

**GRAND JUNCTION BOARD OF APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES
November 18, 1998
9:00 a.m. to 11:10 a.m.**

I. CALL TO ORDER

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Grand Junction Board of Appeals was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by Vice-Chairman William Putnam.

In attendance, representing the Board of Appeals were: Vice-Chairman William Putnam, Pamela Hong, James Nall and Neeoma Coston. Chairman John Elmer was absent.

Also in attendance were Michael Drollinger (Development Services Supervisor) and John Shaver (Assistant City Attorney).

Bobbie Paulson was present to record the minutes.

There were four citizens present, including the Petitioner and his representatives, during the course of the meeting.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

Available for consideration were the minutes of August 12, 1998.

MOTION: (PAMELA HONG) “Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the minutes of the August 12, 1998 meeting.”

Neeoma Coston seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

III. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

VAR-1998-188 VARIANCE—CIMARRON MINOR SUBDIVISION #2

A request for a variance from Section 5-7-7B of the *Zoning and Development Code* to allow redistribution of the signage allowance and location of freestanding signs for a retail shopping center.

**Petitioner: Wayne Fisher
Location: 625 24 ½ Road
City Staff: Michael Drollinger**

PETITIONER’S PRESENTATION

Pat Edwards (592 West Indian Creek Drive, Grand Junction) stated that Cimarron Minor Subdivision #2 is located Northeast of Mesa Mall, East of Home Depot and West of 24 1/2 Road. Cimarron Minor Subdivision consists of three lots. Fisher Liquor Barn will be built on Lot 2, Sooper Credit Union on Lot 3 and a single tenant is proposed at this time for Lot 1. At the time the subdivision was platted, the overall concept of signage was discussed with Mr. Drollinger. Mr. Drollinger pointed out that the Code does not allow signage on Patterson Road for Lot 1 since the lot does not have any frontage along Patterson Road and it does not allow signage on 24 ½ Road for Lot 2. Mr. Edwards stated that if this

piece of property were one parcel with the pad sites leased to individual users, the Code would allow signage on both frontages for those businesses.

Mr. Edwards stated that the petitioner had requested one monument sign and one pylon sign on 24 ½ Road and that City staff has recommended that there only be one sign on 24 ½ Road. The petitioner feels that because of the heavy amount of traffic on Patterson Road, an additional sign on 24 ½ Road would help direct some of the patrons that will use the businesses on this parcel onto 24 ½ Road as opposed to Patterson Road.

Bud Preuss (978 24 Road) of Bud's Signs questioned the math on Table 1 supplied by City staff. He stated that the third column of Table 1 for Fisher Liquor Barn reads the total proposed is 306 ft² and the maximum allowed by Code is 248 ft². Sooper Credit Union reads that 125 ft² is the maximum allowed by Code for Patterson Road and 211 ft² for 24 ½ Road. For the future development, the maximum allowed is 280 ft². The total maximum allowed for the entire development is 864 ft². The petitioner is proposing 824 ft². There is a discrepancy of 40 ft². The petitioner's proposal is to exceed the sign allowance on the Fisher Liquor Barn parcel (Lot 2), to be lower on the Sooper Credit Union parcel (Lot 3) and slightly over, two ft², on the future development (Lot 1). If each parcel/business were to obtain their own signage, they would be allowed by Code to have four free-standing signs, two on Patterson Road and two on 24 ½ Road. The petitioner is proposing to reduce that to three signs, one on Patterson and two on 24 ½ Road. Mr. Preuss noted that City staff is asking for only one sign on each frontage. Mr. Preuss stated that what the petitioner is proposing for signage is not what is reflected on Table 1.

William Putnam asked Mr. Preuss what the petitioner is proposing for signage if Table 1 is not correct.

Mr. Preuss replied that, for example, sign Exhibit A proposed to be located on Patterson Road is 252 ft².

Michael Drollinger explained that the calculations that are on Table 1 may not match the total square feet on Exhibits A, B and C. Table 1 summarizes the amount of signage that has been allocated to each property, for example, in Table 1 for Fisher Liquor Barn, freestanding signs, under the column heading 'Applicant's Proposed Sign Package' there is 126 ft² proposed for Patterson Road and 40 ft² proposed for 24 ½ Road. These numbers were taken from the Exhibits A, B, and C that have Fisher Liquor Barn advertising on them. Mr. Drollinger added that his number is correct if all the individual components are summed. Mr. Drollinger stated that he took the individual components of the signs, the Fisher Liquor Barn, the Sooper Credit Union and the future development and put them on this table by user/business to get an idea that if they were to develop individually per Code what amount of signage is proposed for each business.

