PRE-MEETING:

The board members in attendance were: Jason Lanoha, Brian Mahlendorf, Dustin Friedman, Sean Kelley and Kristine Moore. Planning Department staff in attendance were: Cliff Todd (Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator) and Clinette Ingram (Recording Secretary). The board reviewed the cases.

Certification of Publication: Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator certifies publication of this agenda in the Daily Record, the official newspaper of the City of Omaha on Monday, December 2, 2019 (Use Waivers) and Thursday, December 5, 2019.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jason Lanoha – Chair
Dusty Friedman (Alternate)
Sean Kelley
Brian Mahlendorf
Kristine Moore

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT: Jeremy Aspen – Vice Chair
Matthew Kortright (Alternate)

STAFF PRESENT: Mike Carter, Current Planning Manager
Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator
Jake Placzek, City Planner
Jennifer Taylor, City Attorney
Clinette Ingram, Recording Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. Mr. Lanoha introduced the board members and City staff. He explained the procedures for hearing the cases. He stated that the applicant for Case 19-135 had withdrawn their request.
LAYOVER CASES:

1. Case No. 19-097 (from 10/10/19)  
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-246 - Variance to the minimum lot size in an R7 district from 5,000 sq. ft. to 2,520 sq. ft.; to the minimum site area per unit from 2,500 sq. ft. to 800 sq. ft.; to the minimum front yard setback from 35' to 0'; to the minimum street side yard setback from 15' to 5'; to the minimum interior side yard setback from 7' to 5'; to the minimum rear yard setback from 25' to 5'; to the maximum building coverage from 60% to 63% and to the maximum impervious coverage allowed from 70% to 73% to allow for the construction of new duplex.

   LOCATION: 2518 Mason Street  
   ZONE: R7

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Steven Held (Uptown Properties – 3502 Leavenworth) appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new duplex and was unable to meet a number of the regulations for the R7 district. He noted that if the board chose to approve the waivers, the applicant would be required to re-plat the property before any building permits were issued. The Planning Department found no hardships or practical difficulties to support the waiver requests, noting that the request was the result of design preferences. He added that waivers to build a single-family home could be supported but not to build a duplex on this small property. The Planning Department recommended denial of the waiver requests.

Mr. Held explained that the request had been changed from “single-family attached” to “duplex”. In addition, the applicant also wanted the case to be heard before a full board of five members.

Mr. Mahlendorf stated that whatever was built on this site would probably need waivers due to the size of the lot.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
2. Case No. 19-118 (from 11/14/19)  
   Robert and Judith Evans  
   8002 Kilpatrick Parkway  
   Bennington, NE 68007  
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786(e)(1) - Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 6’ tall, privacy fence within the street side yard setback.  
   LOCATION: 8002 Kilpatrick Parkway  
   ZONE: R4  

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Robert Evans appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, explained that this request had been laid over at the November 14, 2019 meeting to give the applicant the opportunity to appear before the board. Since that time no new information had been received and the Planning Department recommendation had not changed since a code compliant fence could be constructed without the need for waivers. The Planning Department recommended denial.

Mr. Evans indicated that there was 25’ – 35’ of visibility looking west on Reynolds Street that should override any safety concerns.

Mr. Kelley stated that he understood the applicant wanting to provide privacy to the swimming pool area; however, he agreed that there would be visibility and safety concerns with granting a waiver so far into the street side yard setback. Mr. Todd responded that if the fence were built on the 15’ setback, there would be approximately 8” from the pool skirt to the fence.

Ms. Moore stated that she was more concerned about the neighbors on Reynolds Street that were adjacent to the applicant’s back yard who could possibly have some difficulty backing out onto the street. Mr. Mahlendorf believed that more than 8” was needed from the pool to the fence so he suggested that the fence come out 6’ perpendicular from the side of the home for more space. He also suggested that the pool equipment and condensing unit be contained within the 6’ privacy fence (Exhibit B).

Mr. Evans stated that the condensing unit would be contained on the east side of the fence. He was in agreement with the proposed changes to the original plan.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE as modified in accordance with “Exhibit B”.

