

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
OF THE CITY OF SUNSET HILLS, MISSOURI

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 30, 2021

BE IT REMEMBERED that the Board of Adjustment of the City of Sunset Hills, Missouri met by Zoom meeting on Thursday, December 30, 2021. The meeting convened at 7:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present:	William Weber	-Member
	Mark Naes	-Member
	Larry Smith	-Member
	John Hassis	-Member
	Ronald Hack	-Member
	Lynn Sprick	-City Planner
	Brian Malone	-Attorney
	Bryson Baker	-City Engineer
Absent:	Joshua Arnold	-Member

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Copies of the minutes of the December 2, 2021 Board of Adjustment meeting were distributed to the members for their review. Mr. Hassis made a motion to approve the minutes, as submitted. Mr. Naes seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

NEW BUSINESS

A-31-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Corey Geroski, to allow an accessory structure (in-ground swimming pool) in the side yard at 12852 Shadow Lane (Appendix B, Section 5.12-2A1).

Ms. Sprick stated the pool deck is concrete and is not required to meet zoning requirements. All other requirements of Appendix B will be met.

Mr. Malone stated Appendix D and Appendix B should be submitted into the record. The application will be exhibit one, the staff report will be exhibit two, the site plan will be exhibit three, and the public hearing notice will be exhibit four.

Brian Tabor, of Prestige Pools, was present and stated there is no room behind the house for a pool. There is a hill and trees behind the home, as well. The only place on the property that can accommodate a pool is in the side yard. It will meet the front setback.

Mr. Smith stated the site is very restrictive and there is no other logical place to put the pool.

Mr. Weber agreed and stated the petitioner does have a hardship.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-31-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Corey Geroski, to allow an accessory structure (in-ground swimming pool) in the side yard at 12852 Shadow Lane (Appendix B, Section 5.12-2A1). With five aye votes and zero nay votes, the petition was approved.

A-32-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Octavio Ruiz, to vary the side setback from the required five feet (5') to zero feet (0') for an existing parking lot at 10893 Sunset Hills Plaza (Appendix B, Section 6.3-4A2).

Ms. Sprick stated at the December 1, 2021 meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit and an Amended Development Plan for the business, with a condition that all variances are approved. The existing parking lot is already zero feet from the property line. They are making modifications to the lighting to meet City's ordinances. If this cannot be accomplished, an appeal will be submitted at a later date.

Mr. Malone stated the application will be exhibit one, the staff report will be exhibit two, the Amended Development Plan will be exhibit three, and the public hearing notice will be exhibit four.

D. Willie Sandin, with Sandin Engineering, was present and stated they are dealing with what they have. He is not sure that the site is usable without the variances.

Mr. Hack asked if the whole purpose of the petition is to just conform for what already exists.

Mr. Sandin stated they are building a patio and since they are doing that, the Amended Development Plan was necessary and the whole site had to meet current City requirements.

Mr. Weber stated this meets the requirements for a variance.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-32-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Octavio Ruiz, to vary the side setback from the required five feet (5') to zero feet (0') for an existing parking lot at 10893 Sunset Hills Plaza (Appendix B, Section 6.3-4A2). With five aye votes and zero nay votes, the petition was approved.

A-33-21 This Appeal was determined to be unnecessary and has been removed from the agenda.

~~Notice of Appeal, submitted by Octavio Ruiz, to vary the drive aisle width from twenty four feet (24') to twenty feet (20') for an existing parking lot at 10893 Sunset Hills Plaza (Appendix B, Section 6.3-5A).~~

It should be noted that the following petitions were heard simultaneously, but voted on separately.

A-34-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 1 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-35-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 2 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-36-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 3 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-37-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 4 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-38-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 5 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-39-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 6 in the redevelopment of

Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-40-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 7 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-41-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 8 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-42-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and

3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 9 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-43-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 10 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-44-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 11 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-45-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 12 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-46-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 13 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-47-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 14 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

A-48-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary:

1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20');
2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and
3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 15 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D).