Mr. Preuss felt that the square footage should match whether it is calculated by user or by sign. Mr. Drollinger agreed. He said he used the drawing submitted by Mr. Edwards in his response to comments as a basis to prepare Table 1. He added that he would take another look at the drawing to see if there were any discrepancies.

Mr. Preuss pointed out the proposed signage for the entire project is still less than the maximum allowed by Code.

Wayne Fisher (1041 24 Road) stated that he is a native of Grand Junction and previously lived where Mesa Mall is now located. He sold that property to the Mall in 1977. He stated that he has invested a lot of money into Patterson Road and 24 ½ Road improvements and utilities. He said he has owned a business since 1972. Mr. Fisher stated that he considered requesting only one sign on Patterson Road and one on 24 ½ Road for the entire development. He felt that there wasn't a suitable location on 24 ½ Road for only one sign that advertised all the businesses in the development. He considered placing it in the entrance island on 24 ½ Road but there is an existing overhead light in the middle of the island. This light would have to be moved to place a sign there. He felt that two signs would direct traffic better than one.

Neeoma Coston asked if any of the signs were illuminated so that the electrical in the island could be used to light the sign.

Mr. Fisher said that the light from a sign would not be sufficient enough to light the entryway. He pointed out that the light in the island was required by the City. He added that he didn't want to put a sign in the island with a light over it because "it looks kind of funky."

William Putnam asked the petitioner for clarification as to whether he felt that by having two signs on 24 ½ Road that would somehow divert traffic away from Patterson Road and on to 24 ½ Road?

Mr. Fisher replied that he felt it would help keep patrons who are using 24 ½ Road use the 24 ½ Road entrance.

William Putnam asked Mr. Fisher if he knew if Lot 1 would have one tenant or several tenants. He asked if a wall sign would only be allowed on the portion of the building that faces 24 ½ Road.

Mr. Fisher stated that the front of the building on Lot 1 will face the parking lot.

Mr. Drollinger stated that Mr. Fisher is correct. On Figure 1, the front of the building has been identified with arrows and it does face the parking lot. He added that the wall signage would be restricted to the front of the building.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Michael Drollinger stated that this request is for a variance of three sections of the Code, Section 5-7-7B.7a, 5-7-7B.8 and 5-7-7B.5. The applicant is requesting variances from those Code sections to permit redistribution of their freestanding signage for the shopping center that is under development and also to exceed the maximum permitted sign allowance.

Mr. Drollinger said that the Cimarron Minor Subdivision is comprised of three lots. Lot 1 is presently undeveloped and is referred to as the 'future development' or 'future retail lot.' Lot 2 is the Fisher Liquor Barn which is under construction and its orientation is facing Patterson Road. Lot 3 is the Sooper Credit Union which is also under construction. The applicant has proposed three free-standing signs that are identified as signs A, B, and C and are identified as Figures 2, 3 and 4 in the staff report. The sign locations are also identified on Figure 1. Under the current Code, sign calculations for these three lots would be dealt with separately and that may be part of the confusion on Table 1. Mr. Drollinger attempted to clarify the numbers on Table 1. He said that for example, the applicant has proposed Sign A on Patterson Road on the Fisher Liquor Barn property. Sign A has four different signs on it which identify the individual tenants in the development, the first being the Fisher Liquor Barn., the second sign is for Sooper Credit Union, the third for a Cimarron tenant and the fourth sign is to advertise liquor

specials. The Sooper Credit Union and the Cimarron tenant signs are, by Code, considered off-premise signs which would normally not be allowed and this is the reason for one of the variance requests. Mr. Drollinger explained that he translated this information to Table 1 assigning the signage to the business it advertises. For example, the Fisher Liquor Barn sign is made up of two components 1) the Fisher's Liquor Barn sign and 2) the liquor specials sign. The square footage of these two signs were added together and placed on Table 1 under the Fisher Liquor Barn freestanding signs which is 126 ft². The Sooper Credit Union signage was allocated to the Sooper Credit Union. Under the heading Sooper Credit Union on Table 1, free-standing sign on Patterson Road is 66 ft². Mr. Drollinger explained that he wanted to give the Board an idea that if the applicant were to develop this as per Code, how much signage would be allowed on each lot.

