PRE-MEETING:

The board members in attendance were: Sean Kelley, Jeremy Aspen, Jason Lanoha, Brian Mahlendorf and Kristine Moore. Planning Department staff in attendance were Cliff Todd (Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator) and Clinette Ingram (Recording Secretary). Eric Englund was briefly in attendance to discuss Case 19-142. The board reviewed the cases.
LAYER CASE:

1. Case No. 20-051 (from 5/14/20)
   Cameron Ziegenffoss
   16010 Ruggles Street
   Omaha, NE 68116

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-266 - Variance to the interior side yard setback from 10’ to 6’ to allow for the construction of a new deck and stairs.

LOCATION: 123 South 39th Street
ZONE: R8-ACI-1(PL)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Cameron Ziegenffoss appeared before the board on behalf of the property owner.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, recalled that this request was laid over at the May 14, 2020 meeting to give the applicant time to submit revised plans and to obtain documentation from Code Enforcement that showed that the active code violations had been resolved. He stated that the property owner needed to be aware that any future increase in the number of units must comply with the applicable city code, including off-street parking requirements. Since the May 14th meeting, no new information had been provided by the applicant and the Planning Department had not changed its previously stated recommendation of denial of the waiver request.

Steve Anderson, Housing Inspector – City of Omaha, appeared before the board. He stated that the stair issue needed to be remedied for him to clear that particular violation on this property. In response to Mr. Aspen, Mr. Andersen stated that he was reasonably confident that the owner would take care of the remaining violations on the property.

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

AYES: Moore, Lanoha, Mahlendorf, Aspen, Kelley

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
2. Case No. 20-056 (from 5/14/20)  
Nicholas Stalheim  
11208 Martin Avenue  
Omaha, NE 68164  
REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-715 - Variance to the minimum street yard landscaping percentage from 60% to 54% to allow for a new driveway and sidewalk.  
LOCATION: 18701 Patrick Avenue  
ZONE: R4  
This request was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.
3. Case No. 20-073 (from 5/14/20)  
Aaron Campbell  
10652 Woolworth Avenue  
Omaha, NE 68124  
REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-126 - Variance to the interior side yard setback from 25’ to 15’ to allow for the construction of a new garage addition.  
LOCATION:  
10652 Woolworth Avenue  
ZONE:  
R1  
This request was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.
NEW CASES:

4. Case No. 20-075
   Lori Krejci
   21506 Ridgewood Road
   Omaha, NE 68022
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-187(e) – Variance to the front yard setback from 35’ to 23’-8” to allow for the construction of a new home addition.
   LOCATION: 6167 Walnut Street
   ZONE: R4(35)

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Lori Krejci appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new 7’ x 12’ addition at the front of their home that would align with the front wall of the existing covered porch which sat 23’8” from the front property line. The R4(35) District requires a minimum setback of 35’ and since this is new construction, any improvements or additions to the existing home should meet the required setback. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that this was a design preference, and recommended denial. Mr. Todd mentioned that he received communications from some of the surrounding neighbors who felt that the addition would be an improvement to a home that had been neglected.

Ms. Krejci explained that the footings needed to be replaced on the front porch so she decided to add more living space and a second bathroom. She noted that all of the homes on the block were within the 35’ setback. She also mentioned that all of the adjacent neighbors supported the project.

Mr. Kelley noted that the exhibit presented by the applicant showed the hardship that existed because of how all of the homes were situated on that street.

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

AYES: Aspen, Moore, Lanoha, Mahlendorf, Kelley

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
| 5. | Case No. 20-076  
Robert & Darla Knapp  
1505 North 196th Street  
Omaha, NE 68022 | REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786 – Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 6' fence in the front and street side yard setback. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCATION: 1505 North 196th Street</td>
<td>ZONE: R4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Robert Knapp appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicants were proposing to construct an in-ground pool in their back yard and, in order to enclose the property, they wanted to construct a 6' tall, 50% open fence on their property line along Seward Street and Elk Ridge Drive. The proposed fence would be constructed of wrought iron. The submitted plan showed the fence outside of the property lines along Elk Ridge Drive instead of within the property lines. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that this was a design preference, and recommended denial. He noted that this home was on a lot with a double frontage and what was considered to be the front yard was actually the rear yard.

Mr. Knapp indicated that he had sent plans to the president of the Homeowner’s Association and he had no neighbors that were opposed to the request. He stated that he found his property pin and that it was located 10' from the sidewalk which is where he planned to put the fence.

