

Chair DeLossa called for the Approval of the Minutes from the October 9, 2008 Meeting, the December 11, 2008 Workshop, and the January 8, 2009 Board of Adjustment Meeting.

Boardmember Lundberg MADE a MOTION to APPROVE and Boardmember Barker SECONDED the MOTION. The motion carried unanimously.

Chair DeLossa asked staff if there were any requests for Withdrawals or Continuances.

Maryann Pickering, Zoning Administrator announced a changed in the order of Public Hearing items. She stated Agenda Item #2 VAR09-03 would be presented first, as the applicant needed to attend another public hearing, and Agenda Item #1 VAR09-01 would be second on the agenda.

Ms. Pickering stated that since there were only four Boardmembers present, the applicants would need three votes in order to have their requests approved, therefore, anyone who would like a continuance to the next meeting should submit their requests to the Board at this time.

Chair DeLossa asked the applicants if they wished for continuances due to only four Boardmembers being present. There were no objections from the applicants.

Chair DeLossa called for the Public Hearing Items.

III. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

1. **VAR09-03:** A request by Earl, Curley & Lagarde, P.C., representing Friendship Retirement Corporation, to reduce the rear-yard setback to 10 feet where a 20 foot perimeter is required in the R-4 (Multiple Residence) zoning district. The site is located at the northeast corner of 67th Avenue and Butler Drive (8611 North 67th Avenue). Staff Contact: Remigio Cordero Planner (Ocotillo District).

Remigio Cordero, Planner presented contents of the staff report, findings, and analysis. He noted on March 19, 2009, the applicant mailed notification letters to adjacent property owners and interested parties. At that time there were no responses, however, there were two letters received after the notification process had taken place, offering support for this request. He informed the Board that those letters were made available to the Board prior to the meeting.

Mr. Cordero stated that the variance request appeared to meet all four findings and should be recommended for approval subject to stipulation #1 and #3. He noted that Stipulation #2 should be modified to read; all mechanical equipment shall be screened from public view instead of ground mounted as stated in the staff report dated.

1. Development shall be in conformance with applicable site and floor plans, date-stamped March 30, 2009.
2. All mechanical equipment shall be screened from public view.
3. All utilities less than 69kv shall be placed underground.

Chair DeLossa called for questions from the Board. As there were none, he called for the applicant to come forward to make a presentation.

Mr. Stephen Earl, of Earl, Curley & Lagarde, P.C., introduced himself and explained to the Board that he would be filling in for Mr. Mike Curley who could not attend. He stated that his firm represents Friendship Retirement Corporation, specifically Glencroft Retirement Community. He thanked staff for their recommendation for support and stated he was in agreement with the stipulations. Mr. Earl provided a brief history of the site and an overview of some of the imposed hardships and challenges that necessitated the need for this variance.

Chair DeLossa called for questions from the Board.

Chair DeLossa inquired if there was a wall on the corner of Butler and 67th Avenue. Mr. Earl stated that the wall actually runs along 67th Avenue and turns the corner onto Butler Drive. He commented that the wall would not be removed, and that the buildings will be farther away from that wall than they currently are. Mr. DeLossa asked if the parking lot was located on the other side of the wall and would they be doing away with the existing parking lot? Mr. Earl confirmed that they would be replacing the parking lot with landscaping and that both the exterior side and as well as the interior side would be landscaped.

Chair DeLossa asked if there were any questions from any other Boardmembers?

Boardmember Lundberg asked why the change to stipulation #2 was made from ground-mounted to screen. He said he assumed the ground-mounted purpose was to reduce the visual from being on top of the building, and that the air conditioning units would be top and screened, so it would meet the same purpose as ground-mounted. Mr. Earl stated that he was correct, and said that he brought the design that had been approved with him to show the Board. He said that the cut outs in the roof which makes them below the height of the actual roof line is where they are putting the equipment, so it is completely screened by the roof itself.