The criteria for the Board's decision on this are contained in Section 10-1-1B. Mr. Drollinger reminded the Board of Appeals that the applicant carries the burden to demonstrate to the Board's satisfaction that all the criteria on Section 10-1-1B.3.a-d have been satisfied.

Mr. Drollinger stated that there has been a change in retail shopping center development from one large leased site where under the present Code, signage can be allocated and moved all around the site because it is one property. Staff feels that the applicant's proposal to redistribute the signage and treat this development as one property makes good planning sense because on the ground it will function as one unit. Staff believes the concept of redistributing signs and developing a sign plan for a shopping center is a "sound one" and the Code permits the development of sign plans in Section 5-7-7B.9 but that section is not applicable to this property because of its zoning which is Highway Oriented (HO). That Code section is only for properties in a planned development zone or properties that require a Conditional Use Permit.

Staff's findings of review of Section 10-1-1B.3 is that the sign plan concept again that is permitted by Code is a sound one, however, in developing a sign plan for a shopping center, limiting the number of free-standing signs and consolidating free-standing signage should be done to the largest degree practical. Staff feels that the two free-standing signs proposed on 24 1/2 Road could be and should be consolidated into one. The consolidation of signage and limiting the number of free-standing signs is more consistent with the Code's objective of moderating the size, number and obtrusive placement of signs and the reduction of clutter.

Mr. Drollinger referred to the staff report. The staff report addresses two sections, one is titled 'Free-standing Sign Redistribution' and the second is 'Variance from Maximum Sign Allowance,' because the applicant is requesting variances from both. In summary the staff recommendation on this item is denial of the variance for the reallocation of the area and the placement of free-standing signs as proposed by the applicant and denial of the variance to exceed the maximum sign allowance permitted by Code. However, because staff feels there is some merit in preparing a sign plan for this development staff has recommended an alternative sign proposal which is contained on page 5 of the staff report. The staff recommended signage package for the proposal is as follows:

1. One free standing sign per frontage in the locations A and B as noted in Figure 1. Staff feels that a sign could be placed in either location B or C. The free-standing signs should not to exceed 100 ft² each and the height should be limited to 25 feet. These free-standing signs may contain advertisement for one or more of the businesses on the property as requested by the applicant.

2. Flush wall signs on the Future retail building shall be limited to what is called the front of the building that would be the area facing the parking lot that is identified in Figure 1.
3. Flush wall sign allowances for the Fisher's Liquor Barn and Sooper Credit Union may be calculated in accordance with Section 5-7-7B(7)b.

Mr. Drollinger stated that the free-standing signs for each parcel shall be deducted from the total signage allowed for that property.

Staff feels that the staff's recommended proposal permits a generous wall sign allowance and a redistribution of the free-standing sign allowance for the shopping center tenants while limiting the clutter of multiple free-standing signs per frontage. Because of the proximity of all buildings, existing and future, to the adjoining streets, wall signs will supplement the free-standing signs to clearly identify the businesses from the adjoining street network.

QUESTIONS

James Nall questioned whether the Board should continue to hear this item based on the discrepancy between the applicant's calculation of the square footage number and staff's.

Mr. Drollinger felt the 40 ft² wasn't significant enough to delay action on this proposal.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Drollinger to make clear to the Board staff's calculations on Table 1 and what the petitioner is proposing for signage. Mr. Drollinger reiterated the basis for the Table.

Mr. Drollinger used Fisher Liquor Barn as an example. The proposed free-standing signage is 166 ft², the total allowed by Code is 248 ft². The proposed wall signage is 140 ft², the maximum allowed by Code is 180 ft². The total allowed for the entire lot is the higher of the two, which is the 248 ft². The petitioner has proposed 306 ft² and that is why a variance is required for them to exceed the maximum allowed. Again, the total sign allowance may not exceed the higher of the free-standing or wall or sign allowances.

