



**BOARD OF BUILDING AND ZONING APPEALS  
MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE PUBLIC HEARING  
May 31, 2022**

The hearing was called to order at 7:30 P.M. by Vice Chairman Swisher

PRESENT: Karen Alfred, Robert Swisher, Brad Lamb, Bryan Baesel, Cynthia Nolde  
ALSO PRESENT: Clerk of Commissions Nicolette Sackman and Westlake Law Director Michael Maloney

**DOCKET**

Docket: Elias Karsheh 2022-11, tabled 4/26/22

1464 Fitzroy, PP#21321042, Ward 1

Requesting to install a 325 sf pool house (pavilion) 7' off the side property line. §1211.04(O): outdoor structures shall be located in the rear yard and on lots under 20,000 sf the total maximum unenclosed structure is 200 sf; a 125 sf variance and §1211.04(g)(4): on lots under 20,000 sf the minimum setback from the side line shall be 10' a 3' side yard setback variance.

Mr. Harala (architect), sworn in by Mr. Maloney, explained the applicant is requesting variances for 200 sf of extra area for a pavilion and side yard setback for a bath house. The first set of plans submitted were approved and then revisions were made for a second set of plans that were submitted. When they received approval they thought it was for the second set of drawings but it was for the first set so the wrong set of plans were mistakenly constructed. He explained the pavilion is 200 sf but the overhangs are 125 sf. The overhangs are 1' at the rear and 5' next to the pool. The homeowners' association has no objection and Mr. Harala submitted a letter. He stated the HOA polled the neighbors asking if they had any objections. There were no objections but a request was made for a higher privacy fence (6' tall) on the left side of the property installed, which does not require a variance. He presented a picture of the type of fence that will be installed. Additional landscape will be installed along the side of the bath house where a variance is being requested to provide more privacy.

Members of the board discussed the proposal. The fence post holes have been started, and both the bath house and pavilion were already constructed. It was questioned how large the parcel was, but Mr. Harala did not have an answer. They questioned what was approved versus what was constructed. Mr. Harala stated the approved plan had a 10' setback but he knew the revision would require a variance. The second set of drawings were not reviewed and the approval was based off the first set of drawings. Members of the board questioned if the first set of plans the building department reviewed met the requirements. Mr. Harala stated the bath house did but the pavilion needed an area variance. The overhang size was discussed, which Mr. Harala stated was 125 sf with a 1' and 5' overhang. The drawings given to the board showed a 2' and 4' overhang so the board did not know what was correct as statements made did not match the plans submitted to the board. It was questioned if the drawings reflected what was built or were what Mr. Harala referred to as a second version that was never reviewed. He stated the drawings were correct but the overhang was 1' and 5'. It was questioned if the pavilion also had been built, which it had been. The board discussed that looking at the plans that the bath house could have been constructed outside of the setback and questioned the reason why a 3' variance was necessary. Mr. Harala stated that they thought they were going from a different set of plans, and he stated that set of plans still required a variance for the pavilion. It was questioned what the HOA approved – drawings or site. Mr. Harala stated they reviewed the property and drawings but the board questioned which set of drawings the HOA

reviewed as multiple ones have been mentioned. It was also noted the HOA letter notes neighbors did not object but did not state which neighbors as no names or address were noted or letters received from said neighbors. The location of the pool equipment was questioned and Mr. Harala stated what was shown on the plans is not correct as it was moved to another location. The board was not comfortable voting on the requests as it needed to be clarified what exactly was built, correct as built drawings needed to be provided, what neighbors did not object, what was approved verses what was built without comforting to what was approved. Mr. Harala advised the plans submitted to the board were correct. Mr. Harala was told what was submitted was not correct as he stated the overhang was different, the pool equipment was in a different location and they questioned what else was not correctly shown on the plans compared to what was built. Correct plans were requested to be submitted so the board can review the proposal and make an informed decision. Ms. Sackman advised that Mr. Harala should contact her during the week to clarify what needs to be submittedw.

Motion: Mr. Swisher moved, seconded by Mr. Lamb to table the request until June 28, 2022.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Docket: Mark and Katharine Delorean 2022-12, tabled 4/26/22

22985 Detroit Rd., PP21425009, Ward 1

Requesting to construct a 389 sf garage addition 15' off the east side property line, resulting in a total of 1,667 sf of garage area. §1211.33(a): an estate lot shall have a 25' minimum side yard setback and 50' sum total of side yards, garage area shall not exceed 1,400 sf; a **10' side yard setback variance** and a **267 sf area variance**. The existing dwelling is 27' 10" off the west property line so the sum total of the side yards will be 42' 10"; a **7'2" variance for the sum total of side yards**.