Mr. Lanoha noted that there was a hardship due to the double-fronted lot. In response to Mr. Aspen, Mr. Knapp stated that he only received verbal approval from the president of the HOA since he was in quarantine due to Covid19.

Mr. Lanoha moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted subject to the fence being located on or within the property line. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Moore, Lanoha, Mahlendorf, Aspen, Kelley

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
6. Case No. 20-077
Bhuvnesh Bhargava
11227 Franklin Plaza, #1616
Omaha, NE 68154

REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-715 – Variance to the minimum street yard landscaping percentage from 60% to 47% and to the minimum depth of street yard landscaping from 15’ to 0’ to allow for the construction of a new driveway.

LOCATION: 20509 D Street
ZONE: R4

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Bhuvnesh Bhargava appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that although the home had a three-car garage, the applicant had indicated that he had difficulties accessing the third garage due to the current driveway design. The applicant wanted to extend the third driveway to the front property line. If the proposed addition was added, the site would not meet the required minimum percentage of street yard landscaping. The R4 district requires a minimum of 60% street yard landscaping while this design provides only 47%. In addition, the proposed design would provide none of the 15’ of required minimum depth of street yard landscaping. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that this was a design preference, and recommended denial.

Mr. Bhargava stated that his builder did not inform him that the site could not comfortably fit the third-car garage so only 10’ of concrete was provided in front of the garage making it difficult to park in the garage without ruining the landscaping. He wanted to extend the area so that he could use the garage. He provided a letter of support from his neighbor (Exhibit C).

In response to Mr. Kelley, Mr. Bhargava stated that his builder told him that there were no other options and directed him to the Zoning Board of Appeals. There was some discussion as to whether the amount being requested could be reduced while still keeping the garage functional. Mr. Bhargava responded that he needed at least 20’ for the garage to be functional. He accepted the board’s suggestion as shown on Exhibit B.

Mr. Lanoha moved to APPROVE in accordance with Exhibit B. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Lanoha, Mahlendorf, Moore, Kelley

NAYES: Aspen

MOTION CARRIED: 4-1.
7. Case No. 20-078
   Craig Philbrick
   17005 Decatur Street
   Omaha, NE 68118
   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-786 – Variance to the residential fence regulations to allow a 6’ fence in the street side yard setback.
   LOCATION: 17005 Decatur Street
   ZONE: R4

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Craig Philbrick appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to replace the existing 4’ fence with a 6’ tall, 50% open wrought iron fence to enclose the back yard on their property line along North 170th Street. The applicant intended to install a pool and wanted to ensure that his children and pets had ample space to play and run. He believed that if the fence were placed along the required 15’ setback the majority of the yard would become unusable. A 6’ privacy fence in compliance with zoning regulations could be installed 15’ from the property line along North 170th Street with no issues. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that this was a design preference, and recommended denial.

Mr. Philbrick believed that the proposed fence would be just as safe as the existing, 6’ tall fence.

Ms. Moore noted that the proposed fence would be made of wrought iron which is more than 50% open and she also noted the distance of the fence from the stop sign.

Ms. Moore moved to APPROVE in accordance with the plans submitted subject to the fence being wrought iron. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Aspen, Moore, Lanoha, Kelley
8. Case No. 19-142
   Children’s Hospital Foundation  
c/o HDR, Inc.  
   8404 Indian Hills Drive  
   Omaha, NE 68114  

   REQUEST: Waiver of Sections 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 2,114 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 approval from the Nebraska Department of Transportation; and 3) Compliance with Section 55-854 of the Omaha Municipal Code.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Troy Meyerson (409 South 17th Street) appeared before the board on behalf of the applicant. Also in attendance was Rodrigo Lopez (Interim President & CEO – Children’s Hospital) and Bryan Nielsen – 1917 South 67th Street.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to install a 1,000 square foot electronic messaging center, a sign type that is not allowed in a General Office (GO) district. The request also included an increase to the sign budget from 60 square feet to 2,114 square feet. The Planning Department recommended approval in accordance with the plans submitted, subject to the conditions listed above. He noted that the approval from NDOT had been acquired.

Mr. Lopez apologized on behalf of Children’s Hospital for its oversight with regards to the signage. He explained that when the permit was obtained for the new parking garage, the required Conditional Use Permit was overlooked for the messaging center which had already been constructed but not turned on. He requested that the hospital be allowed to use the display for its intended purpose (reminding parents about vaccinations, well-child visits, parenting classes, etc).