Chair DeLossa asked if they would be giving up any parking. Mr. Earl replied that the parking on site was sufficient, and parking would be created on the other side of facility so there would not be parking out by the street. He also stated he believed this would be another improvement to the neighborhood as it is more interior now.

Boardmember Lundberg inquired that if the site did not have the internal property lines, this variance would not even be necessary. Mr. Earl stated that was correct, but for the financing requirement to create an artificial lot line, we would not have an issue here.

Chair DeLossa opened the floor for Public Comment. As there were no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Chair DeLossa called for any other questions or discussions from the Board. The Board had no questions; therefore, he asked Mr. Russ Romney, Deputy City Attorney, to proceed with the findings.

Based on the facts and evidence presented, Mr. Romney requested a voice vote from the Board. He then went on to ask the following questions and waited as the Board responded after each finding.

Finding One: Does the Board find that there are special circumstances or conditions applicable to the property including its size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, which were not self-imposed by the owner;

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding One. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Two: Does the Board find that due to the special circumstances, the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties of the same classification in the same zoning district,

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Two. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Three: Does the Board find that the variance is the minimum necessary to alleviate the property hardship; and

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Three. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Four: Does the Board find the granting the variance will not have a detrimental effect on the property, adjoining property, the surrounding neighborhood, or the city in general?

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Four. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Mr. Romney asked that if based upon these findings, does the Board wish to grant a variance on **VAR09-03** subject to the site plan date stamped March 30, 2009, with the stipulations as set forth by the Planning Department?

Chair DeLossa polled the Board. They responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”. Case No. VAR09-03 was APPROVED.

2. **VAR09-01:** A request by Melvin Leavell, for variances in the A-1 (Agricultural) zoning district to: 1) reduce the north side yard setback to 15 feet where a minimum 50-foot side yard setback is required, and 2) increase the lot coverage to 17% where a

maximum 10% lot coverage is permitted. The site is located north of the northeast corner of 64th Drive and Thunderbird Road (13835 North 64th Drive) Staff Contact: Shaik Shabbeer, Planner (Sahuaro District).

Shaik Shabbeer, Planner presented the application, provided information on the site and request. He mentioned there were no concerns raised when the Citizen Participation Plan was implemented, and that on March 13, 2009, the applicant mailed notification letters to adjacent property owners and interested parties. He commented that no responses were received by either staff or property owner in support or opposition of the proposed variance, however, after the staff report was distributed to the Boardmembers, staff received an email expressing opposition, and a copy of that email was distributed to the Board this evening.

Mr. Shabbeer stated that the variance request appeared to meet the required four findings and should be recommended for approval subject to the following stipulations:

1. Development shall be in conformance with the site plan date-stamped March 30, 2009.
2. All mechanical equipment shall be ground mounted.
3. All utilities less than 69kv shall be placed underground.

Chair DeLossa called for questions from the Board. As there were none, he called for the applicant to come forward to make a presentation.

Mr. Melvin Leavell, owner of the property introduced himself and presented his case. He stated that on the northeast corner of the home, they anticipated making an addition of 1,500 square feet. He explained that out of the thirteen homes in the neighborhood, their home was one of the smallest homes on the block, and this addition would increase their property value as well as maintain the look of the neighborhood.

Chair DeLossa called for questions from the Board.

Chair DeLossa inquired to if there were any other homes that were closer together than Mr. Leavell's home. Mr. Leavell answered that he could not recall any others, but stated that everything is spread out on the properties.

Mr. DeLossa asked Mr. Leavell if this variance was approved, would he just be moving his property line to 15 feet from the neighboring property line. Mr. Leavell confirmed that was correct. Mr. DeLossa questioned where the closest dwelling was in relation to the fence line. Mr. Leavell stated that it was approximately 25 feet from the property line to the home. Chair DeLossa asked if Mr. Leavell was moving closer east, and if so, were there any objections from that particular neighbor. Mr. Leavell stated there were no objections.

