CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF ORION ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS

***** MINUTES *****

REGULAR MEETING – MONDAY, June 28, 2021 – 7:00 PM

The Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals held a regular meeting on Monday, June 28, 2021, at 7:00 pm at the Orion Township Community Center, 1335 Joslyn Road, Lake Orion, Michigan 48360.

ZBA MEMBERS PRESENT (Board Member Location):
Dan Durham, Chairman
Don Walker, PC Rep to ZBA
Derek Brackon, Secretary
Mike Flood, BOT Rep to ZBA
Tony Cook, Vice-Chairman

ZBA MEMBERS ABSENT:
None

CONSULTANT PRESENT:
David Goodloe, Building Official

OTHERS PRESENT:
William Avery
Ted Younk
Frank Cobb
Charity Cobb
Mike Kline
Gerald McCabe
Jeff Aisthorpe
Gary Patterson
Stephanie Damen-Geere
Lawrence Sak

1. OPEN MEETING
Chairman Durham called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

2. ROLL CALL
As noted

3. MINUTES
A. 5-24-2021, ZBA Regular Meeting Amended Minutes

Moved by Vice-Chairman Cook, seconded by Board Member Walker, to approve the minutes as amended, removed line just above #10 by Vice-Chairman Cook (on page 6).

Motion carried.

4. AGENDA REVIEW AND APPROVAL.

Moved by Trustee Flood, seconded by Vice-Chairman Cook to approve the agenda as presented.

Motion carried.

5. ZBA BUSINESS

A. AB-2021—28, William L. Avery, 2722 Wareing Dr., 09-20-376-012

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:

The petitioner is requesting 3 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-2
Charter Township of Orion Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes
Regular Meeting – June 28, 2021

Article XXVII, Section 27.02(A)(4) & Article XXVII, Section 27.05(H)(2)
1. A 35-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 35-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the property line along Baldwin Rd.
2. A 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the north.
3. A 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the south.

Mr. Avery introduced himself to the Board. He stated that the association is allowing the placement of the privacy fences and the majority of the homeowners are installing the fence. He would like the fence for the privacy issue and also to continue the look of the neighborhood.

Chairman Durham asked if he understood that the variance would not allow a fence between the homes.

Mr. Avery replied yes.

Vice-Chairman Cook asked if the fence will be in front of the existing vegetation.

Mr. Avery stated that perhaps he was looking at the neighboring property because his is relatively clear.

Trustee Flood commented on how much the road has changed in the time that Mr. Avery has lived there.

Chairman Durham asked if there was any public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Trustee Flood moved, seconded by Chairman Durham, in Case # AB-2021-28, William L. Avery, 2722 Waring Drive, 09-20-376-012 to grant petitioner 3 variances from Zoning Ord. #78, Zoned R-2 - Article XXVII, Section 27.02(A)(4) & Article XXVII, Section 27.05(H)(2) for the following: a 35-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 35-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the property line along Baldwin Rd. only, a 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the north and a 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the south conditioned upon the setback variances from the property lines to the north and south of said property is strictly for the 6 foot privacy fence that runs concurrent alongside Baldwin Road and the existing safety path only, not between the houses. The petitioner did demonstrate that the following standards for variances have been met in this case and that they set forth facts that show that in this case that:

1. The petitioner does show the following practical difficulty: a unique characteristic of this property is having 2 front yards, one facing on Waring Drive and the other facing Baldwin Road. Widening of Baldwin Road and putting in a complete connection of the safety path system all of the way from starting south at Brown Road north to Indianwood Road.

2. The following are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in this same district or zone: throughout the past several years Baldwin Road traffic volume and road noise has increased due to the increase residential and commercial expansion both to the north and the south of this older, well established subdivision community.

3. The variance is also necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone or vicinity based on the following findings of fact: due to the above previously mentioned findings of fact, the property owner can no longer enjoy the peace, tranquility as well as privacy and safety they once possessed.
4. The granting of the variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to the improvement in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the following findings of fact: Keatington Homeowner’s Association Architectural Control Committee review letter dated March 18, 2021 formally accepted the request with exceptions as noted, ZBA approval of requested variances and fence to be constructed of same material and style, shadowbox, as previously approved fencing along Baldwin Road only.

5. Based on the following findings of fact, the granting of this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property, in fact, installation of this style of fence will protect the subject property owner from vehicles headlights on Baldwin Road from spilling onto their property and privacy. The variance will not unusually increase congestion on the public streets. There is also not going to be an increase of fire, or endanger of the public safety, and is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area. The granting of this variance will not impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Brackon, yes; Cook, yes; Flood, yes; Walker, yes. Motion carried 5-0.