Mr. Meyerson stated that the installation of the sign was unintentional and he apologized for the fact that it occurred. He wanted to work towards a mutually agreeable solution to allow the sign to remain and be used for its intended purpose. He stated that Children’s planned to comply with the brightness, image restriction, transition time and noise restrictions as set forth in the Omaha Municipal Code, Section 55-804. He added that the hours of use for the sign would be restricted to between 5 a.m and 11:00 p.m. They also agreed to turn of the border of the sign so that the display area would be reduced to 1,000 square feet.

In response to Mr. Mahlendorf, Mr. Meyerson stated that sign would be used for information purposes only with regards to Children’s Hospital.

Ms. Moore stated that she was in attendance both times Children’s appeared before the board (December 31, 2019 and January 9, 2020) and she continued to feel very strongly about the size if the sign which she stated was right on top of Dodge Street and larger than a highway billboard sign. She wanted to know why the sign needed to be so large. In response, Mr. Meyerson stated that the size of the sign had been reduced by approximately 257 square feet. He explained that the proposed amount of signage was chosen because it was similar to the Do Space sign located at 72nd & Dodge Streets which he indicated was 834 square feet. Mr. Mahlendorf responded that when he requested that the sign permit be pulled for the Do Space sign it was determined that their electronic sign measured only 640 square feet. Mr. Meyerson explained how the size of the signage was calculated. Ms. Moore noted that the Do Space sign did not require a waiver. Mr. Aspen was concerned about the precedent that would be set if the sign were allowed to remain.

Mr. Kelley believed that the applicant had made some progress with the application since the January 9th meeting, however, he stilled believed that the request for 1,000 square feet of signage was too much. Mr. Meyerson stated that the border of the sign had been increased to reduce the amount of signage.
Mr. Aspen questioned the appearance of the sign with a larger size border. He requested that the border appear to be the same color as the parking structure and he suggested that the border issue be included as part of the motion. Ms. Moore continued to have issues with the size of the sign.

Mr. Lanoha commented that he did not believe that a mistake was made on the Children’s part. He believed that Children’s should have been able to depend on their consultants to make the right decisions on the hospital’s behalf.

Mr. Lanoha moved to APPROVE subject to applicant following the performance standards: A-1) the maximum brightness of the sign shall not exceed a luminance of 5,200 NITS (candelas per square meter) during daylight hours or 0.3 foot-candles over ambient lighting, whichever is less. The maximum brightness of the sign shall not exceed a luminance of 500 NITS during the period from dusk to dawn, or 0.2 foot-candles over ambient lighting, whichever is less; A-2) the sign shall have an automatic dimmer control or ambient light monitors to produce an illumination change from a higher illumination level to a lower one for the period of time from dusk to dawn (or any other applicable conditions based on ambient light); A-3) There shall be a minimal brightness differential from an image with a white or light-colored background/content to one with a black or darker background/content (and vice versa). Screen transitions should not appear to flash due to brightness differential; B-1) any image or message displayed on the sign must have a minimum duration time of ten seconds; B-2) each image shown must be static and not contain any type of motion, animation, scrolling of text or sequential displays designed to appear as such; C-1) the transition time from one image to another shall appear instantaneous; C-2) the use of specialized transitions or other special effects during transition is prohibited; C-3) the sign shall have a default mechanism that will stop the sign in one fixed position should a malfunction occur; D) the sign shall not contain any type of audio speakers or sound broadcast devices. The operating equipment for the electronic off-premises sign must comply with the current noise regulations contained in Section 55-804; E) The hours of use of the digital sign will be restricted to between 5:00 a.m and 11:00 p.m.; F) Content shall be similar to the examples provided by the applicant to the City on June 4, 2020 and also provided to the Zoning Board of Appeals board members; and G) the size of the signage should be limited to 816 square feet. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Mahlendorf explained that he voted no because there was a discrepancy between the signage at Do Space and what the applicant was proposing.

Mr. Aspen wanted the background/border color added to the motion. He also suggested adding a one-year term to the waiver. Mr. Kelley stated that he was in agreement with the addition of the one-year term to the motion.

Ms. Moore continued to request that the size of the sign be reduced at least to the size of a highway billboard sign. Mr. Lanoha responded that he believed that sign would be just as distracting if the sign was reduced to that size.

