

**HANCOCK COUNTY AREA PLAN COMMISSION
111 AMERICAN LEGION PLACE
GREENFIELD, IN 46140**

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES
DATE: DECEMBER 1, 2022 TIME: 6:30 P.M.**

PRESENT:

**BYRON HOLDEN, PRESIDENT
RENEE OLDHAM, SECRETARY
MICHAEL LONG, VICE PRESIDENT
JASON FAUCETT
EVAN MATLOCK
DARLA SMOAK, INTERIM DIRECTOR
TERI SWEET, RECORDING SEC.
KAYLA BROOKS, CONSULTANT
RHONDA COOK, ATTORNEY**

ABSENT:

The December 1, 2022, meeting of the Hancock County Area Board of Zoning Appeals was brought to order by President Mr. Byron Holden. Mr. Long moved to accept the previous month's minutes as received in the mail. Ms. Oldham seconded. Motion carried.

Ms. Rhonda Cook, the Board's attorney, duly swore in all persons appearing before the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Matlock moved to adjourn. Mr. Faucett seconded, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m..

ATTEST:

ATTEST:

BYRON HOLDEN PRESIDENT

RENEE OLDHAM, SECRETARY

**HANCOCK COUNTY AREA PLAN COMMISSION
111 AMERICAN LEGION PLACE, SUITE 146
GREENFIELD, IN 46140**

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MINUTES

Thursday, December 1, 2022

TIME: 6:30 PM

Surber James
4862 W 100 S New. Palestine
5 - 15 - 6

Residential
Variance 22-2302
Sugar Creek

Ms. Smoak presented a staff report with an unfavorable recommendation and conditions of approval: 1) The owner shall seek and obtain a building permit for the deck and pergola with the cost doubled per code due to construction without a valid permit, 2) The building permit application shall substantially conform to the site plan and photos submitted by the petitioner, 3) The petitioner must maintain weed control between the neighbor's property and the deck/pergola/patio, 4) Petitioner must provide written consent to the neighbor's allowing them to enter their property to maintain the neighbor's fence, landscaping and trees, 5) The petitioner must enclose the west & southwest corner of deck & pergola from the handrail of deck to ceiling to provide privacy to Ms. Sandell to the west, and 6) The petitioner must install a 36' long privacy fence along Samples' property line to provide privacy to Mr. Samples. Mr. James Surber was present to request a Variance to reduce the required 15 ft side yard setback to 1.5 ft for an existing deck & pergola to remain at 4862 W 100 S on 0.407 acres zoned R2.5 (Residential). Mr. Surber said he did not know that a permit was required, and he relied on the professional builder to obtain the permit and to guide him in the correct direction. Mr. Surber said they are deeply sorry that the installation of the deck and pergola has upset the neighbors so much. He said they intended to fix a problem while providing a place for them to have coffee in the mornings and an area for their autistic grandson to play. Mr. Surber said they are willing to install a privacy fence along Mr. Sample's property line and enclose the deck and pergola from the handrail to the ceiling to provide privacy to Ms. Cason to the west. He said life is too short to have his neighbors upset and arguing. Mr. Surber said he discussed with the County Surveyor that the fence would be in a drainage easement. He said they understand that if the easement must be accessed the fence would be removed and replaced at their own expense. Mr. Surber said the fence must be raised off the ground about 3' off the ground to not impede on the water. He said the proposed deck enclosure would be from the SW corner of the deck from the handrail to the ceiling using boards to allow Ms. Cason the privacy she says she has lost. Mr. Matlock asked if they have an accurate survey of the property? Mr. Surber answered they do not have it complete yet, but one has been performed. He said he found the original stake marker in the rear from when the house was built on the east side, and he used his tape measure to mark the west line using his legal description. Ms. Katie Cook, granddaughter, read a letter from Ms. Marsha Breen, neighbor to the east who was unable to attend due to having the flu. Ms. Cook said Ms. Breen's letter states the deck is not causing any harm and should be allowed to remain. She said the letter says that a large amount of money was spent on the deck and pergola, and they are built very well. Ms. Cook said the letter states that the Surbers trusted a contractor and they have taken all responsibility for the error in judgment. Ms. Barbara Cason and Mr. Robert Samples, neighbors to the west, were present and opposed to the deck and pergola. Ms. Cason said when the Surbers moved in she welcomed them to the neighborhood and asked one thing of them and that was that the existing tree line separating their properties to remain, and they agreed at that time. She said a few years later the trees were cut down and she was stripped of her privacy. Mr. Faucett asked who the trees belonged to and were the trees on her property? Ms. Cason answered the trees were right on the property line, so she is not certain who the trees belong to but feels they belonged to both of them. She said Mr. Samples told Mr. Surber and the contractor that the deck and pergola were being constructed too close to the property line and suggested they contact the plan commission office when the deck was started before any posts were installed but they ignored Mr. Samples and continued to construct it. Ms. Cason said everyone knows