B. **AB-2021—29, Sadier Abro, 4749 S. Baldwin Road, 09-32-376-002**

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:
The petitioner is requesting interpretation of Section 34.01 – Use Group B Permitted Uses; uses compatible to a laundromat.

Mr. Mike Kline, representing Sadier Abro, presented a letter establishing the fact that he is representing Abro Properties.
Chairman Durham read the letter from Mr. Kline into the record.

Mr. Kline explained the petitioner’s variance request. He stated that Mr. Abro would like to take a vacant commercial space that he owns and locate a laundromat in that vacant space. He stated that the proposed business would be open from 7 am to 10 pm. He stated that Mr. Abro is the largest owner of laundromats in the State of Michigan right now. He suggested that Mr. Abro would install 20 machines.
Chairman Durham stated that the Township Engineer, OHM, suggested that this business would not generate too many trips.
Mr. Kline suggested that there would be 20 – 30 cars coming and going on any given day and probably 20 on Sunday.

Chairman Durham asked if Mr. Kline thought the proposed laundromat would draw business from the condominiums to the east.

Mr. Kline stated that the business should draw business from all throughout Lake Orion. He suggested that the large machines could hold 5 comforters and this type of business draws all types of customers.
Board member Walker asked if drop off service would be available.
Mr. Kline stated that 90% would be customers doing their own laundry but 2/3’s of the other laundromats that Mr. Abro owns do have drop off service. He answered that he doesn’t know how drop off would work out at this location.

Vice-Chairman Cook asked the exact address of the Cricket location.

Mr. Kline stated that he doesn’t know if Mr. Abro is planning on using the old Cricket location or the vacated burger place but he might take 4 feet from the old burger place and add it to the former Cricket location to reach the desired width of 22 feet wide.
Building Official Goodloe commented that the address doesn’t matter, the Board is looking to determine if a laundromat in this location if compatible.

Trustee Flood stated that this would normally go to the Planning Commission but the Township set this up so that any interpretation of the zoning ordinance like this comes to the ZBA. The Building Department is asking the ZBA if a laundromat is a similar use to those allowed on Brown Road under use group, Type B. A laundromat is not listed in the ordinance. He stated that he went back in the ordinance to see what zoning allows a laundromat. The closest thing to a laundromat is under General Services and it says Dry Cleaning. It does have a laundromat listed in General Business. Trustee Flood listed the other businesses listed under General Business. He also questioned if it would be considered a Special Land Use; under General Business, it is a permitted use and not a Special Land Use.

Secretary Brackon asked why laundromat was not in General Business. He commented that his interpretation is that they intentionally left it out.

Mr. Kline commented that there are not a lot of people who build laundromats and a dry cleaner would be a bad idea because of the chemical use. A laundromat uses laundry soap and water.

Chairman Durham asked if there was any public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Board member Walker asked what would be the proposed hours.

Mr. Kline responded that the other locations are open 7 am to 10 pm, seven days a week.

Board member Walker asked if there was a potential for drive-thru.

Mr. Kline answered no.

Trustee Flood stated that the petitioner would have to put in special water and sewer traps. This would be part of the permitting process.

Mr. Kline concurred.

Chairman Durham asked if there were any concerns about having adequate parking.

Mr. Kline answered that there are 80 parking spaces there and they expected 10-12 cars possibility.

Trustee Flood asked that once this interpretation is made, does this go back to the Planning Commission. Building Official Goodloe replied no; it goes to the Building Department.

Chairman Durham asked where else in the Township would this might be allowed.

Building Official Goodloe answered that this case is only considering this district.

Board member Walker, supported by Trustee Flood, moved in AB-2021—29, Sadier Abro, 4749 S. Baldwin Road, 09-32-376-002 that the petitioner’s request for interpretation as to whether or not a laundromat is similar to a use or uses listed under use type Group B in Article XXXIII, Brown Road Innovation Zone, known as the BIZ District, be granted. A laundromat is similar to the following use groups, B type in the Brown Road Innovation Zone under Type B. He asked for this Section of the ordinance to be added to this motion. He read the language regarding the allowed uses under the Type B uses in the Brown Road Innovation Zone. Based upon the information that the petitioner has given the Board, the proposed business would fall under these types of things. The planners did not mean to exclude a laundromat use from this section based on the proposed use and the
existing parking behind the strip mall. He finds that the use is similar to those listed under Group B.
The petitioner indicated that the daily trip generation would be moderately light, no more than 10 cars at a time or 20-30 cars a day. The type of service and merchandise provided seems to fit in Type B grouping which does not require a Special Land Use. The propose hours would be from 7 am to 10 pm. This business fits similarly to the uses allowed in Type B, BIZ District.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Brackon, no; Cook, yes; Flood, yes; Walker, yes. Motion carried 4-1.

