

**SHIAWASSEE COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES
APRIL 10, 2013**

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: Chairman Henry W. Martin III called the regularly scheduled monthly public hearing of the Zoning Board of Appeals “ZBA) to order at 7:00 P.M. within the County Board of Commissioners’ meeting room located on the first floor of the Surbeck Building, 201 N. Shiawassee Street, in Corunna.

ROLL CALL: Present: Larry Gramer, Gerald Wardell, Ann Gamboe Hall, N. Bradley Hissong, Fred Junger, and Henry W. Martin III. Absent: Julie Hales-Smith. Also present: Peter J. Preston/Community Development Director, and Linda Gene Cordier/Zoning Administrator.

EXCUSED ABSENCES: **Motion:** Junger moved to excuse Hall from the January 9, 2013 ZBA hearing. **Support:** Hissong. Motion carried: 6 ayes, 0 nays. Cordier informed the chair she had not heard from Smith. Chair Martin stated they would take action next month after hearing from Smith.

CONFIRMATION OF LEGAL NOTICE: Cordier informed the board that the legal notice for the evening’s hearing was placed within the Shiawassee Independent on Sunday, March 24, 2013. Chair Martin declared the hearing properly noticed.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: **Motion:** Hall moved to approve the agenda as printed. **Support:** Gerald Wardell. Motion carried: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

APPROVAL OF BOARD MINUTES: **Motion:** Hissong moved to approve the January 9, 2013 ZBA board minutes as printed. **Support:** Gramer. Motion carried: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: None.

BOARD OF COMMISSIONER COMMENTS: No County Commissioner present.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

Application #PZBA13-003

Applicant – Phillip A. Bradley, 714 Crawford Street, Flint, MI

Owners – Iona Bradley Et Al, Carla V. Sandlin and Phillip Bradley

Site Location – 9881 (9851) Godfrey Road, Bancroft, MI

Tax Id. – 78-015-04-400-013, Section 4, Antrim Township

Request – Appeal/Temporary Housing: Allow a temporary single-wide mobile home to remain as a recreational/guest house on vacant property under the Temporary Housing provisions of the 1999 Shiawassee County Zoning Ordinance

Ordinance Reference – Section 5.8.2.f. – Temporary Housing

Chair Martin asked staff to provide a staff report.

Cordier stated that back in March of 2007, the Code Enforcement Officer (David Chrenka) visited the site at 9881 Godfrey Road and found what appeared to be an abandoned single-wide mobile home. A photograph was taken to document the site visit. The office then mailed a letter to Carl and Iona Bradley, owners of the property, as appeared within the Tax Roll Book.

Cordier stated for reasons unknown, the site was not revisited again until January 2012. As the mobile home was still on the property, a final 30 day notice was mailed to Iona Bradley, c/o of Carla Sandlin; as owners per the Tax Roll Book.

Cordier stated she received a telephone call from Phil Bradley on January 17th. She discussed the issue that the single-wide mobile home was not under a valid zoning permit. Ordinance language on temporary mobile homes was provided to Mr. Bradley. As the temporary mobile home was not under a valid permit on June of 1999, when the current ordinance was adopted, and had been vacant for more than 30 days, the ordinance requires removal of the mobile home.

Cordier stated that Mr. Bradley indicated to her on the phone that the mobile home was on 31 acres and was used for hunting and farming. Cordier then informed him of the Temporary Seasonal Farm Labor provisions and stated he may be able to qualify for that. She mailed a packet the next day to Iona Bradley/Carla Sandlin containing Zoning Ordinance language pertaining to seasonal farm labor and for permanent placement of a single-wide mobile home on private property for their review.

Cordier continued that on February 16, 2012, she received a telephone call from Attorney Lynne Bowne. He informed her that he was representing Mr. Bradley and would like to go over the file with her, however, he would be out of state for a couple of weeks and asked if the office would extend the time frame for compliance through March. Cordier stated she would grant the extension.

On April 10, 2012, Cordier stated she visited the site to see if the mobile home was still there as she had not heard from Mr. Bowne or Mr. Bradley. The trailer was still on site and a photograph was taken to document her visit.

On April 11, 2012, she mailed a final notice letter to Iona Bradley, c/o Carla Sandlin, that the office would be proceeding with issuance of a misdemeanor ticket for failure to bring the property into compliance.

The ticket was served to Carla V. Sandlin on November 28, 2012. On December 3, 2012, David Chrenka put together a letter for the 66th District Court regarding the ticket and zoning code violation.