Mr. Malone stated exhibits 1-21 are for these 16 applications. For A-34-21, exhibit 1 will be the application, exhibit 16 will be the corner lot staff report, exhibit 19 will be the Preliminary Plat, and exhibit 20 will be the petitioner information. For A-35-21, exhibit 2 will be the application and exhibit 18 will be the staff report. For A-36-21, the application will be exhibit three. For A-37-21, exhibit four will be the application. For A-38-21, exhibit five will be the application. For A-39-21, exhibit six will be the application. For A-40-21, exhibit 7 will be the application and exhibit 17 will be the cul-de-sac staff report. For A-41-21, exhibit eight will be the application. For A-42-21, exhibit nine will be the application. For A-43-21, exhibit 10 will be the application. For A-44-21, exhibit 11 will be the application. For A-45-21, exhibit 12 will be the application. For A-46-21, exhibit 13 will be the application. For A-47-21, the application will be exhibit 14. For A-48-21, the application will be exhibit 15 and the corner lot staff report will be exhibit 16.

Ms. Sprick stated 11 lots make up the Gates Manor Subdivision, which is now under contract. The builder is proposing that all existing structures be demolished and 15 lots be developed. There are three versions of variances being requested. The interior lots are all part of appeals for front setback, rear setback, and building coverage variances.

Tom O'Toole, attorney representing Pentrex Development, Tom Wolfner, owner of Pentrex Development, and Clay Vance, of Vance Engineering, Inc., were present. Mr.

O'Toole stated the property is zoned R-4 and consists of 4.85 acres. They would like to build 15 lots. The R-4 zoning district density requirements would allow 17 lots on the site. 5 of the 11 homes are vacant. The other homes are deteriorating and in need of repair. They are requesting the front yard setback variance from 30 feet to 20 feet on 12 of the 15 lots. A variance for the rear yard setback for all 15 lots from 30 feet to 20 feet is being requested. A variance on all 15 lots' maximum building coverage from 25% to 35% is being requested. There are two styles of homes being proposed. One is a ranch and the other is a one and a half story. The zoning character of the neighborhood will not be altered. The hardship would be the practical difficulties that the lots being shallow in depth create. The proposal does not increase density and does not substantially change the character of the neighborhood. No detriment to surrounding properties will be created. The surrounding property values will increase. The variances are the only way to accomplish the developer's objective. Public safety will be well served and the practical difficulties are the land conditions and marketability. Currently, 9 of the 11 lots' front setback are nonconforming. 4 of the 11 lots' rear setbacks are nonconforming. The Parklind Drive homes have 25 foot setbacks and are the same distance from the middle of the right of way as the homes on Gates Manor. The new construction will enhance that region of the city. The average lot depth in the R-4 zoning district is 167 feet, but the average lot depth of the Gates Manor Subdivision is only 102 feet. Some are a lot less, which creates a practical difficulty. All uniform setbacks and elevations are being proposed. There are many subdivisions with similar setbacks. The Dennison Grove, Starlight Estates, and Twin Meadows homes all have a 50 foot right of way with 20 foot setbacks. The shallow depths of the lots create practical difficulties. Today's market is single level living, with open area, covered porches, and low maintenance. There will be a Homeowner's Association in charge of maintaining yards and common ground. Covered porches count against maximum building coverage in Sunset Hills, which is unusual. It is also highly unusual for an entire subdivision to be acquired and rebuilt all at once. The City can eliminate the deteriorating rental subdivision, which will enhance the area. All Parklind Drive neighbors are in favor of the development.

Mr. Weber stated the Board has four clearly defined criteria to determine a hardship and this development does not meet the criteria. They could make use of the

property without a variance, since they will be starting with a blank slate. The City established setback requirements, but the developer wants to squeeze in 15 lots. He finds it difficult to support the request.

Mr. O'Toole stated the lot square footage meets the ordinance. The hardship that applies is the practical difficulty of the shallow lots.

Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Weber. The houses do not have to be that big and that many homes do not need to be put in. They are developing the maximum number of houses.