Applicant sent a letter requesting to be tabled to June 28, 2022.

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Lamb to table the request until June 28, 2022.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Docket: Zachary Smith 2022-13, tabled 4/26/22

27656 Bryandale Dr., PP#21208026, Ward 3

Requesting to install a 4' tall fence in the side yard of this corner lot, 1' from the planned right-of-way line. §1211.04(b)(3): fences may be permitted along the side lot line to a height of not more than 6' above the average finished grade except that on a corner lot, no fence shall be located within 25' from the planned right-of way line; a **24' side yard setback variance**.

Mrs. Smith, sworn in by Mr. Maloney, explained she is seeking a setback variance for a fence on her corner yard. She has five kids and a dog so she would like a fence around her back yard. The street that is adjacent to her property is a stub street the length of her property and has an emergency access gate as it is not a through street. The emergency access is for safety forces to access the condos behind her property. If she were to put the fence 25' off the planned right-of-way it would be in the middle of her rear yard and she would lose a lot of usable area in the rear yard. It would also not be visually appealing in the required location. The fence is not a privacy fence and is a 4' tall picket fence where visibility will not be impaired. Her neighbors do not oppose her request.

Discussion ensued. Members of the board were in favor of the fence if the corner along the two streets was changed to a 45° angle. Mrs. Smith asked for clarification and it was explained what the board is requesting. She was advised to submit a revised plan to the building department that complies with the condition of the variance request so they can issue a permit.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – no
2. Whether the variance is substantial – yes
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – no
6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance –no
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved, seconded by Ms. Alfred to approve a 24' side yard setback variance with the condition there is a 5' x 5' corner added (by the street at an angle to maintain sight clearance)

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Docket: David DiFrancesco 2022-14

1825 Clague Rd., PP#21426023, Ward 1

Requesting to construct a second detached garage on a lot which currently has a detached garage which will result in a combined total of garage areas equaling 1,188 sf. §1211.04(a)(2): on lots more than 20,000 but less than 40,000 sf the maximum garage area is 1,000 sf.; and private garages may be attached or detached, but not both, and shall be limited to one garage area; a **variance for two detached garage areas** and **an area variance of 188 sf.**

*Note: No height has been presented at this time. Existing garage pad has not been approved by the Building Department for use as a garage foundation.*

Mr. and Mrs. DiFrancesco were sworn in by Mr. Maloney. Mr. DiFrancesco explained they would like to construct a second garage in the location of an existing pad. They purchased the house a year ago and the previous owner demolished the garage in that location and constructed a new structure that was used as a hobby shop. Mr. DiFrancesco also uses the structure uses as a hobby shop and stores two antique cars in the garage. They currently park the vehicles they use on the old concrete pad, which needs to be replaced as it is a trip hazard. In the winter the vehicles can be covered in ice during bad weather. He didn't know he couldn't have a second garage since there is an existing concrete pad where there used to be a garage. They would like a second garage so they have safe access to their vehicles and so they stay ice free in the winter. He presented photos of his property, what the old garage looked like and noted that the new garage provides the neighbors with privacy. He advised the height of the garage will comply with code requirements.

Members of the board wondered if there was a variance granted for the newer garage built by the previous owner and if there were any conditions. It was uncertain but Mr. DiFrancesco commented that garage could have been built larger in area, up to 1,000 sf but did not. Members of the commission struggles with

permitting two garage areas. It was questioned why the applicant could not expand the existing garage as they have a deep lot. Mr. DiFrancesco explained there is approximately a 2' drop in grade adjacent to the existing garage, which creates a hardship and the old concrete pad is the best location for the requested second garage. The concrete will be replaced with the construction of a new garage. It was discussed if there was a way to build the second garage is a different location and somehow connect it to the existing garage so it would be one garage area. Mr. DiFrancesco stated that he could look at that option but was concerned how the rood lines would tie into one another.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact for two garage areas:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – yes
2. Whether the variance is substantial – yes
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – no
6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance –yes
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – no

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact for the additional area:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – yes
2. Whether the variance is substantial – no
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – no
6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance –yes
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to approve a variance for two detached garage areas.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred

Nays: Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde, motion failed

Motion: Mr. Swisher moved, seconded by Mrs. Nolde to approve an area variance of 188 sf.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Swisher, Basel

Nays: Alfred, Lamb, Nolde, motion failed

Docket: Kathy Blouch 2022-15

3389 Arbor Way, PP#21601033, Ward 6

Requesting to install a generator 5' off the side property line. §1211.20(e): central air conditioner, heat pump, etc. may be located in the side yard of a lot providing such units shall be no closer than 10' from the side lot line; a 5' side yard setback variance.