Mr. Shaver asked Mr. Drollinger if a copy of the staff report had been entered into the record.

Mr. Drollinger replied that the file has been public record and that the staff report has been part of the file since November 10, 1998.

Mr. Shaver stated that since the file has not been entered into the record, he asked the Board to do so at this time.

Mr. Putnam asked what the Board needed to do to make that occur. Mr. Shaver replied that the mention of it should be sufficient because it is on a tape recording.

Mr. Putnam asked for clarification since staff recommended denial of the variances as requested but has also recommended an alternate sign proposal.

Mr. Shaver replied that the Board has broad discretion relative to fashioning a remedy. The applicant has a right to have their proposal considered. There are fundamentally two issues, one is the off-premise sign and the other is the total sign allowance. It would be appropriate for the Board to divide motions on those issues and once that is done, the Board can issue direction to the staff in terms of an

accommodating solution. Mr. Shaver added that staff usually likes to suggest options when a recommendation of denial is given but the Board doesn't have to adopt that recommendation.

Neeoma Coston asked the petitioner how far the first sign on 24 ½ Road would be from the intersection of Patterson Road and 24 ½ Road and also how many feet to the following sign.

Mr. Fisher replied that the property is approximately 560 feet long along 24 ½ Road. He wasn't sure of the distances for the signs.

Neeoma Coston asked how far the proposed sign was from the Home Depot sign on 24 ½ Road.

Mr. Drollinger referring to Figure 1 stated that the distance from the signalized intersection to the entrance on 24 ½ Road is approximately 1/8 of a mile. The property is 555 feet long. It is approximately 280 feet from the intersection to the entrance on 24 ½ Road and then another 274 feet the other direction.

James Nall referring to signs B and C, asked if their exact locations were identified on Figure 1 or if they could be moved closer to the access.

Mr. Drollinger stated that signs B and C are being proposed by the applicant in those approximate locations. The applicant has flexibility to request their location today and the Board has flexibility in adjusting that location.

PETITIONER'S REBUTTAL

Mr. Fisher stated that Capps Furniture is currently negotiating to build their store on Lot 1. Capps Furniture has their own pylon free-standing sign which they will want to move to this location. Mr. Fisher stated that they will want to place it nearly even with their building on 24 ½ Road. Mr. Fisher stated that his proposal would work best for the businesses located on this development. He added that Sooper Credit Union has indicated that they want their sign by their building. If the Board doesn't approve this request, there will be four free-standing signs on this development.

Pat Edwards stated that development along 24 ½ Road is going to occur and it will change the character of 24 ½ Road dramatically. The petitioner is requesting two free-standing signs on 24 ½ Road to help direct traffic. Sign B will be a monument sign. Sign C will be a pylon sign. If Capps Furniture builds a building on Lot 1, they will relocate their pylon sign off of Patterson Road and move it to 24 ½ Road. If there is multi-tenant use in that building then the additional sign is needed on 24 ½ Road to identify the building and the individual tenants in that building. Mr. Edwards stated that one sign would not be sufficient to advertise all of the possible businesses that could happen at that location.

James Nall asked if Sign B will be perpendicular to the roadway. Mr. Edwards replied affirmatively.

Mr. Nall asked if there will be a one-lane ingress and a two-lane egress at the 24 ½ Road entrance. Mr. Edwards replied affirmatively.

James Nall stated that if two signs are placed at the entrance, one on both sides, there may be some confusion as to where the correct access point is. Mr. Edwards replied that is a good point. Mr. Edwards added that he also considered reducing the size of the monument sign because it could cause some confusion; however, it is also confusing to have several businesses advertised on a single sign. Mr. Edwards stated that the Sooper Credit Union has indicated they may be willing to reduce the width of

Sign B.

Mr. Preuss pointed out that if the variance is not granted for the off-premise signage, these lots can be treated as individual properties and have up to 864 ft² of signage. That means there could be two 40 foot high signs on Patterson Road and two 25 foot high signs on 24 ½ Road. Mr. Preuss addressed the Board; if all the tenants in this development decide to do their own signage this could happen so consider that in your decision. The Petitioner has asked for only one sign on Patterson and two on 24 ½ Road and for the ability to have off -premise signage.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Joseph Marie (535 ½ 29 Road) felt that the width of the road should dictate the size of signage allowed.