Chair DeLossa called for any additional questions or comments from the Board.

Boardmember Ligon stated that it appeared to him that the amount of coverage on Mr. Leavell's lot was substantially less than anyone else in the neighborhood and that a seventeen percent increase was very minimal. Mr. DeLossa questioned if this was horse property and if Mr. Leavell has horses. Mr. Leavell said it was horse property, but that he owns a steer.

Chair DeLossa opened the floor for Public Comment. As there were no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Chair DeLossa called for any other questions or discussions from the Board. The Board had no questions; therefore, he asked Mr. Russ Romney, Deputy City Attorney, to proceed with the findings.

Based on the facts and evidence presented, Mr. Romney requested a voice vote from the Board. He then went on to ask the following questions and waited as the Board responded after each finding.

Finding One: Does the Board find that there are special circumstances or conditions applicable to the property including its size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, which were not self-imposed by the owner;

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding One. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of "Aye".

Finding Two: Does the Board find that due to the special circumstances, the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties of the same classification in the same zoning district,

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Two. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of "Aye".

Finding Three: Does the Board find that the variance is the minimum necessary to alleviate the property hardship; and

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Three. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of "Aye".

Finding Four: Does the Board find the granting the variance will not have a detrimental effect on the property, adjoining property, the surrounding neighborhood, or the city in general?

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Four. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of "Aye".

Mr. Romney asked that if based upon these findings, does the Board wish to grant a variance on **VAR09-01** subject to the site plan date stamped March 30, 2009, with the stipulations as set forth by the Planning Department?

Chair DeLossa polled the Board. They responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”. Case No. VAR09-01 was APPROVED.

3. **VAR09-04:** A request by John Livingston, representing Arthur and Gayle Dubs, for a variance to reduce the east side yard setback to 10 feet where 25 feet is required in the R1-6 (Single Residence) zoning district. The property is located at the northwest corner of 55th Avenue and Cortez Street (5504 West Cortez Street). Staff Contact: Karen Stovall, Senior Planner (Barrel District).

Karen Stovall, Senior Planner presented the application, reviewing the site history and request. She noted that the subdivision was platted in 1977, which required a 25-foot building setback from the east property line. An addition to the east side of the house was constructed in 1999 without building permits. This addition did not meet setback requirements, and in 2003, the previous homeowner received a permit to construct a storage room on the east side of the house, located to the north of the 1999 addition. The storage room was constructed, but the permit was not finalized. The applicant wishes to demolish the existing additions and reconstruct them to comply with city codes. She stated that on March 9, 2009, the applicant mailed notification letters to adjacent property owners and interested parties, and did not receive any response regarding this request. The Planning Department received one telephone call in support. Ms. Stovall informed the Board that following the completion of the staff report, the Planning Department received an email in opposition and stated that information had been provided to the Board this evening. No opposition was received during the Citizen Participation process.

Ms. Stovall stated the variance request appeared to meet the required four findings and should be recommended for approval subject to the following stipulations:

1. Development shall be in conformance with the site and floor plan, date stamped April 7, 2009.
2. All mechanical equipment shall be ground mounted.
3. All utilities less than 69kv shall be placed underground.

Chair DeLossa called for questions from the Board. As there were none, he called for the applicant to come forward to make a presentation.

Mr. John Livingston representing Arthur and Gayle Dubs presented this case. Mr. Livingston stated he agreed with staff's recommendations and gave a brief history of the property. He explained that the house was purchased as a foreclosure and it was not known at the time of purchase that permits had not been issued to build the additions. He noted it was estimated that the additions were as least 10 years old, and stated there had been no complaints from the

neighbors. Since the structures do not meet code, the applicant would like to tear it down and rebuild it to code.