C. AB-2021-30, Gerald McCabe, 3001 Yosemite, 09-17-104-009

Chairman Durham read the petitioner's request as follows:
The petitioner is requesting 3 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned RM-1

Article XXVII, Section 27.02(A)(4) & Article XXVII, Section 27.05(H)(2)
1. A 10-ft. rear yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the rear property line.
2. A 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the north.
3. A 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the south

Mr. McCabe introduced himself to the Board and explained the variance request. He stated that he feels that it is a safety issue since they abut a public walkway and they also need it for privacy. He stated that it would also help reduce the noise. He stated that the neighbors requested that they do a 6 foot privacy fence.

Chairman Durham commented that the playground at the elementary school is used year-round. He asked where the fence would be tied into the house.

Mr. McCabe explained where the fence would be located.

Vice-Chairman Cook asked about the mature trees that were there.

Mr. McCabe stated that he removed 4 mature trees and there was also a berm that was flattened to make room for the pool.

Vice-Chairman Cook stated that from the pool to the property line is 18 feet. He stated if they lessened that by 2 feet on each side, would that be acceptable.

Mr. McCabe stated that there already is a 6 foot cyclone fence that abuts the parking lot so it might be strange to have 2 feet to maintain between them.

Vice-Chairman Cook asked who owned the 6 foot cyclone fence.

Mr. McCabe answered that he thinks it is the homeowner's association.

Vice-Chairman Cook asked why the gate was there.

McCabe stated that his kids attend Weber Elementary.

Vice-Chairman Cook asked what type of lock would be on the gate.

Mr. McCabe stated that the fence would have a self-closing mechanism and it is a certain distance high so kids can’t reach it. If the gate is problematic, he will get rid of it.
Chairman Durham asked if there was any public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Chairman Durham read two letters received from neighbors supporting the request.

Trustee Flood added that there was also a letter from the HOA President Jane Sierra dated 5/12/21 that supported the request. He stated that he is looking at the request and the practical difficulty and whether or not it is self-created. He stated that this situation is self-created. He stated that by ordinance, to maintain safety, a 4 foot fence must be placed around the entire pool. He stated that he thinks the existing 6 foot fence is owned by the school. The applicant is also right next to the public access for the subdivision to get to Weber Elementary. There are unique circumstances associated with this property. He agrees that a 6 foot fence is needed along the school property.

Mr. McCabe stated that he agrees with the side along Weber but if he went the ordinance distance on the other side, it would be right on the apron that goes around the pool.

Trustee Flood stated that no one else in the neighborhood has the public walk running right along the property.

Chairman Durham asked Trustee Flood about the self-created hardship of putting in a pool. He commented that in his view, it is a substantial property right which is also part of the motion language.

Building Official Goodloe stated that the fence will need to be approved by the Building Department to make sure it follows pool requirements.

Vice-Chairman Cook, supported by Board member Walker, moved in Case # AB-2021-30, Gerald McCabe, 3001 Yosemite, 09-17-104-009, to approve the petitioner’s request for 3 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned RM-1, Article XXVII, Section 27.02(A)(4) & Article XXVII, Section 27.05(H)(2) including: A 10-ft. rear yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the rear property line, a 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the north and a 10-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to erect a 6-ft. privacy fence 0- ft. from the side property line to the south because the petitioner did demonstrate the following standards of variance have been met and set forth fact which show that:

1. The petitioner does show the following practical difficulty; due to the unique placement of the home with the elementary school and parking lot adjacent to the petitioner, the uniqueness of this characteristic is that this is why the request for the fencing has been submitted.

2. The following are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally to other properties in this same district or zone: due to the elementary school being right behind the subject home, for him to install this pool would create a circumstance where the number of people who may be looking into the yard or passing by is rather unique for this location.

3. The variance is also necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity based on the following findings of fact: the petitioner and the neighbor to the north are the only two homes that have this public access between the one to the north and the other to the south.

4. The granting of the variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the following: due to the uniqueness of it being an elementary school and a public walkway, it will assure that the students are protected from gaining simple and easy
access to the pool in addition to the fact that it being a 6 foot high fence takes away the ability for many students to climb it and none of the students will be able to see it.

