Administration Building

Council Chambers

308 Fountain Circle

July 21, 2020

6:00 p.m.

**BOARD OF ZONING ADJUSTMENT**

Members Present:

Mr. Bert Peake – Vice Chairman

Mr. Fred Coffey

Ms. Kimberly Ford

Mr. Johnny Ozier – Supernumerary

Dr. David Branham

Others Present:

Mr. Thomas Nunez, City of Huntsville Planning Department

Mr. Travis Cummings, City of Huntsville Zoning Administration

Mrs. Jon Johnson, City of Huntsville Zoning Administration

Mrs. Courtney Edwards, City of Huntsville Zoning Administration, Recording Secretary

Mr. Robert Baudendistel, City of Huntsville Zoning Administration

Officer Johnny Hollingsworth, Huntsville Police Department

The regular meeting of the Board of Zoning Adjustment was called to order by Vice-Chairman Peake at the time and place noted above.

Vice-Chairman Peake explained the procedures of the Board of Zoning Adjustment to those present, advising that any decision made by the Board may be appealed to Circuit Court within 15 days from this date and that any variance or special exception requires four affirmative votes as set by State law. Any variance or special exception granted must be exercised within six months by obtaining the proper permit. Also, if the Board denies a request, the appellant would have to wait six months before reapplying for a variance unless there was a significant change in the appellant’s request.

Vice-Chairman Peake stated that the following cases are all continued for 30 days: The height of a building, an additional story, and an off-street parking variance at 1550 Perimeter Parkway NW, The height of a building, an additional story, and an off-street parking variance at 1551 Perimeter Parkway NW, and Case 9242-1 The location of a structure, total lot coverage and rear yard lot coverage variance at 1122 Clinton Avenue SE. Also, the following cases have been withdrawn: A use variance to allow a mobile food vending unit in a Neighborhood Business C2 Zoning District at 2212 Governors Drive SW aka 2300 Governors Drive SW, and Case 9239-1 Additional signage and the size of signage at 7252 Governors West NW.

Vice-Chairman Peake then called the extension items.

**Case No. 9233-1** **185 Plummer Road NW;** Jahazy P. Rooks of Center Grove United Methodist Church, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a seven (7) foot setback variance for the location of an accessory ground sign. In a Residential 2 Zoning District, no part of any sign shall be erected closer than ten (10) feet to any overhead electric, cable, or other transmission line. Mr. Fred Coffey recused from this case.

Mr. Jahazy Rooks appeared before the Board. Mr. Cummings stated this request was before you last month where they were requesting a setback to get closer to the power lines. The Board requested they continue this request so they could meet with Huntsville Utilities. Mr. Cummings stated they met with Huntsville Utilities and Mr. Rooks on site and Huntsville Utilities has no issues with the sign being a zero setback under the power lines. Mr. Cummings further explained the sign will still meet the height restrictions and distance requirements from the sign to the utility lines. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Cummings if this was a monument sign. Mr. Cummings stated this is an existing pole sign they removed from the old church and bringing to the new church location. Mr. Cummings also stated this property has a large right of way. Mr. Cummings stated they are trying to get as close as they can for visibility. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Rooks if they are refacing the sign. Mr. Rooks stated they are using the traditional box sign from the old church and moving the sign to the new church location.

A motion was made by Dr. Branham and seconded by Mr. Ozier to approve a 7 foot setback variance for the location of an accessory ground sign due to the fact the pole sign is not in violation of the distance requirements for Huntsville Utilities and this property has a large Right of Way. **Approved unanimously**

**Case No. 9242-1 1122 Clinton Avenue SE;** The location of a structure, total lot coverage and rear yard lot coverage variance; Gary W, Watson, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a 3 foot secondary front yard setback variance. This request will also require an 18 foot 6 inch rear yard setback variance. This request will also require a 25% total lot coverage variance. This request will also require a 17.5% rear lot coverage variance. In a Residence 1-C Zoning District, a setback of 5 feet is required from a side street on corner lots.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Peake and seconded by Mr. Coffey to continue this request for 30 days. **Approved unanimously**.