Mr. Nielsen discussed how the sign would be negatively impacted if it was reduced to 816 square feet. He also stated that he was in possession of the shop drawings for the Do Space signage and that he would be able to present those if necessary.

Ms. Moore was more comfortable with the one year requirement being added to the motion along with the stipulation that the border of the sign match the parking structure. The size of the sign would be 816 square feet.
Mr. Lanoha AMENDED his motion to include the previously stated conditions and the addition of the one-year term and the unused portion of the sign matching the façade of the garage. Mr. Kelley seconded the amended motion.

AYES: Moore, Lanoha, Mahlendof, Kelley

NAYES: Aspen

MOTION CARRIED: 4-1.
9. Case No. 20-079 - **WITHDRAWN**
   Tony Brown
   11408 Frederick Street
   Omaha, NE 68144

   **REQUEST:** Waiver of Section 55-503 - Variance to the use regulations of the General Industrial district to allow an expansion of an existing Kennel use not otherwise permitted.

   **LOCATION:** 6508 North 16th Street
   **ZONE:** GI

This request was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.
10. Case No. 20-080  
    Jason Hoesing  
    11714 Sprague Street  
    Omaha, NE 68164

    REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-126 - Variance to interior side yard setback from 25' to 24.4' to allow for the construction of a garage addition.
    LOCATION: 8309 Howard Street
    ZONE: R1

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Jason Hoesing and Rob Schartz (Property Owner) appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to add a new garage and room addition to the existing home. The structure would encroach into the required side yard setback on the east side of the house by approximately 6”. The new garage addition would comply with the front yard setback and would encroach no further into the side yard setback; however, due to its length, it was not eligible for relief from any code exceptions, per Section 55-864(b). The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that this was a design preference, and recommended denial.

Mr. Hoesing discussed the plans for the proposed addition. Mr. Schartz stated that the renovations would help to increase the value of the home and make it fit in better with the neighborhood. He noted that when the home was built in 1957 it was 6” short of the side yard setback.

Mr. Kelley noted that the request was minimal and that the existing property line would not change.

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

AYES: Mahlendorf, Aspen, Moore, Kelley

MOTION CARRIED: 4-0.

(Mr. Lanoha was not present when the roll was called.)
11. **Case No. 20-081**  
Steve Hansen  
1305 South 156th Court  
Omaha, NE 68130

**REQUEST:** Waiver of Section 55-715 – Variance to the minimum street yard landscaping percentage from 70% to 44% and to the minimum depth of street yard landscaping from 25’ to 10’ to allow for the construction of a new driveway addition.

**LOCATION:** 8825 Edgevale Place  
**ZONE:** R2

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:** Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Steve Hansen appeared before the board on behalf of the property owners.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that during the construction of a new, single-family home, the applicant chose to install an additional driveway extension which had not been approved with the original building permits. Had the design been included on the original plans, it would have been deemed non-compliant and the applicant would have been instructed to apply for a waiver prior to beginning construction. He added that having two driveways less than 40’ will also need to be approved by the Public Works department. If Public Works did not approve the request, the applicant would need to apply for a waiver from the Administrative Board of Appeals. Noting that this is new construction, the Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request and recommended denial.

Mr. Hansen stated that during the construction of the home, neighbors made him aware of parking and traffic issues in the neighborhood. They also indicated that there were no sidewalks for children and dog walkers to use causing them to walk in the street. For those reasons he decided to create a circular drive. He stated that he was not aware of the landscaping requirements and failed to apply for a permit for the additional work. He also spoke with the neighbors and they stated that they had no objections to the request (Exhibit B). He believed that there was a hardship due to the limited street parking and he felt that it helped to make the neighborhood safer.

Mr. Mahlendorf suggested that the applicant heavily landscape the center area of the circular drive.

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

**AYES:** Mahlendorf, Moore, Lanoha, Kelley  

**NAYES:** Aspen

**MOTION CARRIED:** 4-1.
12. Case No. 20-082
   Immanuel Inc.
   c/o Dan Dolezal, EGA
   3552 Farnam Street
   Omaha, NE 68131

   REQUEST: Waiver of Sections 55-246 & 55-786 –
   Variance to the required front yard setback
   from 35’ to 25’ & to the residential fence
   regulations to allow a 6’ fence in the front
   yard setback to allow for a new assisted
   living facility.