that you can not just build right on top of the property line. She said she was told that they even discussed connecting the structure to her fence. Ms. Cason said the Surbers did not discuss building the structures with her until after the fact and by then it was too late because the damage has already been done. She said she cannot maintain her fence because she cannot fit between the structures. Mr. Long asked if her fence was built on the property line? Ms. Cason answered yes. Mr. Long told Ms. Cason if the fence was built on the property line, then she left no room for maintenance of her fence on her own property and she would need consent of the Surbers to access her fence. Ms. Cason said she feels that she cannot peacefully access her rear yard with her 82-year-old mother and grandchildren. She said the contractor should be held accountable for and should be required to move the deck and pergola at their own expense. Ms. Oldham asked when she witnessed the construction, did she go over to talk to the Surbers? Ms. Cason answered no, and said she feels the Surbers do what they want to do without any care for others. She said she feels they should have discussed the construction with her so she could have access to her side of the fence. Mr. Holden said when a person builds a fence on the property line, they should not expect to access the rear side on the neighbor's property. Mr. Matlock said Ms. Cason keeps talking about her privacy but if the deck/ pergola were moved over 15' she will still not have her privacy restored because she will still see the deck and pergola and the Surber's will still see her back yard. Ms. Cason answered if the deck was moved over the 15' at least it would meet code requirements and allow the space that was intended to be between property lines. Ms. Cason said her trees were removed so she installed the fence, but her privacy is still violated. Mr. Holden said this board does not deal with removal of trees. He said it would be a civil matter. Mr. Faucett asked Ms. Smoak, for clarity, the only issue for the board to consider is the variance request to reduce the side yard setback from 15' to allow 1'6"?" Ms. Smoak confirmed the only issue for the board to consider is the side yard setback variance request. Ms. Oldham asked Ms. Cason if there was anything, short of tearing the deck and pergola out, that would bring comfort to her? She asked is there any room for compromise? Ms. Cason answered she is not sure what that would be, because she feels the deck and pergola should not have been built that close to the property line and she requests and deserves her privacy back. She said there are rules for a reason. Mr. Samples said the stone patio is 5' from his property line and covering the drainage easement with a beehive tile inlet in the middle of the patio. He said the entire structure is illegally constructed in the drainage easement and his fence and trees were removed without his permission. Mr. Samples said he talked to the Surber's contractor before the footers of the structure were complete and told him the structure was being constructed too close to the property line. He said the contractor informed him that he was building the structure where the Surbers instructed him to. Mr. Samples said he is a contractor and setbacks are important to know and follow. Mr. Samples said the contractor should have known the county requirements and he should be responsible to move the structure. He said Ms. Cason has a right to her privacy while in her yard. Mr. Surber said Mr. Samples cannot provide proof that he willingly removed his fence or trees however, he can prove he did not. He said he did not consult with Ms. Cason before he hired the contractor to build the deck and pergola as it was not required just like Ms. Cason did not consult them when she constructed the fence. Mr. Surber said he did not remove any trees on Ms. Cason's property, with the exception of one tree that was right on the property line that Ms. Cason's mother, Ms. Sandell, the property owner, helped pay to remove it. Ms. Oldham asked how long it took for the structure to be constructed? Mr. Surber answered it took about one month. Mr. Matlock asked Mr. Surber if he agreed with all the staff recommendations? Mr. Surber answered yes. Mr. Long moved, if approved, the petitioner must comply with staff conditions 1-6 and added 7) Setback variance only applies to the existing non-conforming deck and pergola, and 8) Petitioner must submit a survey that complies with the variance requested. Mr. Holden said he is concerned to make #4 a condition when the neighbors are at odds with each other. He said it could be problematic. Motion dies due to lack of a second. Mr. Matlock moved, if approved, the petitioner must comply with staff conditions 1, 2, 3, 5 & 6 and added 7) Setback variance only applies to the existing non-conforming deck and pergola, and 8) Petitioner must submit a survey that complies with the variance requested. Mr. Faucett seconded. Motion carried. There was no further discussion. Three (3) approved (Matlock, Holden Oldham) and two (2) denied (Long, Faucett).