Chair DeLossa opened the floor for public comment. As there were no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Chair DeLossa called for any other questions or discussions from the Board. The Board had no questions; therefore, he asked Mr. Russ Romney, Deputy City Attorney, to proceed with the findings.

Based on the facts and evidence presented, Mr. Romney requested a voice vote from the Board. He then went on to ask the following questions and waited as the Board responded after each finding.

Finding One: Does the Board find that there are special circumstances or conditions applicable to the property including its size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, which were not self-imposed by the owner;

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding One. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Two: Does the Board find that due to the special circumstances, the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties of the same classification in the same zoning district,

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Two. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Three: Does the Board find that the variance is the minimum necessary to alleviate the property hardship; and

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Three. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Four: Does the Board find the granting the variance will not have a detrimental effect on the property, adjoining property, the surrounding neighborhood, or the city in general?

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Four. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Mr. Romney asked that if based upon these findings, does the Board wish to grant a variance on **VAR09-04** subject to the site plan and floor plan date stamped April 7, 2009 with the stipulations as set forth by the Planning Department?

Chair DeLossa polled the Board. They responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”. Case No. VAR09-04 was APPROVED.

4. **VAR08-14:** A request by Bootz & Duke Sign Co., representing Orion 51 LLC, for variances in the C-O (Commercial Office) zoning district to: 1) increase the permitted height of wall signs to 20 feet where a maximum 15 feet is permitted, 2) increase the maximum sign area for buildings A through E to 264 square feet where a maximum 24 square feet is permitted, 3) increase the maximum sign area for building F to 658 square feet where a maximum 100 square feet is permitted, and 4) permit a maximum sign area per tenant of 72 square feet on Building F where a maximum 40 square feet per tenant is permitted. The site is located at the southwest corner of 51st Avenue and the Loop 101 Freeway (20100 North 51st Avenue). Staff Contact: Karen Stovall, Senior Planner (Cholla District).

Karen Stovall, Senior Planner presented the application, reviewing the site and request. This property was rezoned to C-O in 2004, and the Design Review application for the site was approved in 2005. A request for variances to allow two freestanding signs, an increase to the number of tenants identified on the sign, and an increase to the sign height was denied in 2006. She stated that the applicant is requesting variances to increase the height and square footage of wall signs to bring greater visibility to the business signage within the office complex. On December 9, 2008, the applicant mailed notification letters to adjacent property owners and interested parties. The applicant was contacted by three individuals who own or represent owners of suites within the office complex, and all were in support of the requests. The applicant was also contacted by two neighboring property owners who had questions about the application, and after clarification, did not oppose the requests. The Planning Department received an email from a citizen who is opposed to these requests, as she believes the approval would lead to equitable treatment of properties in this same zoning district. Staff requested her telephone number so that the applicant could contact her to discuss her concerns, and received no response. Following the completion of the staff report, the Planning Department received three emails; one is from the individual previously mentioned who is opposed to the request, and the email states that the applicant is attempting to overturn the sign ordinance. The other two emails are from a citizen and tenant of the office complex who believe that the site has visibility problems for the tenants and that the variances are warranted. Ms. Stovall informed the Board that this correspondence had been provided to the Board prior to the start of the meeting.

Ms. Stovall stated the variance requests appeared to meet the required four findings and should be recommended for approval subject to the following stipulation:

1. Development shall be in conformance with the Master Comprehensive Sign Package date-stamped February 17, 2009.

Chair DeLossa called for questions from the Board. As there were none, he called for the applicant to come forward to make a presentation.

Bill Allison of Gallagher & Kennedy spoke on behalf of Bootz & Duke and the property owner. Mr. Allison stated he wanted to reiterate what Ms. Stovall had just said and stated that he worked very closely with her in preparing this sign package. He stated at the time this property was rezoned, there was discussion from the neighborhood, that although commercial uses were appropriate on this site, a whole range of commercial uses were not appropriate, and that was why the zoning is C-O rather than a more standard neighborhood shopping center type zoning district.