AYES: Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Lanoha  

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
3. Case No. 19-133 (from 11/14/19)  
Nancy Schlessinger  
c/o Adam Dusatko  
2117 South 156th Circle  
Omaha, NE 68130  
REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786(e)(1) - Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 6' tall, 50% open fence within the front yard setback.  
LOCATION: 3310 South 228th Terrace  
ZONE: R1  

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Adam Dusatko appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that this request had been laid over at the November 14, 2019 meeting to give the applicant time to discuss their request with their homeowners association. Since that time no new information had been received and the Planning Department’s recommendation of denial had not changed.

Mr. Dusatko stated that the applicant had applied with the HOA since the last meeting. The applicant proposed that the fence be built 5’ within the setback, similar to other fences in the area. He submitted a letter from a neighbor (Steven M. Hinchcliff – 3412 South 228th Terrace) who supported the request (Exhibit B).

Mr. Lanoha stated that he would abstain from voting on this case. He did, however, explain that this type of multi-lot situation was typical for the area.

Mr. Dusatko clarified that the case had also been laid over because there were only four board members at the November meeting instead of five.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Kelley  
ABSTAIN: Lanoha  
MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-1.
NEW CASES:

4. Case No. 19-134
   Kim Haws
   5719 South 114th Street
   Omaha, NE 68137
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-186 - Variance to the side yard setback from 5' to 1’10” to allow for the construction of a carport to store a camper.
   LOCATION: 5719 South 114th Street
   ZONE: R4(35)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Kim Haws appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a carport on the south side of his home and was unable to meet the required 5’ side yard setback. The Planning Department did not support the request since there was no hardship or practical difficulty and, therefore, recommended denial. He noted that a letter of support had been submitted from the adjacent property owner at 5725 South 114th Street.

Mr. Haws stated that he wanted to put a carport over the area where he parks his motorhome beside his home. He stated that if the carport was installed it would extend 6” closer to the side yard setback. He intended to make the carport match the existing home and add some landscaping around it.

Mr. Kelley stated that he could support the request if it was limited to this homeowner only. In response to Mr. Mahlendorf, Mr. Haws explained that he intended to enclose the rear of the carport and the side that was closest to his neighbor. Mr. Mahlendorf was concerned that the enclosure of the carport made it a more permanent structure. Mr. Lanoha agreed.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE the request for this applicant only. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

Mr. Mahlendorf clarified that the intent of the motion was that when the applicant left the home, the structure would be removed.

AYES: Moore, Friedman, Kelley

NAYES: Mahlendorf, Lanoha

MOTION FAILED: 3-2. Request denied.
5. Case No. 19-135  
Derek Quinn  
4301 North 193rd Circle  
Omaha, NE 68022

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786(e)(3)(4) - Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 6' tall, privacy fence within the front yard setback.

LOCATION: 4301 North 193rd Circle  
ZONE: R3

This case was withdrawn as the request of the applicant.
6. Case No. 19-136
Pine Crest Homes
11205 South 150th Street
Suite 100
Omaha, NE 68137

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-201 - Variance to the rear yard setback from 25’ to 19’-9.5” to allow for construction of a new deck.

LOCATION: 15460 Jaynes Circle
ZONE: R5

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Larry Jobeun (11440 West Center Road) appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new deck that would encroach 5’2 1/2” into the rear yard setback. Since this was new construction on an undeveloped lot, the Planning Department believed that a deck could be designed that would be in compliance with the minimum setback requirements. The Planning Department did not support the request since there was no hardship or practical difficulty and recommended denial.

Mr. Jobeun indicated that there was a practical difficulty due to the irregular shape of the lot. He stated that the deck was actually smaller than what would usually be put on this type of home (8’ in depth and 16’ in length as opposed to the typical 12’ in depth and 16’ in length). He also mentioned that there was a significant grade change on this lot and he indicated that there would never be a home immediately to the rear of the deck.