QUESTIONS

James Nall asked staff for clarification; does each property that has street frontage allowed two types of signs, a free-standing and a wall sign. Mr. Drollinger replied that is correct.

James Nall stated that the proposed staff compromise is that Fisher Liquor Barn be eligible to have a free-standing sign on Patterson and a free-standing sign on 24 ½ Road even though their lot does not have frontage on 24 ½ Road. Mr. Drollinger stated that is correct and that is what the applicant has proposed. Mr. Drollinger added that the future development would also have option to have an off-premise sign on Patterson Road.

James Nall stated that if the development were to obtain separate signage for each lot they could have four free-standing signs but they would not be allowed to have any off-premise signage. Mr. Drollinger replied again that is correct. Mr. Drollinger stated that based on the plat, the future development retail center would be allowed one sign on 24 ½ Road, the Sooper Credit Union would be able to have two free-standing signs, one on Patterson Road and one on 24 ½ Road and the Fisher Liquor Barn would be restricted to one free-standing sign on Patterson Road. They would only be allowed to advertise their business on the sign(s) on their property.

Mr. Drollinger referred to Table 1. The numbers used in Table 1 were supplied by the applicant and are correct. The aggregate signage allowed for all these properties together is 864 ft². The total that is proposed by the applicant in Exhibit 5 is 824 ft² which also matches a table supplied by Mr. Edwards in the petitioner's response to comments where the total is 824 ft² which also cross references to Figures 2, 3 and 4. There may have been some confusion to what the applicant's proposal is versus the total allowed.

The public hearing portion of the meeting was officially closed.

DISCUSSION

Mr. Nall stated that he was not comfortable with the proposed location of the signs on 24 ½ Road, particularly Sign B. He felt that the proposed location would create a traffic hazard adding that people are not going to be sure where the entrance is. When there are multiple signs it creates confusion. A single sign would be best.

Pamela Hong asked how the wall signage was going to be redistributed. Mr. Preuss replied that all the square footages were included in the application.

There was discussion on whether to re-open the public hearing. The Board agreed that the petitioner can respond to questions but not make additional comments.

Ms. Hong asked if the petitioner would be willing to redistribute the signage on 24 ½ Road to one sign. Mr. Fisher stated that if this proposal is denied by the Board, he would install a free-standing sign on Patterson for the Fisher Liquor Barn and a wall sign on the rear of the building. He reiterated that there will be four free-standing signs if this proposal is denied.

Mr. Putnam felt that it was reasonable for businesses to share signage.

The Board discussed the Home Depot signage and how it was shared with other businesses.

Mr. Putnam stated that he agreed with the philosophy of shared signage but felt uneasy about negotiating the details.

Mr. Shaver stated that as discussed previously, the applicant has submitted their proposal and they are entitled to have a decision on that proposal; however, that does not preclude the Board from, after the first question is answered, to either adopt staff's proposal or craft its own proposal. Mr. Shaver added that the applicant, however, is not obligated to accept anything the Board recommends. Even if the applicant's proposal is approved, they could still construct their signage according Code.

Mr. Drollinger stated that the Board needs to consider three different variances of the Code and they are detailed on page 1 of the staff report. The first variance is from Section 5-7-7B.7a. "the sign allowance per frontage can only be used on that frontage and shall not be transferred to any other frontage." The second variance is from Section 5-7-7B.8 "off premise signs erected on ground or wall locations shall only be permitted in the C-2 and I-1 and I-2 zones." This particular development is located in a HO Zone District. The third variance is from Section 5-7-7B.5 Sign "allowance calculations" which is their proposal to exceed the maximum allowed on two of the parcels. The first two variances are very closely related so Mr. Drollinger recommended that the Board consider them together.

The Board's discussion ensued regarding the number of free-standing signs, the location of the signs, the off-premise signage and the height of the signs.

The Board agreed that the petitioner should be allowed the off-premise signage.

James Nall asked about the height limits for the signs.

Mr. Drollinger stated that as per Code, the height limit for the sign on Patterson Road is 40 feet because it is a four-lane road. The height of the sign is dependent on the size and number of lanes in the street. The signs along 24 ½ Road can only be 25 feet high as per Code because it is a two-lane road. The applicant is proposing that Sign A be 34 feet high, Sign B be 11 feet high and Sign C be 28 feet high. In the original proposal Sign C was within the Code limit. Sign C needs to be restricted to 25 feet high as per Code.