Seventy Connect III
7366 W 350 N Grfld
14 - 16 - 5

Industrial Business Park
Variance 22-2304
Buck Creek

Ms. Smoak presented a staff report with a favorable recommendation and conditions of approval: 1) Petitioner must meet the landscape and buffer yard requirements on the remainder of the site (south of regulated drain). Mr. Dillon Reynolds, civil engineer, representing the petitioner, was present to request a variance to reduce the required landscape buffer yard in the area north of the regulated drain. Mr. Reynolds stated when the property was originally purchased the company thought they owned the property on the east side north of the regulated drain however, after the rezoning was approved, they learned that the property north of the regulated drain on the east side did not belong to the company. He said the property north of the regulated drain on the west side still belongs to the company and the company cannot access the area and has no use for the area. Mr. Reynolds said to access the site they would have to build a bridge across the regulated drain which would be more invasive to the property. Ms. Sweet said when the rezone petition was first presented the petitioner was given a deed that said they owned the area on the northeast side of the regulated drain, however, when the deed and the legal description were presented to the County Auditor's office, they informed them that area was not under their ownership and was not part of the deed. Mr. Reynolds said the petitioner has talked about giving the property on the northwest side of the regulated drain to the owner of the parcel on the east, Dennis Fry. Mr. Long asked, if approved, would the petitioner agree to install additional landscape plantings along the new north property line south of the regulated drain? Mr. Reynolds answered he is unable to speak to that, however, if the board makes it a condition of approval, he is certain the petitioner will comply with the requirements. He said the company has committed to installing all the required landscaping and buffer yard on the remainder of the site south of the regulated drain. Ms. Brooks suggested, instead of waiving the buffer yard requirement, make the area a protected green space. She said the petitioner could contact DNR for the sapling trees and they could hire an arborist to wade across the drainage ditch and plant the saplings. Mr. Reynolds said he could not commit or agree to that suggestion. Ms. Brooks said the area could be left as a natural area with trees however, weed control would be required. Mr. Holden asked how they would access the area to maintain it? Mr. Reynolds answered they cannot access the area without building a bridge or using Mr. Frey's property. Mr. Holden asked how Mr. Frey can access his property since it appears to be landlocked? Ms. Sweet explained that Mr. Frey can access his portion of the lot from the lot to the east that he owns. Ms. Smoak pointed out that the new approved landscape plan would not require any landscaping buffer yard to be installed. Mr. Holden asked for remonstrators, and none were present. Mr. Holden said he was concerned that when the property was rezoned with the R2.5 zoning to the north, the buffer yard was intended to be installed along the entire north side of the property along the regulated drain but now they present a completely different plan. He said he wants to ensure that the buffer yard will meet the requirements. Mr. Long asked if they would agree to installing additional plantings on the southwest area of the property? Mr. Reynolds said he is sure that the petitioner will comply with the whatever requirements are approved. Mr. Long moved, if approved, the petitioner must comply with staff's conditions of approval and install on the Southwest side of the lot 14 TM units and 10 WF units with saplings to be planted along the north property line. Mr. Holden said he would like to see a new landscape plan. Mr. Long withdrew the motion. Mr. Holden asked if the setback was measured from the existing lot line? Mr. Reynolds answered yes, and said the regulated drain requires a minimum of 75' setback from the center. Mr. Faucett said with the required 75' setback the required rear yard setback of 50' will be within the setback. Mr. Matlock moved, if approved, the petitioner must comply with staff's conditions of approval and install on the Southwest side of the lot an additional 14 TM units and 10 WF units. Mr. Long seconded motion carried. There was no further discussion. Five (5) approved and zero (0) denied.