Vice-Chairman Peake then called the agenda items.

**Case No. 9243 4839 Sparkman Drive NW**; A use variance to allow a pest control office, the size of signage, location of signage, height of signage, and type of signage in a Residence 1A Zoning District; Christopher Eby, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a use variance to allow a pest control office in a Residence 1A Zoning District. This request will also require a variance to allow a 15 square foot attached accessory sign in a Residence 1A Zoning District.

Mr. Matt Summers appeared before the Board for Mr. Christopher Eby. Mr. Summers explained this is an existing bank building they bought about a year ago and turned into their office and storage area. Mr. Summers stated the variance request was approved over a year ago, however they did not get their business license within 6 months of the variance case that was approved. Mr. Cummings stated the exact same request was before the Board on April 16, 2019 and was

approved for a use variance to allow a pest control office in a Residence 1A Zoning District for this appellant only and for this use only, due to the fact this location has a history of variances. Also, the Board approved a variance to allow a 15 square foot attached accessory sign in a Residence 1A Zoning District. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if anything had changed with this request. Mr. Cummings stated no.

A motion was made by Mr. Ozier and seconded by Dr. Branham to approve a use variance to allow a pest control office in a Residence 1A Zoning District for this appellant only and for this use only, due to the fact this area has a history of variance and a variance to allow a 15 square foot attached accessory sign in a Residence 1A Zoning District. **Approved unanimously**.

**Case No. 9245 212 Dan Tibbs Road**; PVA landscaping and the location of a structure; James L. Batson of Spacegate DTR LLC, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a 15 foot rear yard setback variance. This request will also require a buffer of screen planting variance. The minimum required depth of rear yard shall be twenty 20 feet with a berm and planting screen or thirty-five 35 feet without a berm and planting screen.

Mr. James Batson appeared before the Board and Mr. Jeff Mullins appeared before the Board. Mr. Mullins stated this is a 1 acre vacant lot. Mr. Mullins also explained the lots to the east and west are in the county and has the industrial look for this area. Mr. Mullins further explained they are requesting a variance on the rear yard setback. Mr. Mullins stated the rear yard shall be 20 feet with a berm and planting screen or thirty-five 35 feet without a berm and planting screen. Mr. Mullins stated this site does not have city sewer services and to make this work they cannot fit a berm due to the need of the septic being placed in the rear yard. Vice-Chairman Peake asked will they meet the front and side yard setbacks. Mr. Mullins stated yes, they will comply with the setbacks. Mr. Mullins stated this lot is in the city limits and in a Commercial Industrial Park Zoning District.

Mr. Cummings presented the Board with a site plan of this lot. Mr. Cummings reiterated they are not allowed city sewer services and they are requesting a 15 foot rear yard setback due to the need of placing the septic in the rear yard. Mr. Cummings stated because the building setback is suppose to have a berm on it, they do not want to put a berm on top of the septic tank lines and wish to have a 20 foot setback, with no berm. If you do not have a berm, the setback is suppose to be 35 feet, with a berm you can go to 20 feet, therefore that is why they are requesting to be able to place the building at 20 feet due to the lot size. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Mullins what is the issue with putting a berm on top of the septic system. Mr. Mullins stated the placement of the septic system should be shallow placement and the Health Department will not approve plantings, landscaping or berm material on top of it. Dr. Branham asked Mr. Mullins if they will be able to still place landscaping in the rear yard. Mr. Mullins stated yes, they can still do landscaping in the rear, sides and the front areas. Vice-Chairman Peake stated if they can place some landscaping in the rear and whatever they cannot place in the rear, to distribute it elsewhere on the property. Mr. Mullins stated they have no issue with that. Mr. Cummings stated because this lot is in the Commercial Industrial Park Zoning District, all PVA areas are supposed to have buffer screening material which is not the traditional 5 foot of perimeter landscaping, it is a 15 foot wide screening buffer around all the PVA. Mr. Cummings further explained due to the size of this lot, they are also requesting a variance not to require the buffer screening plant materials around the side, and the front of this parking area. Vice-Chairman Peake asked how big is the building. Mr. Mullins stated 12,000 square feet. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if the City had any comments or issues. Mr. Cummings stated they are also planning to put a 5 foot perimeter landscaping around the property. Vice-Chairman Peake asked the Board for any comments or issues. No comments were given.