5. Based on the following findings of fact, the granting this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property, in fact the neighbors to the north and south are supportive of the fence and it being a solid vinyl. It would not unusually increase congestion on the public streets. There is also not going to be an increase of fire, or endanger of the public safety, and is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area. The granting of this variance will not impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township due to the fact that the request is also supported by the community’s HOA. The Fire Marshall has no concern. Principal Goethals is not opposed to the erection of the fence.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Brackon, yes; Cook, yes; Flood, yes; Walker, yes. Motion carried 5-0.

D. AB-2021-31, Jeffrey Aisthorpe, 800 Golden Gate Ave., 09-12-326-002

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:
The petitioner is requesting 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-1

Article VI, Section 6.04, Zoned R-1
1. A 14-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 40-ft. for a 96-sq.ft. shed to remain 26-ft. from the front property line.
2. A 3.4-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 96-sq. ft. shed to remain 6.6-ft. from the side property line to the east.

Mr. Jeff Aisthorpe introduced himself to the Board and explained the variance request. The shed was in existence when he bought the property.

Chairman Durham read two letters from neighbors about the existence of sheds in this neighborhood.

Trustee Flood commented on his visit to the property. He confirmed that the subject property is not part of the HOA. The shed does not follow the setback guidelines of the ordinance. He suggested moving the shed to comply with the ordinance since the property is 5 acres and the shed can be relocated. He stated that for the ZBA, a practical difficulty is not cost so the cost of such relocation is not an issue.

Chairman Durham asked if moving it would make it more exposed.

Trustee Flood replied yes. However, the applicant can put the shed wherever he wants on his property as long as it meets the setbacks.

Mr. Aisthorpe stated that it is very hard to find flat ground on the property. Where it is located now is ideal, in fact, you cannot even see it when you pull in. He could move it but there are many renovations planned for the home and the shed is the last thing on the list.

Vice-Chairman Cook commented that the petitioner is here because the HOA thought the shed belonged to one of their neighbors. Building officials came out to the property and discovered that it is noncompliant. He asked what was in the shed.

Mr. Aisthorpe replied lumber, auto parts, neighbor’s lawn mower and snow removal equipment.

Chairman Durham asked if there was any public comment.

Ms. Stephanie Damen-Geere stated that she is here to discuss the shed. She reached out to her HOA and asked if she could build a shed and was told no.
Secretary Bracken stated that they are discussing the petitioner’s request and the petitioner’s property and the property is not in the HOA.

Ms. Stephanie Damen-Geere stated that she called the Township and was told that the shed was in violation. She asked if the HOA doesn’t allow sheds, could she go to the Township and request a variance to build a shed too.

Chairman Durham stated that the petitioner was in violation because it was too close to the property line; it had nothing to do with the HOA allowing or disallowing sheds. The ZBA doesn’t enforce HOA rules. The petitioner is there to ask for an adjustment in the rules to allow it to stay where it is, not to make it go away.

Secretary Bracken stated that this case does not set precedence. Each case is looked at individually.

Chairman Durham stated that Ms. Damen-Geere has a civil matter with her HOA and the Township does not get involved in civil matters. He explained that to Ms. Damen-Geere.

Board member Walker explained the variance request and the Board’s position to Ms. Damen-Geere.

Building Official Goodloe explained the variance request to Ms. Damen-Geere.

Vice-Chairman Cook asked the petitioner if the shed was on his property.

Mr. Aisthorpe replied yes.

Board member Durham asked when Mr. Aisthorpe purchased the property.

Mr. Aisthorpe replied summer of 2011 and the shed was there when he purchased the property. He does not know when it was installed.

Secretary Bracken commented that the shed is somewhat hidden based on the vegetation that is around it. If the petitioner were to move it to comply, it would be completely exposed.

Mr. Aisthorpe replied yes.

Trustee Flood stated that right now the shed is sitting 26 feet off of the HOA’s property line. Because that is considered a front yard, for 5 acres, he is supposed to have a 40-foot setback. The variance he is asking for is for 14 feet. The side yard is supposed to be 10 feet away and the petitioner is 6 foot, 6 inches off of it. There is no question that the shed is on the petitioner’s property.