Beeson, Karen/Neimier 300 Plaza
6072, 6080, 6084, 6088 W 300 N Grfld
13 - 16 - 5

Commercial Community
Variance 22-2312
Buck Creek

Ms. Smoak stated the petitioner requested the petition be continued to January to allow revisions to be made to their request. Ms. Oldham moved to continue the petition to January, as requested. Mr. Matlock seconded. Motion carried. There was no further discussion. Continued to January 26, 2023.

Brightwork Real Estate WITHDRAWN
SE corner of US 40 & 600 W Grfld
6 - 15 - 6

Commercial Neighborhood
Special Exception 22-2313
Sugar Creek

Ms. Smoak stated the petitioner has requested to withdraw the petition. Ms. Oldham moved to withdraw the petition as requested. Mr. Long seconded. Petition was withdrawn.

Upton Brian & Kristie
4945 E US 40 Grfld
35 - 16 - 7

Agricultural
Special Exception & Variance
Center

Ms. Smoak stated the petition must be continued to January due to improper advertising. Ms. Oldham moved to continue the petition to January. Mr. Matlock seconded. Motion carried. There was no further discussion. Continued to January 26, 2023, due to improper advertising.

Rosado, Emmanuel Mt. Comfort Plaza -
2767 - 2805 N 600 W Grfld
24 - 15 - 5

Industrial Business Park
Variance 22-2323
Buck Creek

Ms. Smoak presented a staff report with an unfavorable recommendation and conditions of approval: 1) The owner shall seek and obtain an improvement location permit for sign, 2) Landscaping shall be installed at the base of sign per code requirements, 3) Monument style sign shall be installed, and 4) The BZA reserves the right to revoke the special exception at a public hearing if the sign is demonstrated to constitute a public nuisance. Mr. Emmanuel Rosado was present to request a special exception to allow a multi-tenant sign and variances to allow the height of the sign to be 25' and to exceed the maximum amount of sign face area. Ms. Oldham asked if a petitioner is made aware of the highway corridor overlay standards when they apply for a variance petition? Ms. Smoak answered she did not work with the petitioner when the petition was submitted but the project is well underway, so she assumed that Mr. Rosado was aware of the standards from working with Mr. Dale during the permitting process. Ms. Smoak said the variance request to exceed the allowable amount of sign area is not necessary, according to her calculations, with the proposed size of the sign. She said that variance request should be null and void. Ms. Brooks said staff recommendation is a strong unfavorable because the corridor is highly visible and heavily traveled. She said quite a bit of time and money has been invested in the plan for the corridor and it should be followed. Mr. Rosado said he will revise the plan and work with the board to find an agreeable height. He said he cannot install the sign along 600 W due to an easement so he thought the prime location would be in the northeast corner of the lot at the intersection of the streets. Mr. Rosado said the building will have 10 units with the Mexican restaurant as the anchor. He said the restaurant use to be located on the NW corner of 300 N and 600 W and the owners are anxious to bring the restaurant back to the area. Mr. Rosado said a different Mexican restaurant is proposed to be built in their previous location and they have submitted plans for a permit. He said they would like to beat their competition with the opening. Mr. Rosado said the tenants in the building, existing and proposed, want the sign to be installed. He said he has contracts with a couple of proposed tenants that are requiring sign space. Mr. Rosado said tenants are demanding, as part of their lease contract for sign space on the building, that they provide sign space on the building and on the