A motion was made by Mr. Coffey and seconded by Dr. Branham to approve a buffer of screen planting material variance due to the size of the lot and with the stipulation the 5 foot PVA perimeter landscaping requirements are met and a 15 foot rear yard setback variance for the location of a building. **Approved unanimously**.

**Case No. 9246 1300 Meridian Street NE;** Location of off-street parking and a PVA landscape variance; Jerry Cargile of Schoel Engineering for Wesley Crunkleton of Lincoln Revival, LLC, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a variance for the location of off-street parking. This request will also require a PVA landscape variance. Mr. Fred Coffey recused from this case.

Mr. Jerry Cargile appeared before the Board. Mr. Cargile stated this is a historic property and the developer is getting ready to do a major renovation investment. Mr. Cargile also stated at the southeast corner there are some existing parking lots that are already encroaching into the existing right of way for Neely Avenue. Mr. Cargile further explained with the improvements to the site which will include restaurants, and entertainment space, they are adding a substantial amount of new parking and to line up the parking with the existing parking, they are requesting a variance for a 5 foot setback for the parking so they can line up the parking area. Mr. Cargile also stated they will still meet all landscaping requirements. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Cargile if the non-compliance of the parking area was just on that one side. Mr. Cargile stated yes. Mr. Cummings stated they will still meet all lighting, and landscaping requirements to include interior landscaping.

Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Cummings to explain the off-street parking. Mr. Cummings stated the off-street parking is the location of the parking to go inside the 5 foot perimeter landscaping area. Dr. Branham asked Mr. Cummings about the existing parking that is over the line. Mr. Cummings stated since this parking is existing, it can remain like it is. Mr. Cummings also stated Traffic Engineering doesn't have an issue because it is existing. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if the City has any issues. Mr. Cummings stated no. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if they meet parking requirements. Mr. Cummings stated yes.

A motion was made by Ms. Ford and seconded by Dr. Branham to approve a 5 foot variance for the location of off-street parking on the south property line. and a 5 foot perimeter landscape variance on the south property line. **Approved unanimously**

**Case No. 9247 109 Northside Square SE**; Projection of a sign; Ron Jewell of Chandler's Ford Brewing, LLC, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a 32 inch projection variance for an attached vertical lettered double-faced sign. In a General Business C3 Zoning District, a double-faced sign shall project no more than sixteen (16) inches from the face of the building.

Mr. Rick Prescott appeared before the Board and Mr. Ron Jewell appeared before the Board. Mr. Prescott stated in a General Business C3 Zoning District, a double-faced sign cannot project no more than 16 inches from the face of the building and they are requesting a 32 inch projection variance for an attached vertical lettered double-faced sign, therefore the sign will project 48 inches. Mr. Cummings stated the City is in the process of amending the Zoning Ordinance and the 48 inches will fall under the ordinance. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if they will be meeting the size requirements for the sign. Mr. Cummings stated yes.

A motion was made by Mr. Coffey and seconded by Dr. Branham to approve a 32 inch projection sign variance for two double face projection sign and based on the understanding the City is in process of amending the Zoning ordinance and with the stipulation air rights are granted over any City Right of Way. **Approved unanimously**

**Case No. 9248 209 Four Mile Post Road**; The location of a structure; Brad Dempsey for Scott Swatzell, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a 6 foot 2 inch side yard setback variance. In a Residence 1 Zoning District, a 15 foot side yard setback is required.