Mr. Hack stated difficulties or hardships are peculiar to lots compared to others in the area. It cannot be beneficial to the owner. He favors the layouts, but they came in with a potential size home to squeeze into the properties. If the homes were smaller, they would fit. The hardship is created from the applicants own action.

Mr. O'Toole stated the living area on the ranch style is 2,400 square feet and 1,851 square feet for the one and half story home. They are proposing extra garage and covered porch space due to Covid-19. The homes are not too large and it is not for financial gain, but for the homes to be marketable.

Mr. Hack asked if he came in with pre-drawn homes and is trying to fit them into the lots or if he looked at the lots and made homes especially for them.

Mr. O'Toole stated they offer a variety of homes that are capable of being built. They decided which homes fit onto each lot best.

Mr. Wolfner stated he tried a number of ranch designs, using the existing setback requirements. A 102 foot deep lot with a 30 foot front and rear setback cannot fit a three car garage and a covered porch area. 42 feet is not enough to accommodate these types of homes.

Mr. Weber stated the developer created his own issue.

Mr. Wolfner stated the depth is the issue, whether there are 11 or 15 lots.

Mr. Weber stated the existing home types are being squeezed in.

Mr. Smith stated the neighborhood is in dire need of redevelopment. What is there is not desirable.

Mr. Weber agreed, but they should meet the requirements when starting with a blank slate.

Mr. Naes stated the City is not hindered by the size of these homes. He does not have a problem with the project.

Mr. Hassis asked staff if there are any other stipulations for the amount of variances allowed that can alter the four requirements.

Mr. Baker stated all variances are in agreement with the Code, if granted.

Mr. Hassis asked if the Planning and Zoning Commission did approve it.

Mr. Baker replied yes.

Mr. Hassis asked if they approve the variances, if the proposal will go onto the Board of Aldermen. He agreed with Mr. Naes that it would be beneficial to the City.

Joe Mueller, a Parklind Drive resident, stated he has been looking for a house to grow his family in. The size of these homes are exactly what he has been looking for. The side setback is not being touched; only the front and back. To build a home to fit into the depth of these lots would be equivalent to the size of a double wide trailer. The existing homes are not big enough and there is a market for the homes being proposed. He does not like the look of the homes, as they are.

Mr. O'Toole stated the zoning district allows for 15 lots. Zoning is about being flexible and enhancing cities. The lots are too shallow, but the development will be an enhancement to the City.

Mr. Smith stated he agrees that it will be an enhanced development. He asked if a homeowner wanted to build a shed in the future, if they would have to come back for a variance.

Ms. Sprick stated yes.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-34-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 1 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-35-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 2 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-36-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 3 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-37-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 4 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-38-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 5 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-39-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 6 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-40-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 7 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-41-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 8 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-42-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 9 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-43-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 10 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-44-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 11 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-45-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 12 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-46-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 13 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-47-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 14 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

Mr. Weber called for a vote on petition A-48-21 Notice of Appeal, submitted by Pentrex Development Corporation, to vary: 1. the front setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); 2. the rear setback from the required thirty feet (30') to twenty feet (20'); and 3. the building coverage allowed from twenty five percent (25%) to thirty five percent (35%) for proposed Lot 15 in the redevelopment of Gates Manor Subdivision (Appendix B, Section B1a & c, Appendix B, Section D). With 3 aye votes and 2 nay votes, the petition was denied.

ANY OTHER MATTERS DEEMED APPROPRIATE

Ms. Sprick stated the January meeting will have appeals for development on the Lion's Choice property. They are adding another drive thru lane and the existing conditions do not meet current Code requirements. Bass Pro Shops may have variance requests as well.

Mr. Hassis asked if it will be an in-person meeting.

Ms. Sprick stated the City was getting close to go back to in-person meetings, but with the holidays, rising level of illnesses, and Covid-19 the Board is staying virtual.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Smith made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 P.M. Mr. Naes seconded the motion, and it was unanimously approved.

Recording Secretary



Sarina Cape