freestanding sign. He said the tenants complain that the restaurant blocks the view of the other doors when traffic is traveling south because the restaurant portion of the building sticks out in front of the other business fronts. Mr. Rosado said one of the lease spaces will be occupied by a national coffee shop and they would really like to get the coffee shop open as soon as possible with their competition opening already just down the street to the south of the interstate. Mr. Rosado said he has 5 tenants that are waiting to move in with 2 tenants waiting for confirmation that the sign was approved. Mr. Matlock said the proposed project will be welcomed and is needed for the area, but he does not think that a large sign is necessary. He said with the technology available signage is not needed as much as it used to be. Mr. Matlock said the phone will direct you to almost anything you want in the area. Mr. Rosado said the sign will be needed for the local visitors and those traveling off the interstate. Mr. Rosado said he has faced many challenges and quite a few costly setbacks. He said he has invested 4.8 million dollars to date and the project is not complete yet. Ms. Oldham thanked Mr. Rosado for the investment he has made in the county and commended him for the quality of the project. She said she visited a community that did not allow the large signs so all the signs were monument style signs with multi-tenants and each of the tenant's names could be clearly seen on the signs. Ms. Oldham said it is possible to design the signs that meet the standards and are still visible for the motorist. She said she does travel frequently, and her phone will guide her to a desired location. Ms. Oldham said the signs will set the tone for the area and the corridor study strongly opposes the large signs. She said she feels the study should be respected and followed. Mr. Rosado said he is willing to downsize the proposed sign by 50% and he is willing to redesign the sign to please the board. He said the sign will match the façade of the building. Mr. Long commended Mr. Rosado for the good project. Mr. Rosado said the project has faced many unexpected delays and each delay usually costs him additional money. Mr. Faucett asked Mr. Rosado if he would be willing to reduce the sign to 8' to meet code? Mr. Rosado answered he would discuss reducing the height to 10' to 15', however, he would like to discuss it with the sign designer. Mr. Holden asked Mr. Rosado if he would be willing to continue the petition to January to allow him time to meet with staff to come up with a height that may be acceptable with staff? Ms. Smoak stated staff feels that the sign should meet the 8' height requirement so staff would like direction from the board on an acceptable height. Ms. Brooks said the position of staff is that the sign can and should meet the standards especially given the location. Mr. Long said the market today is making signage part of the lease agreements for tenants as an amenity. He said the sign is for the impulse shopper who may be traveling by and sees the coffee shop or bagel shop and stops just because. Mr. Faucett moved to withdraw the variance request to exceed the sign area square footage since it is not needed. Mr. Long seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Rosado asked if the variance to exceed the maximum height could be continued to January to allow him time to reduce the height and redesign the sign? Mr. Holden answered yes, and said the special exception should be heard so Mr. Rosado will know if the multi-tenant sign will be allowed. Special Exception to allow multi-tenant sign: Five (5) approved and zero (0) denied. Ms. Oldham moved to continue the height variance to the January meeting. Mr. Faucett seconded. Motion carried. Continued to January 26, 2023, to allow time to revise the plan and reduce the height of the sign.

Miller, Silvia Wright, Norman
6911 W Jennifer Dr. Grfld
36 - 16 - 5

Residential
Variances 22-2328
Buck Creek

Ms. Smoak stated the petitioner requested the petition be continued to February due to the death of the petitioner. She said the son will take over the petition Ms. Oldham moved to continue the petition to February, as requested. Mr. Matlock seconded. Motion carried. There was no further discussion. Continued to February 23, 2023, at the petitioner's request.