On January 10, 2013, Phil Bradley, his wife, Carla Sandlin and her husband, and another relative met with her and Mr. Preston to discuss the code violation and pending ticket.

Cordier stated that in June of 1988, the office records were destroyed by fire. Since that time staff has been working on recompiling records with the help of the townships and what was retrieved from the fire. She had obtained a copy of a May 1971 Septic System report from the Environmental Health Department, which noted there was a mobile home on the property. Staff provided Mr. Bradley with a copy of the septic system report on January 10th.

Cordier said because the Health Department record noted a trailer was there in 1971, it would have come under the 1957 Zoning Ordinance. At that time there was a provision for temporary mobile homes under the Relative Mobile Home regulations, but a permanent dwelling would have been required on the property. Another provision would have been During Dwelling Construction. Cordier said she contacted the township assessor and was informed that the assessment card reflected no house was ever built on this property. Based on that information, it wouldn't have qualified for a relative trailer permit.

Cordier said the photograph taken in 2007 by staff compared with the photographs provided by the applicant in his packet revealed that extensive remodeling to the mobile home has taken place. No permit applications or approvals were granted for any remodeling of the structure. Cordier passed out photographs taken by the Code Enforcement Officer last week showing that some of the scrap had been dumped out back.

Cordier said the mobile home was too old to be considered for permanent placement. Minimum requirements for a mobile home unit would have had to have been built after June 1976, have a 20 foot wide addition expansion, be placed on a permanent foundation, and have a shingled-pitched roof over the entire structure.

There is no valid temporary zoning permit on file; the mobile home has been documented as vacant for over a 30-day period. It does not meet the ordinance language for a temporary mobile home that was in existence on private property prior to June of 1999.

Chair Martin opened the floor for Mr. Bradley to present his appeal.

Mr. Bradley said that when the letter was mailed in 2007, his mother was ill at that time. There was no contact from the office again until 2012. Bradley stated that he had resided in the trailer in 1975 and 1976. His uncle also resided in a single-wide mobile home on the property in 1976. They made his uncle move off because he was using an old fuel drum for the septic system. The County made him move. Bradley said his address to the trailer is 9851 and not the 9881. He didn't have anything saying it was under a valid permit; however, from the documents provided you can tell it was a record from the fire.

Bradley continued that it was never their intent to hide anything. The Environment Health Department visited the site in the 1990's regarding the well and septic system. The wrong address keeps coming up. In 2012 we were told there was no permit. Bradley acknowledged he had fixed up the trailer by doing some caulking, entry door replacement, and interior remodeling. He said he wasn't trying to be deceiving and wondered how that was considered illegal. It was permitted for his grandmother to live there.

Bradley continued that she (Cordier) tried to lead him down a path saying it was seasonal farm labor when it wasn't. He believed this could be worked out based on the documents he provided. He felt they qualified to keep the trailer there based on the county's own statute under "f" in the ordinance which says "any mobile home permitted by temporary permit for purposes other than (a) or (b) above prior to April 1999 may be issued a temporary permit by the Zoning Administrator." Bradley told the board he was asking for that tonight; he believed in his government. They (staff) ticketed my innocent sister. Everyone knows the trailer has been there. The electric bills go back to 1971. He stated that there have been improvements to the 15-acres in the country and that he has been cleaning it up. He would hope the board would take his side and allow him them the continued use permit.

Chair Martin thanked him and opened the floor for public comment in support of the request.

Speaker #1 – Marty W. Sandlin, 4391 W. Reid Rd., Swartz Creek.

Sandlin informed the board that he likes to take his family out to the site and felt it was safe. They get to see the deer. There are apple trees on the property. He didn't see where they have done anything wrong. We would like to keep our heritage going by being allowed to go out to the property.

Chair Martin called for public comment in opposition of the request.

Speaker #2 – Dan J. Milu, 10347 Godfrey Road, Bancroft.

Milu stated he has resided in the area for 35 years. There are three old trailers on this road. The time is up. A home was never built on the site. The trailer should be removed. One person in the area has moved a trailer behind their home and another trailer has been abandoned now for at the past 4-5 months. I am tired of the trailer being there and would like to see it removed. I pay taxes and believe that this trailer devalues my property. This is an eyesore.

Speaker #3 – Jon Alden, 9936 S. Godfrey Road, Bancroft.