Mr. Brad Dempsey appeared before the Board. Mr. Scott Swatzell also appeared before the Board. Mr. Dempsey explained they are planning to tear down an existing 10 foot 2 inch garage and rebuild a 2 car garage and room above at 8 foot 8 inch. Vice-Chairman Peake stated the existing garage is out of compliance. Mr. Cummings stated that is correct. Mr. Cummings stated the proposed garage will be attached by a breeze way. Vice-Chairman Peake stated if part of the breeze way is taken away and pull it over, it will be compliant. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Swatzell what was the purpose of the breeze way. Mr. Swatzell stated they wanted a breezeway area for storage and other things. Mr. Cummings stated due to this being an addition, it will have to meet the 15 foot side yard setback. Dr. Branham stated the lot is very deep and could place the garage in the rear. Mr. Dempsey stated it will be very expensive due to the slope. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if Mr. Swatzell heard anything from the most effective neighbor. Mr. Swatzell stated she was not concerned just wanted to know what the meeting was about. Vice-Chairman Peake asked how did the existing garage get there. Mr. Cummings stated it pre-dates the Zoning Ordinance. Again Dr. Branham stated they could place the structure in the rear yard and have no hardship. Vice-President asked Mr. Dempsey did he look at other areas to put the structure. Mr. Dempsey stated no because that's not what the homeowner wanted. Vice-Chairman Peake asked the Board for any other questions or comments. No comments were given.

No motion was made therefore the request was **denied.**

**Case No. 9249** **6806 Whitesburg Drive SW**; Size of signage; T. Kenneth Spain of Whitesburg Baptist Church; appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a 37 square foot size variance for an attached sign. In a Residence 1-A Zoning District, attached accessory signs must not exceed two (2) square feet in size.

Mr. Chris Waters with Chapman Sisson Architects appeared before the Board representing the church. Mr. Waters explained the children's wing is being renovated and want to put a sign on the lobby/main entrance to the church. Mr. Waters stated this is a 10 acre site in a Residence 1A Zoning District which only allows 2 square feet and they are requesting 37 square foot size variance. Also, Mr. Waters stated the sign will stay in context with this area. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if any other signage will come down. Mr. Waters stated no. Dr. Branham asked Mr. Cummings how many signs are the church allowed. Mr. Baudendistel stated the Board has approved a special exception for the electronic display sign, a 115 square foot size variance and a 31 foot setback variance for the location of the monument sign. Mr. Cummings stated they have one detached sign now. Mr. Cummings further explained where the electronic display sign is located, that was the main entrance but they are moving the main entrance to this children's wing area. Mr. Cummings stated this is a relatively small request for a church due to the size of the building. Dr. Branham asked if they could move the electronic display sign to the main entrance. Mr. Waters stated the electronic display sign is mainly to advertise the worship service times and not to designate where you go in the church. Mr. Coffey asked Mr. Waters if there was any kind of campus plan for signage. Mr. Waters stated he was not aware of any campus plan for signage. Mr. Ozier asked Mr. Cummings if this variance was compatible with other variances that were granted for other churches. Mr. Cummings stated yes and this request may be a little smaller than what the Board has seen in the past. Vice-Chairman Peake asked the City for any comments. No comments were given.

A motion was made by Ms. Ford and seconded by Mr. Ozier to approve a 37 square foot size variance for an attached sign due to the size of the church campus. **Approved unanimously.**

**Case No. 9250 300 Sparkman Drive NW**; PVA lighting and PVA landscaping; Donald G. Hersh of Teledyne Technologies Incorporated, appellant**.** Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a PVA landscape and PVA lighting variance for the addition of a new building and expansion of an existing building. According to Article 71.2.2 of the Zoning Ordinance, until a new or additional structure is constructed on the property; at which time the entire PVA must be brought into conformity with requirements for new construction. Mr. Johnny Ozier recused from this case.

Mr. Donald Hersh, Director of Facilities for Teledyne Brown appeared before the Board. Mr. Hersh stated they are adding a 40,000 square foot new facility and an addition on to the existing facility of 14,000 square feet. Mr. Hersh stated he had been before the Board previously asking for the variance on the expansion and was granted the variance. Mr. Hersh stated six months had lapsed and now they are before the Board for the addition and the new facility. Vice-Chairman Peake stated from the previous meeting the Board was in favor of the request because the relief was internal to the site and was not affecting any neighbors. Mr. Cummings stated that was correct. Mr. Hersh stated both entrances are gated, they will have 24-hour security, no public access, and not visible from any street. Mr. Jason Phillips stated the PVA area they are requesting is the interior parking lot that is shielded from exterior trees, landscaping and other existing buildings. Mr. Phillips also stated there is no significant visibility of that area from the exterior of the facility. Vice-Chairman Peake stated the area that is affected and asking for relief is the area in the middle that is internal to the campus. Mr. Cummings stated that is correct.