Robert Bogar (15453 Ellison Circle) appeared in opposition to the request. He stated that the back of his property is adjacent to the applicant’s. He explained that all of the water from other homes in the area runs down through his property. He explained that this resulted in the ground being damp which prevented him from being able to mow it. He was also concerned about the location of the proposed deck. In response, Mr. Jobeun stated that the deck would meet the impervious coverage requirements of the R5 district. He also mentioned that the area in question would be sodded which should help with some of the drainage issues. In response to Mr. Lanoha, Mr. Jobeun stated that he would pass the concerns of Mr. Bogar on to his client.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
7. Case No. 19-137
   Joe Semin
   17104 Chalet Drive
   Bellevue, NE 68123

   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-187(e) - Variance to the front yard setback from 35’ to 25’ to allow for construction of a new, single-family home.

   LOCATION: 4323 South 33rd Street
   ZONE: R4(35)

   PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Approval, subject to the applicant submitting an application to rezone the property to R4.

   At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Joe Semin appeared before the board.

   Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new, single-family home on this undeveloped lot and was unable to meet the required 35’ front yard setback. With regards to the front yard setback, a hardship existed due to the age of the neighborhood and the proximity of the other homes in the area. He explained that the R4 district requires a 25’ front yard setback and if the applicant were to rezone the property to R4, this request would then become unnecessary. The Planning Department recommended approval, subject to the applicant submitting an application to rezone the property to R4.

   Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted, subject to the applicant submitting an application to rezone the property to R4. Mr. Friedman seconded the motion.

   AYES: Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Lanoha

   MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
8.

Case No. 19-138
Jane Stessman
c/o PEN Architect LLC
1331 Ridgewood Avenue
Omaha, NE 68124

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-146 - Variance to the maximum impervious coverage allowed in a R2 district from 40% to 45% to allow for construction of a new, detached garage.

LOCATION: 1329 South 83rd Street
ZONE: R2

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Paul Nelson (PEN Architect - 1331 Ridgewood Avenue) appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new, detached garage that would exceed the maximum impervious coverage allowed in a R2 District. The site was already non-compliant, since the existing impervious coverage measured 44%. The proposed garage would bring the total to 45%. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request since it was a design preference and the property already did not comply with the zoning code. The Planning Department recommended denial. He mentioned that a letter of support had been submitted from an adjacent property owner.

Mr. Nelson stated that the property owners had purchased the property approximately 10 years ago with the amount of impervious coverage at about 50%. He suggested that as much pavement as possible was removed so that the garage could be constructed. He explained that the pool was removed and more green space and drainage basins were added. The property was then re-surveyed and it was determined that the impervious coverage was down to 44%. He also submitted a letter of support (Exhibit B).

There was some discussion about the locations of the rain gardens. Mr. Mahlendorf believed that there was a practical difficulty that resulted from the current building regulations not acknowledging modern pervious applications like pavers or rain gardens.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
9. Case No. 19-139
   Elizabeth Behrens
   c/o Leimbach Construction
   5644 South 51st Street
   Omaha, NE 68117
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-187(e) - Variance to the front yard setback from 35’ to 32’4” to allow for construction of a new front deck and steps.
   LOCATION: 2129 South 62nd Street
   ZONE: R4(35)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Paul Nelson (Nick Leimbach - Leimbach Construction) appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new deck and steps on the front of the home that would not meet the required 35’ front yard setback. Since this was new construction, it was determined that a code compliant deck and steps could be designed that would meet the required setback. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request since it was a design preference and recommended denial.

Mr. Leimbach stated that the steps would be the only part of the deck that would extend into the setback. He explained that the previous steps had deteriorated and needed to be replaced.

Ms. Moore stated that she understood the need for the variance and supported the request.

Ms. Moore moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
10. Case No. 19-140  
Nebraska Methodist Hospital  
c/o Tod Trigg, HDR, Inc.  
1917 South 67th Street  
Omaha, NE 68106

REQUEST:  Waiver of Section 55-326 - Variance to the front yard setback from 25' to 20.6” to allow for the construction and screening of an emergency generator.

LOCATION:  8303 Dodge Street

ZONE:  GO

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Approval in accordance with the plans submitted.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Tod Trigg appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to expand the emergency department and, due to limited space, asked for a setback adjustment to allow for the installation of an emergency generator. A practical difficulty existed due to inability to further expand the hospital site, the irregular shape of the property, the civic nature of the use along with the growing demands for services at the facility. At its December 4, 2019 meeting, the Planning Board approved a Major Amendment to a Conditional Use Permit to allow the proposed generator with one of the conditions being the approval of the waiver for the front yard setback by the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Planning Department found the requested waivers to be acceptable due to the irregular shape of the lot, the large civic nature of the use and the site constraints. The Planning Department recommended approval in accordance with the plans submitted.