The Board discussed whether considering individual aspects of the variance request or considering it as a package.

The Board continued discussion of the location of the proposed signage.

James Nall felt that the two free-standing signs, one on Patterson Road and one on 24 ½ Road would allow the petitioner to have the off-premise signage he is requesting.

Mr. Shaver advised the Board that if they were leaning towards denial of the applicant's proposal that they first consider the applicant's proposal in their motion and then if so inclined craft a motion based on the discussion.

MOTION: (JAMES NALL) “Mr. Chairman, on variance request VAR-1998-188, a variance for a variance from Section 5-7-7B.7.a and 5-7-7B.8 I move that we deny the variance for the reasons we discussed.”

Pamela Hong seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed by a vote of 3-1, with Neeoma Coston against.

MOTION: (JAMES NALL) “Mr. Chairman on item VAR-1998-188 a request for a variance for the maximum total sign allowance I move that we deny the variance for the reasons stated during discussions.”

Pamela Hong seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

MOTION: (PAMELA HONG) “Mr. Chairman on item VAR-1998-188 I move that there be one sign on F Road and one sign on 24 ½ Road and that the petitioner will work with City staff to determine that the aggregate square feet is not exceeded for their signage.”

Mr. Shaver stated that for purposes of clarity, is the intent of this motion to allow one off-premise sign on 24 ½ Road for a business that is fronting Patterson Road and for the two lots that have frontage on 24 ½ Road be allowed one off-premise sign for either of those lots to be decided by the staff and the petitioner. Is the Board essentially approving two off-premise signs?

James Nall replied that his intent is to allow one free-standing sign on Patterson Road for the development which may include off-premise signage for all the properties within the development and one free-standing sign on 24 ½ Road for the development which may include off-premise signage for all of the properties within the development.

Mr. Shaver asked the Board to clarify whether the sign square footage is to be determined by the applicant so long as the total does not exceed what has been proposed or by what the Code allows.

Pamela Hong replied that it should be the aggregate square footage allowed by Code.

Mr. Shaver asked if the aggregate would be determined by the entirety of the parcel based upon Code allowances.

Ms. Hong and Mr. Nall replied affirmatively.

Mr. Drollinger added that the height limit of the two free-standing signs will not exceed that allowed by Code. The Board agreed.

Mr. Nall seconded the motion. A vote was called and the motion passed unanimously by a vote of 4-0.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Mr. Drollinger stated he has three discussion items to present to the Board. The first item, Mr. Drollinger referred to the August 12, 1998 Board of Appeals meeting. At that meeting, there was discussion regarding the zoning classification of RSF-5 in the area between Grand and Gunnison Avenues and 12th and 14th Streets. Only 23 of a total of 53 properties in that district meet the minimum lot size for this zone designation. There are also some bulk standards attached to that zoning for that area that could create additional variance requests. The surrounding zoning is RSF-8. Mr. Drollinger stated that the RSF-8 zoning would better reflect what is in that area and lessen the potential variance applications. The Board's discussion based on the August 12 minutes is that the Board might consider referring this to the Planning Commission asking them to take a closer look at the zoning for that area to see if it is appropriate. The current proposal is to rezone that area from RSF-5 to RMF-5 which would still leave several non-conformities. Mr. Drollinger asked the Board if he should draft a document that could be referred to the Planning Commission suggesting they take closer look at the existing and proposed zoning for that particular area.

The Board agreed to have staff draft a document for this purpose.

Mr. Drollinger said that once the document is drafted he will bring it to the Board for its review and the Board can take formal action at that time.

Mr. Drollinger stated that the second item is Ivy Williams, Code Enforcement Supervisor, will be requesting the Board to consider designating an additional noxious weed. She will be presenting information regarding that at the Board's next meeting.

Mr. Drollinger stated that the third and final item is that he would like the Board to discuss their by-laws at the next meeting. The next regularly scheduled Board of Appeals meetings is December 9, 1998. Several Board members stated that they would not be able to attend that meeting. Mr. Drollinger said he would look into some alternative dates.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 a.m.