   LOCATION: 6803 & 6809 North 68th Plaza
   ZONE: R7

   PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

   At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Dan Dolezal and Rhonda Distefano
   (Immanuel, Inc.) appeared before the board. Mr. Mahlendorf stated that he would be abstaining from
   voting on this case due to a working relationship with the applicant.

   Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a
   new assisted living facility and the proposed design did not meet the R7 setbacks or the residential fence
   regulations. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request,
   noting that these were design preferences, and recommended denial.

   Mr. Dolezal explained the three phases of the project and he discussed the storm water issues. Those
   issues resulted in small portions of the proposed building being located in the front yard setback.

   Ms. Distefano discussed the history and the reasons for the construction of the new facility was
   completed. She explained that the existing facility needed to remain in operation until the construction of
   the new facility. She explained that in order to keep the site safe and secure for staff and residents, the
   new fence design was being proposed. The fence was similar to what was being used by the QLI
   campus, located to the south of the Immanuel campus.

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

   AYES: Aspen, Moore, Lanoha, Kelley

   ABSTAIN: Mahlendorf

   MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-1.
13. Case No. 20-083
   Eric Williams & Linda Buchanan
   c/o Mick McGuire
   Straightline Designs
   3925 South 147th Street, Suite 119
   Omaha, NE 68144

   REQUEST: Waiver of Section 55-146 - Variance to the front yard setback from 40' to 32' to allow for the construction of a new covered stoop.

   LOCATION: 1331 South 93rd Avenue
   ZONE: R2

PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION: Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Mick McGuire appeared before the board on behalf of the property owners.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new, covered stoop on the front of the home to provide protection from the elements and to add curb appeal. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request and recommended denial.

Mr. McGuire stated that the homeowners had spoken with five of the neighbors who were mostly impacted by the addition and they all supported the request (Exhibit B). He noted that a similar waiver had been granted to a couple of the homes in the area.

Mr. Kelley noted that stoop would encroach no further into the setback than the existing one.

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

AYES: Moore, Lanoha, Mahlendorf, Aspen, Kelley

MOTION CARRIED: 5-0.
14. **Case No. 20-084**
Leah Thrasher  
c/o Jack Piels  
1019 Park Avenue, #321  
Omaha, NE 68105

**REQUEST:** Waiver of Section 55-734 - Variance to the required number of off-street parking stalls from 36 to 10 to allow for the construction of a new cocktail lounge.

**LOCATION:** 1231 South 14\(^{th}\) Street  
**ZONE:** CC

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATION:** Denial.

At the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting held on June 11, 2020, Leah Thrasher and Jack Piels appeared before the board.

Cliff Todd, Zoning Board of Appeals Administrator, stated that the applicant was proposing to construct a new cocktail lounge and was unable to provide the required number of off-street parking stalls. The number of required parking stalls was originally 36 and had been revised to 29. The Planning Department found no hardship or practical difficulty to support the request, noting that these were design preferences, and recommended denial. He added that if the board decided to grant the waiver, it should be for this applicant only. He noted that an adjacent property owner had expressed support for the waiver request and he mentioned revised information that showed additional on-street parking availability.

Ms. Thrasher explained that this location that would be known as the Omaha Dog Bar would be a unique, membership based facility for dogs and their owners. It would consist of an indoor/outdoor dog park with a bar and eatery. She provided some background information about herself and the project. She explained that there were originally only four stalls on the property with another six being added to the rear of the building. She indicated that many of the surrounding residential and commercial property owners supported the project and she read some of the statements of support from them. She added that the employees would be required to park in the public lots on William Street.

Mr. Aspen mentioned that he had spoken with the most affected neighbor who expressed support for the project.

Mr. Lanoha moved to **APPROVE** for this applicant only. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

**AYES:** Lanoha, Mahlendorf, Aspen, Moore, Kelley

**MOTION CARRIED:** 5-0.
APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Lanoha moved to APPROVE the minutes of the March 12, 2020 meeting. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Mahlendorf, Lanoha, Aspen, Kelley

ABSTAIN: Moore

MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-1.

Mr. Aspen moved to APPROVE the minutes of the May 14, 2020 meeting. Mr. Kelley seconded the motion.

AYES: Aspen, Moore, Mahlendorf, Kelley

ABSTAIN: Lanoha

MOTION CARRIED: 4-0-1.

ADJOURNMENT

It was the consensus of the Board to ADJOURN the meeting at 2:44 p.m.

____________________________________________
Approved (date)

_____________________________________
Sean Kelley, Chair

_____________________________________
Clinette Ingram, Secretary