Mr. Trigg explained that the generator would be behind the 25’ setback and would be concealed behind a solid screen wall that would match the new expansion.

Mr. Kelley mentioned that the board usually grants these types of waivers for hospitals, especially due to the limited space available.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
11. Case No. 19-141
American National Bank
c/o Signworks
4713 F Street
Omaha, NE 68117
REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-836 - Variance to the front yard setback from 12' to 6' to allow for the installation of a new monument sign.
LOCATION: 8990 West Dodge Road
ZONE: CC-ACI-2(PL)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Gaby Ryan (Signworks – 4713 “F” Street) and Jim Burns (American National Bank) appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to add two new monument signs, one of which was unable to meet the required 12’ setback. Based upon the proposed size and location of the sign, it appeared that the signage would obstruct the sight lines along 90th Street, creating a safety issue. He explained that the 12’ setback was a matter of aesthetics and, more importantly, a matter of safety. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty, noting that the request was the result of a design preference, and recommended denial of the request.

Ms. Ryan explained that there had never been a sign at the 90th Street entrance. She noted that 6’ was the standard side yard setback. She clarified that the proposed sign would be 2’8” wide.

In response to Mr. Kelley, Ms. Ryan explained that the sign was needed at this entrance so that people would know exactly where the entrance to the bank is on 90th Street. She added that some of the signage on the building would be removed leaving just one sign. She indicated that the applicant had attempted to work with the doctors to the east so that the two-drive entrance could become a one-drive entrance but they declined.

Ms. Moore stated that after looking at the site, it appeared that the sign would be approximately 24’ - 26’ from the actual curb which helped her to feel comfortable with the sign being placed in its proposed location.

Mr. Mahlendorf stated that he did not believe that the sign would cause any obstruction issues. He believed the request to be reasonable.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Friedman seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Lanoha

NAYES: Kelley

MOTION CARRIED: 4-1.
12. Case No. 19-142  
Children’s Hospital Foundation  
c/o HDR, Inc.  
8404 Indian Hills Drive  
Omaha, NE 68114

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-834(1)(2) - Variance to allow an electronic messaging center for a civic use in a GO district and to the maximum sign budget from 60 sq. ft. to 2,520 sq. ft. to allow for a new signage plan.

LOCATION: 8300 Dodge Street  
ZONE: GO-ACI-2(65)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Approval in accordance with the plans submitted subject to: 1) No off-premise advertising is permitted; 2) The applicant securing any necessary approvals from the NDOT for the electronic messaging sign; and 3) Compliance with Section 55-854 of the Omaha Municipal Code.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Brian Nielsen (HDR - 1917 South 67th Street) and Tim Jacoby (Children’s Hospital) appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to install an electronic messaging center, which is not allowed in a GO district. In addition, an increase in the sign budget from 60 square feet to 2,520 square feet was also being requested. He stated that a practical difficulty existed due to the growing demands of services at this location and the civic use of this facility. At its December 4, 2019 meeting, the Planning Board approved a Major Amendment to the Conditional Use Permit, with one of the conditions being the approval of this waiver request from the Zoning Board of Appeals. The Planning Department recommended approval in accordance with the plans submitted subject to the following: 1) No off-premise advertising is permitted; 2) The applicant securing any necessary approvals from the NDOT for the electronic messaging sign; and 3) Compliance with Section 55-854 of the Omaha Municipal Code.

Mr. Nielsen recalled that back in 2007, the applicant had been granted 987 square feet of signage instead of the 60 that was allowed.

Ms. Moore stated that, although she understand the civic nature of the site, she believed that the digital signage would prove to be distracting on one of the busiest streets in Omaha. She also believed that there was already enough signage to identify the hospital and she questioned the purpose of the sign and how it would help the public. She added that the screen appeared to be advertising a television commercial. Mr. Nielsen responded that the purpose of the signage was to educate the public on the services that were being provided in a tasteful manner.