Alden informed the board that he had written a letter to the board on April 5th. He has resided in the area for 21 years. The trailer has been there for 21 years. The trailer appears abandoned except during deer season. It should have been permitted under a temporary permit. There is no permanent residence on this parcel. The neighbors are all sick of it. It has been there since the 1970's. It should not be permitted to remain there. I am hoping the trailer will have to be removed based on the law pertaining to this.

Chair Martin asked Preston to read Mr. Alden's letter.

Preston read the following letter for the record:

Letter #1 - "This letter is in regard to the Bradley property located at 9881 (9851) Godfrey Road, Bancroft, MI, which is across the road from my property.

As stated in your letter of March 25, 2013, Mr. Bradley has requested an extension of the temporary housing provision for a house trailer currently on his property.

I have lived here since 1992 and the house trailer in question has always been on the property. Does Mr. Bradley want another 22 years before he puts up a permanent residence?

I object to a continuance of the temporary housing ordinance for this trailer. It is an eyesore and definitely degrades the value of adjacent properties. It has never been lived in and only used as a hunting "camp" during deer season. It has been poorly maintained and I doubt it meets any code requirements. It should be removed as soon as possible. Jon Alden."

Preston stated he would also read a second letter that had been received in the mail.

Letter #2 - "We occupy the property at 9941 S. Godfrey Road. My parents owned our property since 1972, and the trailer had been there prior to them purchasing the property. My parents were told that this trailer was supposed to be removed when they owned the property. We purchased and built our home next door to this trailer in 1995. We were not allowed to put a brand new temporary trailer on the property, while we were building our home (5 months build time). If you allow this trailer to remain, it would further devalue our property. This trailer had been left to deteriorate and become a nesting place for varmints. It is not a positive addition to our neighborhood. It has been an eye sore to our neighborhood. The term "recreation purposes" is just a way around removing this run down trailer. It has also come to our attention, the recent unauthorized renovations to this trailer; have been made without permits being drawn and necessary inspections as required. The septic system has not been evaluated, and is questionable at best. Last, and worst case scenario, when the original owner of this property passed away, (if grandfathered in) this trailer should have been removed at that time. We believe enough time has been given, considering the amount of money we pay in taxes. It is time to remove the trailer.

The answer is ‘NO TRAILER FOR ANY REASON’. Respectfully, Thomas Bridges and Joanie Crowder.”

Chair Martin called for additional comments. Hearing none, he asked Cordier if the township had responded. Cordier replied that she had not heard from the township. Martin opened the floor to Bradley for rebuttal.

Bradley answered he would have to disagree with the statement about the condition of the trailer, but they are entitled to object. Bradley said he would like to read from the county’s own rule with respect to his neighbor’s opinions; *“Any mobile home permitted by temporary permit for purposes other than a) or b) above prior to April 1999 may be issued a temporary permit.”* Bradley said he was recently retired. Making us move will not make the problem go away. There are still other trailers out there. The trailer was allowed to be placed there for a good reason. I am retired now and am committed to making it look good and maintained. I had asked the office if they had received any complaints about the trailer, but they said no.

Chair Martin closed the public hearing segment and called for board deliberation.

Hissong asked Bradley if he was aware that permits were required. Hissong stated his main concern was that Bradley took a “Hud” home and altered it, which was confirmed in Bradley’s packet. Bradley provided us pictures that showed it had been totally remodeled.

Bradley replied he had changed some lighting, but wasn’t aware permits were required.

Hissong asked if he even checked with the department to see if a permit was required.

Bradley said they were told they weren’t supposed to be out there.

Wardell asked Bradley if the kitchen had been remodeled as there were no pictures of the kitchen within the packet.

Bradley answered he removed the old plywood cupboards because it was no longer a functional kitchen. Bradley said the well was installed in the 1980’s. There was a permit to install the well at that time and was installed by a licensed well driller.

Chair Martin commented on the electric bill that was submitted in his packet and noted it was for 2012.

Bradley said it has always had electricity on the property since 1971. The electric bill was to clear up the confusion about the address.

Chair Martin asked about occupying the trailer.

Bradley said they like to go out to the property. He tried to spruce the trailer up. The trailer is usable; it just doesn’t have a kitchen. Bradley again stated he hadn’t realized a permit was needed.

Wardell commented on the on-site septic system. The paperwork is dated 1971. Most septic systems are good for 25 years and then usually need to be replaced.

Bradley replied that the county's own language says if permitted prior to 1999 it can be permitted. The septic was approved.

Hall asked when the last time the trailer was occupied.

Marty Sandlin answered he had resided in the trailer in 1991 and that no one has lived there since that time.