Mr. Betts (contractor), sworn in by Mr. Maloney, explained he is seeking a 5' setback variance for a generator. The setback between the house and the side property line is 9' so a 10' setback is not possible. The unit needs to be spaced away from the house and the proposed location is where the utility connections are located. There isn't another location for the unit.

Members of the board discussed that the style unit is quieter than older models and the test run and be set to a time that would not impact the neighbor. Mr. Betts explained the unit will be screened and in its current location it cannot be seen.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – no
2. Whether the variance is substantial – no
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – n/a
6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance – yes but would require a hardship
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to approve a 5' side yard setback variance with the condition that the unit is screened from visibility.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Docket: Arcadia Suite Home Congregate Living Facility 2022-16

3400 Dover Center Road, PP#21505002, Ward 4

Applicant appeals the decision of the Director of Inspections regarding: §1303.06 which prohibits the use of type 5 (wood) construction for the proposed use. The existing structure is an existing single-family residence and the proposed project will cause a change of use to an R-4 use (adult senior residential care home – 8 beds). *The board will only address the variance request for the proposed use in an existing house with type 5 construction.*

Ms. Dinary, Arcadia Suite Home Congregate Living Facility, and Westlake Building Inspector Donald Grayem were sworn in by Mr. Maloney. Ms. Dinary explained the existing single family house will be transformed into an adult group home for seniors. This is not a nursing home and will be similar to a single family home. Per the state of Ohio codes this use is permitted to have up to 16 residents but only eight residents will be in this home. The state also allows Type 5 construction for this type of a use but the City of Westlake has stricter regulations. The seniors that will reside in the home are active and able body but need assistance not nursing care. The house will have a commercial sprinkler and alarm system and there are protocols in place for evacuations. The exterior of the house will retain the character and

look of a single family house.

Mr. Maloney advised that the use is permitted and the variance request is to only address the use in a Type 5 (wood) constructed house.

Mr. Grayem explained that Westlake has adopted some additional restrictions above the state building code restrictions. The Type 5 material is permitted per state regulations just not in Westlake based on the city's codes. Legally Westlake can have stricter codes and he supports the variance request. There are other same uses in the city with this material. He added that a hotel in the city can be constructed with Type 5 materials but this use can't and requires a variance.

Members of the board discussed the proposal and that the state allows the use in a wood structure. As proposed the use complies with all state requirements. Supervision is provided 24/7 the structure will have an alarm system and sprinkler. The board was not opposed to the request.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – n/a
2. Whether the variance is substantial – no
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – n/a
6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance –no
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to allow an R-4 use in a structure with Type 5 construction.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Basel, Nolde

Nays: Lamb, motion carried

Docket: Lisa Zayac 2022-17

25373 Brittany Circle, PP21327058, Ward 2

Requesting to construct a pavilion addition which enlarges the existing structure (house and pavilion) to a total footprint of 2,937 sf on a lot which is 13,416 sf in size. §1211.09: the maximum percent of lot coverage on a one-family dwelling shall be a maximum of 20 %; **variance of 254 sf on this lot (or 1.89%)**.

Mr. and Mrs. Zayac and Mr. Young (architect) were sworn in by Mr. Maloney. They explained the existing trellis structure over their patio is rotted and in disrepair. They are limited recreation space on their property and would like to construct a pavilion over their patio and remove the trellis. Since this is a covered attached structure to the house a lot coverage variance is required.

Members of the board discussed that there is an existing trellis attached to the house and this would not impact the character of the neighborhood.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – no
2. Whether the variance is substantial – no
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – n/a
6. Whether the property owner’s predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance – yes
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to approve a variance of 254 sf on this lot to allow an overage of 1.89% lot coverage.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Docket: Anthony Valore 2022-18

31001 Silveridge Trail, PP#21112048, Ward 6

Requesting to install a single-family dwelling 30’ off of the front right of way line. §1211.09:

minimum yard dimensions for a front yard in one-family districts is 50’; **a 20’ front yard setback variance.**

Mr. Valore sworn in by Mr. Maloney explained the lots are part of a new subdivision in Lands End South. On this parcel the city required an asphalt access drive to the retention basin to be installed rather than the grasscrete type of paver drives that he has installed for years in the past throughout other subdivisions. By using asphalt the rear yard was reduced by 20’ so he would like to move the building line closer to the right-of-way. He would like a variance to allow a 30’ front yard setback. The lot is on a cul-de-sac and moving the house up will actually visually line up the houses site line on the street. This also allows for some more usable rear yard. There is also a creek in the rear yard and steep grade changes.