Mr. Mahlendorf stated that, although he liked the signage, it was difficult to support it from a zoning standpoint.

Mr. Jacoby stated that Children’s was expanding their services in Omaha and bringing more specialties to the region. He indicated that the applicant had worked with the Planning Department to add controls to the sign that would mitigate any safety concerns.

Referring to the signage standards mentioned in the Planning Department’s recommendation report, Mike Carter (Current Planning Manager), explained that there were currently no rules regulating on-premise electronic signs. He added that the Planning Department had attempted to use off-premise regulations for on-premise signage. He added that the department was comfortable with the conditions that had been presented to both the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Mr. Lanoha stated that he was surprised that the Planning Department supported the request and he expressed concern about what the limits were for signage. He mentioned that it would be difficult to put a time limit on the sign considering its size.
Mr. Kelley mentioned that at the pre-meeting that morning, the board had watched an example of what would be shown on the screen. He agreed with Ms. Moore that it appeared to be a commercial. He stated that he could not support the request because he felt that the request was going too far into the commercialization of electronic signage. He was also concerned about the content of the sign. Mr. Jacoby stated that the applicant would work with the board regarding the content of the sign.

It was determined that the sign had already been installed but was not running. Mr. Neilsen apologized for the installation of the sign explaining that he was new to the area.

Mr. Mahlendorf moved to APPROVE subject to review of this case by the board in 1 year (December 2020) with regards to functionality and the impact on Dodge Street. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Friedman, Lanoha
NAYES: Kelley, Moore
MOTION FAILED: 3-2.

Mr. Kelley suggested that the case be laid over for 30 days so that the applicant could provide the board with other options with regards to the content of the sign. Mr. Kelley wanted more time between images along with less pictures and more wording.

Mr. Kelley moved to LAYOVER for 30 days. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Lanoha
MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.

The applicants offered to immediately agree to any stipulations set by the board. They also wanted the option to advise the board of their options before the next scheduled meeting. Ms. Moore also wanted to know if NDOT had given approval for the sign before the January 2020 meeting. Mr. Todd agreed to provide any additional information to the board.
13. Case No. 19-143  
Francisco Betanzos  
2208 South 11th Street  
Omaha, NE 68108  

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-715 - Variance to the minimum percentage of street yard landscaping from 50% to 34% to allow for the construction of a new parking area.

LOCATION: 2208 South 11th Street  
ZONE: R7  

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on December 12, 2019, Francisco Betanzos appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new parking area in the front of the home and was unable to meet the minimum required street yard landscaping percentage. He explained that, if the board chose to grant the request, the proposed parking area must be located entirely within the property lines since a parked vehicle could not block or extend into the sidewalk. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty, noting that the request was the result of a design preference, and recommended denial of the request.

Mr. Betanzos explained that he had already put the driveway in and that he had gotten a violation notice about a month after it was installed. He wanted a waiver so that the parking area could remain. He indicated that he had a neighbor whose driveway was similar to his. He explained that it was difficult to park behind the home because of a 5’ tall wall that was located there.

Ms. Moore liked the appearance of the parking area and she noted that it looked very similar to the neighbors.

In response to Mr. Lanoha, Mr. Betanzos stated that there was not enough room for him to use the neighbor’s driveway to access the back of his home.

Ms. Moore moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Moore, Friedman, Kelley, Mahlendorf

NAYES: Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 4-1.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Lanoha moved to APPROVE the minutes of the October 10, 2019 meeting. Ms. Moore seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha

ABSTAIN: Kelley

MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-1.

Mr. Kelley moved to APPROVE the minutes of the November 14, 2019 meeting. Mr. Lanoha seconded the motion.

AYES: Friedman, Kelley, Moore, Lanoha

ABSTAIN: Mahlendorf

MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-1.

DISCUSSION:

The board discussed whether they should hold the election of officers although it was not on the agenda. Ms. Taylor, Attorney – City Law Department, suggested that they choose a slate that could be formally voted on at the January 2020 meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

It was the consensus of the Board to ADJOURN the meeting at 2:53 p.m.

____________________________________________
Approved (date)

____________________________________________
Jason Lanoha, Chair

____________________________________________
Clinette Ingram, Secretary