Hall answered that this was nothing more than a structure found in a day-park where someone could go in and use the bathroom, wash their hands, or change their clothing.

Bradley answered again that it was this county's own statute that says it can be there. It doesn't say anything else.

Hall said the language says it had to have been under a permit for consideration.

Bradley again read from Section 5.8.2.(f) – *“Any mobile home permitted by temporary permit for purposes other than a) or b) above prior to April 1999, may be issued a temporary permit.*

Cordier responded that there are a number of temporary mobile homes under a temporary zoning permit that are considered for renewal on a yearly basis that had been granted temporary zoning approval prior to 1999. This was not under any permit on April 1999. Cordier read the remainder of the paragraph that Bradley had referenced: *“may be issued a temporary permit by the Zoning Administrator for continuation of use of an existing mobile home by the present occupant, but no other, provided the dwelling remains in good structural condition, the septic system and well remain approvable by the Shiawassee County Environmental Health Department and a Performance Guarantee pursuant to Section 16.10 is collected to insure the temporary mobile home is removed within thirty (30) days of its no longer being used by the present occupant.”*

Junger noted the laws have become much tougher with the adoption of each ordinance since 1957 regulating temporary zoning permits for mobile homes outside a mobile home park.

Bradley responded that the trailer was put there legally. There are at least seven trailers in the area similar in nature.

Hall questioned the fact that someone had to reside or live there and they do not.

Junger agreed, live there means the same as occupy.

Bradley disagreed; it doesn't say you have to live there.

Hissong answered that occupy does mean living there. Hissong said he was not in favor of allowing the trailer to remain there. There are nice homes surrounding this. It's an old 12'x50' trailer built before 1976 and wouldn't fit in anywhere plus it has been altered. The only way it could have been grandfathered in was if it had been under a valid zoning permit. Anyone could put a trailer in and try and say it was grandfathered in. You need documentation that it was under a valid permit.

Preston agreed with Hissong. The 1999 Ordinance provided language that allowed mobile homes that were originally granted under the 1957 or 1982 Zoning Ordinance under various temporary

provisions remain as long as the temporary permits were valid in April of 1999 and remained occupied by the same occupant. The office has nothing to reflect there ever was a permit. A well and septic permit dating back 41 years ago was proven, but nothing else. Staff had to draw the line and say there was no zoning permit for the temporary placement of this mobile home. Mr. Bradley is appealing our decision. Can the office issue them a temporary zoning permit or not? Staff made a decision that a temporary permit could not be issued.

Discussion on the terms illegal and/or legal nonconforming status amongst the board followed. Preston stated the board needed to decide if this trailer was illegal or legal nonconforming. If there never was a zoning permit issued, based on the fact no documents were ever found, then this board is looking at just a temporary permit for just recreation purposes. Is that legal? We have had a lot of discussion on this with the applicant. Preston said he had the ticket dismissed because the applicant was willing to pursue the appeal.

Hall commented on the fact that no one has occupied the trailer since 1991. She questioned going back to 1971 and whether or not it was ever under a temporary zoning permit. Hall said she can remember trailers like this one (size and style) when she was a kid. She felt that this slipped under the radar some how and now it has finally caught up with them. The request doesn't meet the requirements of 5.8.2.f.

Chair Martin asked Preston to proceed with the Findings of Fact unless there were additional comments or questions by the board.

FINDINGS OF FACT:

1) How the application of the Zoning Ordinance creates unnecessary hardship or practical difficulty in the use of the petitioner's property.

Staff: Staff believes there is no hardship. The property is being utilized for recreational outings and gardening. A principal structure could be built on the property.

ZBA Findings: Concur with staff's findings.

2) Identify the unique physical circumstances or conditions or exceptional topography that create practical difficulties.

Staff: It is the opinion of staff that there is no unique circumstance or practical difficulty that would warrant the single-wide mobile home unit to remain on the property.

ZBA Findings: Concur with staff's findings.

3) Specific findings (characteristics of the land) showing that because of the physical circumstances or conditions there is no possibility that the property can be developed in strict conformity with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance. That the authorization of a variance or appeal is, therefore, necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property and that the condition is specific to this property and not general to other properties in the area.

Staff: Denial of the request would not hinder future development of the property. The property can still be used for gardening or deer hunting. Until such time a principal resident is placed on the property, overnight camping or other recreational activities would be a violation of the ordinance as interpreted by the ZBA Board.

ZBA Findings: Concur with staff's findings.

