walking through each change and discussing each item.

365 Mr. Lovely agreed to create a second option and present it at the next possible Planning  
366 Commission Meeting to continue the review of the draft ordinance amendments.

367 Commissioners briefly discussed and agreed with Chair Corfman's and Mr. Lovely's  
368 proposed approach.  
369

370

**OLD BUSINESS**

371 Corners Business District Final Draft Ordinance Review



372 Mr. Lovely provided Commissioners with the Draft Corners Business District 1-4-2023  
373 explaining that the DDA approved of providing bike racks for each development and benches at  
374 250-foot intervals as currently drafted at the December 29, 2022, DDA Meeting.

375 **F. DESIGN STANDARDS**

376 *iii Landscape and streetscape elements*

377 h. Benches and bike racks

378 *Discussion:*

379 Mr. Lovely asked Commissioners if they approved of the current draft ordinance, now having  
380 DDA approval for initially funding benches and bike racks as stated in the draft ordinance.  
381 Commissioners agreed that the current draft was acceptable. Mr. Lovely stated that a Public  
382 Hearing will be scheduled for the February 14, 2023, Workshop Meeting to allow enough time  
383 for public noticing.  
384

385 **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

386 Mr. Eavey, citing Jack Gesmundo’s earlier comments regarding a decline in sales and  
387 construction, asked Commissioner Roberts and Mr. Lovely if they were seeing a similar decline  
388 in inquiries, applications, etc.

389 Mr. Lovely stated that there has been a decline in inquiries over the holidays and that this is  
390 different from his experience in Portage over the past few years. Texas Township is a different  
391 animal and it is still possible that development and inquiries will pick back up in the upcoming  
392 months. For now, we will focus our efforts on ordinance updates with private development is  
393 slow.

394 Commissioner Roberts stated the Board received 19 applications for the upcoming vacant  
395 trustee position. The search firm will narrow it down to eight, with the applicants remaining  
396 anonymous. The Board will then narrow the group down to four and the four candidates will be  
397 made public knowledge. Board members plan to have a new superintendent selected before  
398 February 1, 2023. Bart Davis, Ken Toy, Michelle O’Neale and Todd Johnson will interview for  
399 the Township Board of Trustee vacancy on January 16, 2023.

400 Mr. Loeks stated he will be absent for the next two meetings.

401 Chair Corfman stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals will be meeting in January 2023 for  
402 administrative purposes.  
403

404 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

405 There were no comments  
406

407 **ADJOURNMENT**

408 Motion by Matson, seconded by Loeks, motion carried to adjourn the meeting. The meeting  
409 was adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.  
410

411 Submitted: January 19, 2023

Approved:

412 Zoning Administrator John Lovely  
413  
414