Members of the board discussed the proposal. They reviewed the proposed setback, the retention basin access drive, grade changes and how the setback will impact the neighborhood.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – no
2. Whether the variance is substantial – yes
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – n/a
6. Whether the property owner’s predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance – no
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to grant a 20' front yard setback variance.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Docket: Anthony Valore 2022-19

31021 Silveridge Trail, PP#21112049, Ward 6

Requesting to install a single-family dwelling 30' off of the front right of way line. §1211.09: minimum yard dimensions for a front yard in one-family districts is 50'; **a 20' front yard setback variance.**

Mr. Valore explained this parcel is next to the previous parcel. Granting a front yard setback for this lot will retain the line of site as noted for the adjacent lot. The rear yard of this lot is also limited due to the property grade and retention basin. Members of the board discussed this request is similar to Mr. Valore's previous request for the adjacent parcel.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – no
2. Whether the variance is substantial – yes
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – n/a
6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance – no
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to grant a 20' front yard setback variance.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Docket: Welcome House Inc. 2022-20

26082 Hilliard Blvd., PP#21319033, Ward 1

Requesting to install a generator 5' off the side property line. §1211.20(e): central air conditioner, heat pump, etc. may be located in the side yard of a lot providing such units shall be no closer than 10' from the side lot line; **a 5'side yard setback variance.**

Mr. Hoberg, sworn in by Mr. Maloney, explained the applicant is seeking a 5' setback variance for a generator. The house is setback 10' from the lot line so a variance is needed as the unit needs to be setback off the house. The rear corner of the neighbor's house is 62.5' away and the proposed location for the unit is where the utility connections are located. They looked at a location at the rear of the house but this area is fenced in for safety as it is a group home, so placing the unit in that location would not be desirable.

Mr. Timothy and Louis Crnjak (father and son), 26194 Hilliard Blvd., were sworn in by Mr. Maloney. They stated they were against the request; there have been noise issues in the past; they do not want any noise directed toward their house.

Members of the board discussed the proposal and the unit is a new unit which is quieter than older units.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – yes
2. Whether the variance is substantial – no
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no
5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – no
6. Whether the property owner’s predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance –yes
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Mr. Lamb moved, seconded by Ms. Alfred to approve a 5’ side yard setback variance with the condition that the unit is screened from visibility.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: Swisher motion carried

Docket: Bill and Kathy Osbourne 2022-21

2980 Waterfall Way, PP#21604062, Ward 6

Requesting to construct a 600 sf pavilion in size which is 21’ tall. §1211.04(O): outdoor structures shall be located in the rear yard and on lots from 40,000 to under 60,000 sf the total maximum unenclosed structure is 400 sf with a maximum height of 15’; a 200 sf area variance and a 6’ height variance.

Mr. Osborn and Mr. Liggett (architect) were sworn in by Mr. Maloney. Mr. Liggett explained the applicant owns over two acres but the rear portion of his property is a parcel that is in Avon not Westlake. Due to that, only the property that is in Westlake can be used to calculation lot area to determine how large the pavilion can be. If both parcels were in Westlake a variance would not be necessary as it would comply with code. He reviewed the site plan and proposed structure. The design will complement the house and be a nice feature on the property.

Members of the board discussed the proposal and did not raise any issues.

After a careful review of the evidence and testimony, the Board made the following findings of fact:

1. Whether the property in question yield a reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without a variance – yes
2. Whether the variance is substantial – no
3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance – no
4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services – no

5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction – no
6. Whether the property owner’s predicament feasibly can be obviated through some other method other than a variance – no
7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance – yes

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to approve a 200 sf area variance.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to approve a 6’ height variance.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

**MISCELLANEOUS**

None

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion: Ms. Alfred moved, seconded by Mr. Swisher to approve the minutes of the April 26, 2022 Board of Building and Zoning Appeals hearing.

ROLL CALL:

Yeas: Alfred, Swisher, Lamb, Basel, Nolde

Nays: None, motion carried

**ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Swisher adjourned the meeting at 9:45 P.M.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Bryan Basel, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Clerk of Commissions Nicolette Sackman, MMC

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_