4) Finding that the practical difficulty was not created by the applicant and is related only to property that is owned or occupied by the applicant.

Staff: The temporary mobile home was originally placed on the property by the applicant's grandparents. Once the unit was no longer under a valid Zoning permit or

became empty, the temporary structure was to have been removed from the property. Questions asked during the hearing found the trailer had not been occupied since 1991 and that is no longer considered a viable residence as there is no longer an operable kitchen has it had been removed per testimony received.

ZBA Findings: Concurred with staff's findings.

5) A statement of the impacts of the variance if authorized, the property values, use and enjoyment of the property in the neighborhood or district, and on the public, health, safety and welfare.

Staff: Currently there are a number of temporary single-wide units that had been granted prior to 1999 that are under valid permits, as well as some such as this one that has been brought to the office's attention. Granting the use of this temporary structure to remain for recreational purposes or as an occasional guest house/cabin without a permanent structure would be setting a precedent. It would open the doors for others attempting the same privilege.

ZBA Findings: Concur with staff's findings.

6) The proposed variance does not permit the establishment of any use which is not permitted by right within the district or any use or dimensional variance for which a special use permit is necessary.

Staff: A special use permit is not required for a permanent structure; however, authorizing the single-wide unit to remain does not meet the criteria for a zoning permit for a temporary structure on private property outside a mobile home park or with the criteria outlined within Section 5.8.2.f. Again, a principal residence would have been required under the 1957 Ordinance for consideration of a relative trailer permit to have been obtained otherwise it would have had to qualify as a temporary permit for farm labor or during dwelling construction.

ZBA Findings: Concur with staff's findings.

7) Findings on whether the proposed development complies with the requirements, standards, or procedures given in the Zoning Ordinance or an interpretation of the disputed ordinance provisions, if applicable.

Staff: Again, it is staff's believe it does not comply with the Zoning Ordinance and that authorizing the temporary mobile home to remain for recreational purposes or an occasional guest house/cabin would be a violation of the ordinance and be precedent setting. To follow-up with tonight's public hearing, the kitchen has been removed and improvements were made to the trailer without permits.

ZBA Findings: Board members agreed with Hall's statement that the structure is no different now than a structure at a park, it basically is a place to use a bathroom or change clothing. The board also concurred with staff's findings.

8) Findings on any error in judgment or procedure in the administration of the relevant zoning provisions.

Staff: The temporary structure is not under a valid Zoning permit, improvements to the structure have been made without Zoning/Building permit approvals or inspections.

ZBA Findings: Hissong commented that the trailer was altered when the applicant made improvement to it without permit approval. As a building inspector, a permit could not be granted to bring the Hud trailer into compliance. Once it was altered, it would be required to come under today's building code standards. There is no way this unit could meet code based on the piping and other materials used at the original time the trailer was built. The board concurred with the findings.

9) The possible precedents or affects which might result from the approval or denial of the appeal.

Staff: Consideration for the temporary structure to remain will be precedent setting and would open the door for others within the County to seek the same benefits of a temporary mobile home that has become empty or abandoned.

ZBA Findings: Concur with staff's findings.

10) Findings on the impact if the appeal is approved, on the ability of the County or other governmental agency to provide adequate public services and facilities and/or programs that might reasonably require in the future if the appeal is approved.

Staff: No additional impact is perceived if the appeal is approved.

ZBA Findings: Wardell noted that he would disagree. It could be difficult to get a fire truck back to the trailer as there is no driveway to the site. The board concurred with staff's findings as well.

6. **Additional Standards for Review-**

6.1 **Reasonable Use-** Can the property be used in a manner consistent with existing zoning without the need of a variance?

Staff: The property could be used, however, the structure could not because it is no longer a trailer any more.

ZBA – Concur.

6.2 **Uniqueness-** Is the need for the appeal due to a unique circumstance and not general to conditions of the neighborhood.

Staff: No, there are other mobile homes in the county under a valid temporary permit. There is no supporting document showing it had been under a permit dating back 40 years ago or up to now. The office has no record or even past complaints.

ZBA: Martin noted that the owners would have had copies of zoning permit approvals. None was provided by the applicant. The board concurred.

6.3 **Essential Character Affected-** Will the appeal effect the essential character of surrounding area?

Staff: Yes, we know there are others that exist.

ZBA: Martin agreed and asked if staff was working on those as well. Preston Answered yes, they working through them. Violations are prioritized. The board Concurred.