Vice-Chairman Peake asked if they had lighting. Mr. Hersh stated they do have existing lighting, with campus surveillance. Dr. Branham asked Mr. Hersh if the campus meets PVA lighting now. Mr. Hersh stated probably not and they are always working to increase the lighting. Mr. Phillips stated the way the Zoning Ordinance reads is when you add an additional structure to the site, you would have to bring the entire site up to meet the requirements. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if the lighting around the addition and the new facility be compliant. Mr. Hersh stated yes and the buildings will be very well lit and will look at the impact around the perimeter of the buildings. Mr. Phillips stated they do have wall packs on the building and could evaluate to make sure the lighting requirements are met. Mr. Cummings stated wall packs usually meet the minimum light levels. Mr. Coffey stated the appellant should make the lighting compliant around the addition and new building.

Mr. Coffey asked about the PVA landscaping variance. Mr. Cummings stated they would have to bring the entire site up to code with perimeter and interior landscaping. Mr. Cummings stated the property already includes a well-maintained perimeter landscape including a buffer of many large mature trees. Mr. Coffey stated as long as the addition and new building are compliant in PVA landscaping and PVA lighting.

A motion was made by Mr. Coffey and seconded by Dr. Branham to approve a PVA lighting and PVA landscaping variance for a new building and an addition to an existing building due to the fact the proposed buildings are interior to the development, there is 24-hour security, and there is a large existing area with mature landscaping; all with the stipulation lighting is provided around the building for pedestrian access areas. **Approved unanimously.**

**Case No. 9251 127 Holmes Avenue NW, Suite 300**; Additional signage; Michael McKeon of Experience Signs of the South for Kaitlyn Cunningham of BRPH Architects-Engineers, Inc., appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a variance to allow one (1) additional sign to the front of a multi-tenant building. In a General Business C3 Zoning District, multiple tenant buildings shall include no more than one sign per street frontage.

Mr. Michael McKeon appeared before the Board. Mr. McKeon stated they want to install a 2 foot by 6 foot illuminated box sign on the side of the building. Mr. Cummings stated the Zoning Ordinance is being amended for multiple tenant buildings and signage on ground levels. Mr. Cummings stated if there is an entrance on the ground level they get a small sign, but the City is working on how to address upper floor units for signage. Vice-Chairman Peake stated a tenant has the right to have a sign but does not like signs covering the whole building. Vice-Chairman Peake suggested to Mr. McKeon to continue this case to give the City and the appellant time to further discuss the issues with this case.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Peake and seconded by Mr. Coffey to continue this request for 30 days. **Approved unanimously.**

**Case No. 9252 555 Discovery Drive NW**; A variance to allow one additional attached sign and one additional ground sign; Michael Samples of Explorer Development, LLC, appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a variance to allow 1 additional attached sign. This request will also require a variance to allow 1 additional ground sign. According to Article 72.4.8(1)(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, a facility yard pylon may contain one, two, or three company names or logos. If more than three companies occupy a single facility, only the facility name may be place on the yard pylon. According to Article 72.4.8(3)(f) of the Zoning Ordinance, if a building has two or three tenants, each may have a building mounted sign. Where multiple tenant building mounted signs occur, their combines area shall not exceed twenty percent (20%) of the gross area of the face of the main building fronting a street, and they shall be visually equal in size and positioned according to a consistent format.