Miller, Silvia McDonough, Kyle
1024 W US 52 Fountaintown
35 - 15 - 6

Commercial Neighborhood
Special Exception & Variances
Brandywine

Ms. Smoak presented a staff report with recommendations and conditions of approval: Special Exception: Favorable: A) The business shall operate according to the submitted petition, B) The owner shall seek and obtain annual occupancy permits for the home occupation, C) The BZA reserves the right to revoke the special exception at a public hearing if the business is deemed to be a public nuisance, D) The owner shall seek and obtain an improvement location permit for the change of occupancy, 2) Variance to use a sign: Unfavorable, if approved, subject to conditions: E) Sign design and installation shall be subject to a sign permit. 3) Variance to allow off street parking regular on-site gathering of more than one person: Favorable, subject to condition: F) The number of customers or clients regularly gathering on-site at any one time shall not exceed five. Ms. Smoak said a neighbor visited the office with concerns about a rumor that a shooting range is being proposed, however, a shooting range would not be allowed as part of the petition. Ms. Silvia Miller, attorney, along with Mr. Kyle McDonough, were present to request a special exception to allow a home occupation (HO) in the CN zone and variances to allow the HO in a detached building, to allow a sign to be used for the HO and to allow the on site gathering of more than one person providing additional off-street parking. Ms. Miller said Mr. McDonough purchased the property with the expectation that he could simply operate his business without any zoning approval. She said Mr. McDonough moved from out of state expecting to operate but found out that there were many hoops to jump through. She said the property is zoned CN and it used to be an old restaurant that has been converted to a single-family dwelling. Ms. Miller said there is an old pole sign that has been there since 1953, however, it has not been used for many years since the restaurant went out of business. Ms. Miller confirmed that a shooting range is not part of the petition. Mr. Faucett asked if there will be test firing of the guns? Ms. Miller answered no, and said test firing of the repaired guns will be performed off site. Ms. Miller said the proposed use is a use needed in the county. She said the business will be operated in the outbuilding next to their home. She said they do not want the business to dominate the use of the property. Ms. Miller said out of state guns must be shipped to a licensed dealer and there are not many in the area. She said the sign will be used to identify the licensed gun dealer operates here. Ms. Miller said the outbuilding was used for tile/flooring shop and the restaurant closed in the 1990's and the sign has been a landmark since that time. She said the petitioner wants to do the correct thing and commits to follow the conditions of approval. Mr. Faucett asked if the sign is lighted? Mr. McDonough answered the wiring for the sign is existing and the sign could be lighted however, it is not now. Ms. Oldham said a home occupation is a hidden specialty and is not supposed to be visible to the public. She said the sign makes it very visible and asked if the sign is necessary? Mr. McDonough answered unlike most items the state requires that any out of state guns be shipped to a licensed dealer and the sign will help them locate the address and identify the business. Ms. Miller said the area is zoned CN. Mr. Holden said the CN zone should not be considered because the operation will be a home occupation not a commercial business. Ms. Miller said the situation is unique. She said the sign predates the zoning ordinance. Mr. Matlock said the sign is well known and is used as a road marker. Mr. McDonough said all customer interactions will be by appointment only. Mr. Faucett said a sign usually welcomes the customer for business and invites them to stop by. Mr. McDonough answered he believes the sign will put the business in their thoughts as they pass. He said a customer might not think much when they see the sign but later the customer can recall the sign and remember they can pick up their gun at this location. Mr. Long said the sign structure would be considered a legal non-conforming structure if the sign was continually used, however, since not used then it should have been removed within 6 months after the use stopped. Mr.

Holden said the sign would now be an illegal non-conforming structure since not removed within the 6 months and this board could request the sign structure be removed. Ms. Miller said she disagrees and said the law states if the structure predates the zoning ordinance, then the board cannot make it be removed. Ms. Miller said case law in 2006, that involved the Town of Frankfort and Cracker Barrel, where the court ruled if the sign predates the zoning ordinance the sign was legal non-conforming, and the board has no say so in the matter. Mr. Holden said if the petitioner is not willing to comply with the conditions of approval, then he will not support the petition. Ms. Miller said the petitioner agrees with the staff's conditions of approval and wants to operate his business legally. Mr. Faucett asked what are the hours of operation? Mr. McDonough answered he is a full-time caregiver, so he plans to operate for approximately 30 hours through the week and maybe 16 hours on the weekends. Ms. Oldham said the business appears to sound like it will meet the criteria of a home occupation except for using the sign to advertise the home occupation. Mr. Faucett asked if the petitioner intended to use a shooting box to test fire the guns? Mr. McDonough answered no, and said they are prohibited to be used and he has no interest in discharging a gun on the property. Mr. Long moved, if approved, the petitioner must comply with staff's conditions of approval A-D for the special exception. Mr. Faucett seconded. Motion carried. Mr. Long moved, if approved, the petitioner must comply with staff's conditions of approval E-F for the variances. Mr. Matlock seconded. Motion carried. There was no further discussion. Special Exception to allow a home occupation: Five (5) approved and zero (0) denied. Variance to allow the HO to be in a detached structure: Five (5) approved and zero (0) denied, variance to allow a sign to be used to advertise a HO: Three (3) approved (Oldham, Faucett, Matlock) and two (2) denied (Holden, Long), and variance to allow onsite gathering with additional parking: Five (5) approved and zero (0) denied.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Interim Term- Mr. Long stated when Mr. Dale resigned from the Planning Director on a Friday on the following Monday, he received an email from Ms. Darla Smoak (Zoning Assistant) and Ms. Teri Sweet (Office Manager) volunteering to serve as Interim Directors while the search for a new Director was underway. He said he never expected the office and the interim to operate as efficiently as it has. He said staff has kept the daily operations going without any issues with the help of the consultant from GRW, Ms. Kayla Brooks. Mr. Long thanked the staff and Ms. Brooks for the smooth transition. Mr. Long said the new Director will begin and take charge in January 2, 2023. There was no further discussion.

ZONING VIOLATIONS: None