6.4 **Self-Created Hardship-** Is the hardship or practical difficulty the result of the applicant's own actions with respect to the request.

Staff: The applicant is appealing staff's decision of the initial placement of the temporary trailer on the property and how it was allowed to be placed on vacant property.

ZBA: Junger added that the trailer had been remodeled without permit approvals or inspections. This was done by the applicant as stated earlier and would be considered self-created.

Motion: Gerald Wardell moved that the application request to appeal (temporary housing) of the 1999 Zoning Ordinance requirements (Section 5.8.2.f.) submitted by Phillip A. Bradley, applicant/property owner, for property known as Tax Id. 78-015-04-400-013-00, Section 4 of

Antrim Township, and located at **9881 Godfrey Road, Bancroft, MI** to allow the 10'x60' temporary single-wide mobile home unit remain on the property for continued use as recreational and guest house purposes be **denied** pursuant to Section 18.4.5. of the 1999 Shiawassee County Zoning Ordinance, as amended, and based on the Findings of Fact within Section 18.4.6.

Support: Fred Junger.

Roll Call: Ayes to Deny: Ann Gamboe Hall, N. Bradley Hissong, Larry Gramer, Fred Junger, Gerald Wardell, and Henry W. Martin III. **Nays:** None. **Motion carried: 6 ayes to deny, 0 nays.**

Discussion: Bradley asked what was going on here and how could this happen? Something is better than nothing. We did nothing wrong. I may have violated the building code. Your own statute says it can be there. Your law says that anything before 1999 can be granted. This just doesn't smell right.

Junger responded that the ordinance states it had to be removed once it was no longer occupied or under a permit by the occupant.

Bradley replied that it should have been.

Chair Martin answered that the trailer has not been occupied for 30 years.

Preston informed Bradley that a decision has been made by the ZBA tonight. You can appeal their decision through Circuit Court.

Bradley answered he was a reasonable person, he was responsible. You could have come to me and said this was a piece of junk and you have no permit. You gave my sister the ticket. Why didn't the neighbors come to me? How come others can have a trailer?

Chair Martin answered that he (Bradley) resided in Flint and that he didn't have a permit for the trailer. The ordinance states if it hasn't been occupied for over 30 days it has to be removed. The trailer is vacant and has been.

Bradley responded that he wasn't mad at this board. He felt this was handled poorly. He has a lot of time now that he is retired. I will need to come back before this board because I was told we can't divide the 31 acres into two parcels of 15 acres each. Bradley again noted that if they would have been told we would lose the appeal and get the trailer out of there we would have. The office lost their records because of a fire. He asked the board to be reasonable about this. You want me to tear it down. Isn't something better than nothing? I could be taxed on the trailer.

Hissong answered that once the trailer is removed he would have the option to apply for a permit for a permanent residence on the property.

Bradley replied that they were misled and that they would be able to leave it there.

Marty Sandlin replied if the trailer is removed, there will be no bathroom facilities available when they are out there hunting. They used the trailer to wash their hands or use the bathroom. Apparently when you own something, you don't own it. Sandlin continued that he didn't have any records granting approval for the home he currently resided in. He has painted and replaced windows in the home. He was very disappointed with this board. This board is opening a can of worms. Sandlin again stated he was disappointed in the whole system. We were told we can't even camp out there.

Bradley said he probably will go to court on this. He had legal counsel and was told it would prevail; however, he wasn't sure if it was worth going to court over. The staff should have been honest with me and said it was a piece of junk and get it out of there. How much time do I have on this?

Chair Martin stated he would need to contact staff on that.

Bradley responded he would meet rather contact Preston.

Preston stated he would need to contact the office to make an appointment to speak with both he and Cordier as they work together.

Chair Martin stated a decision was made and that the board needed to proceed with the rest of their meeting.

INTERPRETATIONS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE:

Cordier stated staff had nothing to bring forward.

ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:

Cordier replied that two dimensional variance applications were received and will be placed on the agenda for the May 8, 2013 public hearing. Cordier said she had passed out a travel voucher as a reminder that she will have the vouchers ready to be signed at the May meeting. Mileage for site visits need to be included.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS:

None.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion: Ann Gamboe Hall moved to adjourn the public hearing. **Support:** Larry Gramer.

Motion carried: 6 ayes, 0 nays.

Hearing adjourned at approximately 8:20 P.M.

Recording Secretary: Linda Gene Cordier

Henry W. Martin III, Chairman
Zoning Board of Appeals

Wednesday, May 8, 2013
Approval Date of Minutes