Mr. Kyser Samples appeared before the Board. Mr. Kyser stated they are requesting to put 4 signs on the building and 4 signs on the exterior yard pylon sign. Dr. Branham asked how many signs are on the building now. Mr. Samples stated 3 and they would like to put 4. Mr. Cummings stated they are only requesting 1 additional attached sign and 1 additional sign to go on the yard pylon sign to make a total of 4. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if there was any change in the size or face of the sign. Mr. Samples stated no. Vice-Chairman Peake asked if they had to appear before the Research Park Board. Mr. Nunez stated no. Vice-Chairman Peake also asked if by them reconfiguring the pylon sign, and adding the attached signage be out line for this area. Mr. Cummings stated no this request is in line due to what has been approved in this area.

A motion was made by Dr. Branham and seconded by Mr. Coffey to approve a variance to allow one additional attached sign and a variance to allow an additional tenant sign on the existing ground sign. **Approved unanimously**

**Case No. 9253 1550 Perimeter Parkway NW**; The height of a building, an additional story, and an off-street parking variance; Stanley McCall, Jr. of Management Enterprise Development & Services, Inc., appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a variance to allow a 7 foot 4 inch height variance in a Residence 2B Zoning District. This request will also require a variance to allow an additional story in a Residence 2B Zoning District. This request will also require an off-street parking variance. In a Residence 2B Zoning District, a maximum height of 45 foot is permitted. In a Residence 2B Zoning District, a maximum of 3 stories is permitted.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Peake and seconded by Mr. Ozier to continue this request for 30 days. **Approved unanimously**

**Case No. 9254 1551 Perimeter Parkway NW**; The height of a building, an additional story, and an off-street parking variance; Stanley McCall, Jr. of Management Enterprise Development & Services, Inc., appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a variance to allow a 7 foot 4 inch height variance in a Residence 2B Zoning District. This request will also require a variance to allow an additional story in a Residence 2B Zoning District. This request will also require an off-street parking variance. In a Residence 2B Zoning District, a maximum height of 45 foot is permitted. In a Residence 2B Zoning District, a maximum of 3 stories is permitted.

A motion was made by Vice-Chairman Peake and seconded by Dr. Branham to continue this request for 30 days. **Approved unanimously**

**Case No. 9255 6744 Swancott Road SW**; The type of signage; Guy J. Spencer III of The Spencer Companies Inc., appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a use variance to allow green and red LED lighting for an accessory ground sign. According to Article 72.5.25(f) electronic text messages shall be limited to either white or amber in color on a black background and entire text message must be monochrome. Mr. Fred Coffey recused from this case.

Mr. Spencer appeared before the Board. Mr. Spencer stated they are requesting a variance to allow red and green LED lighting for fuel pricing signs. Mr. Cummings stated to the Board we have reviewed this type of request before for red and green color for fuel pricing signs. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Spencer if they will be compliant in everything else. Mr. Spencer stated yes. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Cummings if the City was still amending the Zoning Ordinance to accommodate this. Mr. Cummings stated the City is still in the process of rewriting the sign ordinance to accommodate the red and green led lighting.

A motion was made by Dr. Branham and seconded by Mr. Ozier to approve a use variance to allow red and green LED lighting for an electronic message center ground sign only for fuel prices and based on the understanding the City is in process of amending the Zoning ordinance. **Approved** **unanimously**

**Case No. 9256 4001 University Drive NW**; The type of signage; Guy J. Spencer III of The Spencer Companies Inc., appellant. Mr. Baudendistel stated the location of the property and stated this request will require a use variance to allow green and red LED lighting for an accessory ground sign. According to Article 72.5.25(f) electronic text messages shall be limited to either white or amber in color on a black background and entire text message must be monochrome. Mr. Fred Coffey recused from this case.

Mr. Spencer appeared before the Board. Mr. Spencer stated this request is also to allow green and red LED lighting for fuel prices, just like the previous request but at a different location. Vice-Chairman Peake asked Mr. Cummings did the City have any issues with this request. Mr. Cummings stated no.

A motion was made by Dr. Branham and seconded by Mr. Ozier to approve a use variance to allow red and green LED lighting for an electronic message center ground sign only for fuel prices and based on the understanding the City is in process of amending the Zoning Ordinance. **Approved unanimously**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m.