Secretary Bracken, supported by Vice-Chairman Cook, moved in Case AB-2021-31, Jeffrey Aisthorpe, 800 Golden Gate Ave., 09-12-326-002 to grant the petitioner’s request for 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-1, Article VI, Section 6.04, Zoned R-1 including: A 14-ft. front yard setback variance from the required 40-ft. for a 96-sq.ft. shed to remain 26-ft. from the front property line and a 3.4-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. for a 96- sq. ft. shed to remain 6.6-ft. from the side property line to the east be granted because the petitioner did demonstrate that the following standards for variances have been met in this case as shown by the following findings of fact:

1. The practical difficulty in this case is that the shed was already there when the petitioner bought the house. The property, although it is 5 acres, is not completely level and in order to move the shed would require leveling property and moving dirt.

2. The variance is also necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity based on the following findings of fact:
the petitioner and the neighbor to the north are the only two homes that have this public access between the one to the north and the other to the south.

3. The granting of the variance or modification will not be materially detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located.

4. The granting this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to the adjacent property. It would not unreasonably increase congestion in public streets. There is also not going to be an increase of fire, or endanger of the public safety, and is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area. This is evidenced by the fact that it was built before 2007 and has not caused any of these issues to date.

5. This variance will not reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area. It would not impair the public safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the Township in any way.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Brackon, yes; Cook, yes; Flood, yes; Walker, yes. Motion carried 5-0.

E. AB-2021-32, Frank Cobb, 662 Porteous, 09-01-136-021

Chairman Durham read the petitioner’s request as follows:
The petitioner is requesting 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3

Article 6.04 Zoned R-3
1. A 5-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to construct a deck 5-ft. from the property line to the north.

Article 27.03(C)(3)(b)(ii)
2. A 15-ft. rear yard setback variance from the required 20-ft. to construct a deck 5-ft. from the rear property line

Mr. Frank Cobb introduced himself to the Board and explained the variance request. He currently has a door wall that exits out to a drop and he is trying to build an 11 foot by 40 foot deck. The deck will be elevated 9 foot. He currently has wetland in the backyard. He also has a significant slope in the back.

Trustee Flood stated that property is unique with the drop in the back and the side hill too.

Board member Walker asked when Mr. Cobb purchased the home.

Mr. Cobb replied 2009. He has a contractor picked out.

Chairman Durham asked if there was any public comment.

No public comment was heard.

Vice-Chairman Cook, supported by Trustee Flood, moved in Case AB-2021-32, Frank Cobb, 662 Porteous, 09-01-136-021 to approve the petitioner’s request for 2 variances from Zoning Ordinance #78 – Zoned R-3 as follows: Article 6.04 Zoned R-3, a 5-ft. side yard setback variance from the required 10-ft. to construct a deck 5-ft. from the property line to the north and from Article 27.03(C)(3)(b)(ii), a 15-ft. rear yard setback variance from the required 20-ft. to construct a deck 5-ft. from the rear property line because the petitioner did demonstrate the following standards for variance have been met in that they set forth facts that show:

1. The petitioner does show the following practical difficulty; the uniqueness of the property and the lack of a rear yard.
2. The following are exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved that do not apply generally apply to other properties in this same district or zone: there is steep topography and this would allow them to enjoy the rear portions of the property safely.

3. The variance is also necessary for the preservation and enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity based on: this is a unique piece of property in terms of the way that it drops off.

4. The granting of the variance or modification will not be materially be detrimental to the public welfare or materially injurious to the property or to improvements in such zone or district in which the property is located based on the following: the petitioner will be improving the property by building the deck coming off of the second floor which will not encroach on anyone else’s property but will go into side and other setback limits that have been imposed by the ordinance.

5. Based on the following findings of fact, the granting this variance would not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent properties, it would not unusually increase the congestion on the public streets, it would not increase of fire, or endanger of the public safety, and is not going to reasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area. The granting of this variance will not impair the public health, safety, comfort, morals or welfare of the inhabitants of the Township.

Roll call vote was as follows: Durham, yes; Brackon, yes; Cook, yes; Flood, yes; Walker, yes. Motion carried 5-0.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENTS**
   None

7. **COMMUNICATIONS**
   A. Date Certain Memo

8. **COMMITTEE REPORTS**
   None

9. **MEMBERS’ COMMENTS**
   Chairman Durham stated that the joint meeting between the various boards is scheduled for Thursday, July 29th from noon until 2:00 pm. Trustee Flood encouraged members to submit items to Lynn or Tammy for consideration at this meeting.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**
    Moved by Chairman Durham, seconded by Board member Walker to adjourn the meeting at 8:23 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Erin A. Mattice
Recording Secretary