Chair DeLossa asked how long the property owner had owned the complex. Mr. Allison stated that the owner was the developer and had purchased the property in the beginning. He explained that this is an office condo project and some of the condos have been sold to the current users and that he was representing the developer of the property. He said that with this type of zoning the sign standards are very restrictive. The buildings have as many as eight suites where only 24 square feet of signage is allowed. He stated that three square feet of signage per suite in a building is very small, and does not allow adequate signage for a business. He stated the signage in the sign package submitted in February is appropriate. It is scaled for the building so it complements the architecture, and that it is not going to be overwhelming from the street or neighborhood. He said the only comments they received from the neighborhood were people who wanted to make sure the signs were not going to be put on the roofs of the buildings. Mr. Allison explained that there is also separation with landscaping and with covered parking between the buildings and the neighborhood, which further mitigate the impacts of the signs. The office condo owners believed that this variance is necessary for them to have adequate signage for their customers and their clients to find them when they come to the site. He stated they are in agreement with the staff recommendations and findings, and said he would be glad to answer questions.

Chair DeLossa asked Mr. Romney if the Planning Commission received information with respect to the size and type of the new signs. Mr. Romney addressed the Board and said that if there had been a comprehensive signage package delivered, it would have been delivered to the Planning Department for Design Review. Mr. Romney reminded the Board that the comprehensive sign package was part of their case materials. The purpose of which was to give an idea as to where those signs would go.

Mr. DeLossa asked if he would be correct in assuming that if they voted to approve would they be giving a blank check to put anything the tenants wanted on the sign. Mr. Allison did not believe this was a correct assumption. He stated, the comprehensive sign plan is very restrictive, and the stipulation, which staff is suggesting ties to this comprehensive sign plan.

Ms. Stovall added that each tenant that comes in with a sign would need to apply for a sign permit through the Building Safety Department so the design and the lettering would be reviewed, and it would have to fit within the design requirements, which is the square footage that would be approved tonight. She pointed out that the variances before them tonight have to

do with the height of the signs and the overall square footage, not the appearance of the lettering or the design itself, that would be done at design review.

Boardmember Ligon asked Mr. Romney if the Board would be establishing any kind of precedent by their vote. Mr. Romney said, not necessarily, and explained, that what is being requested tonight is a variance in the size of the sign envelope, meaning, just the area that the sign would fit in. It is not the type of sign or the lettering or anything else. You are just saying that the size of where the signs would go, and the area on the building where it would go, is going to be altered somewhat from the original.

Boardmember Ligon asked if the letters would stay the same. Mr. Romney answered that they may change, but the actual signage itself would be a different review. The package and the envelopes that are shown in the comprehensive sign package give the areas that will be taken up in the general locations where those signs would be. He stated that according to Ms. Stovall, they are to scale and they fit the building. However, the actual lettering itself would be another review process when that tenant or condo owner comes to get a sign, does a permit, and that kind of thing.

Boardmember Ligon said he thought he saw somewhere in the paperwork where it was mentioned that due to the economic circumstances we are going through now, they might lose tenants because of the sign situation. He stated the zoning laws should not be taken into consideration with an economic situation. Mr. Romney said that is the case, but some of the tenants there or the condo owners probably feel that way. He stated that the economic situation is tough right now and by having a better sign; it might be able to improve their ability to attract more clients and customers since they can draw more people to their business. Mr. Romney also stated that such a sentiment had been expressed in some of the letters and correspondence.

Chair DeLossa inquired as to the number of units in the complex, and how many of the units were vacant. Mr. Allison replied that there are 24 units and only two are unsold. He said that one unit is in escrow so 23 are either sold or in escrow and they are all occupied. Mr. DeLossa asked of those that are occupied how many were dedicated to either doctors or dentists as opposed other commercial type products?

Dr. John Wood asked the Board if he could answer that question. Chair DeLossa requested that he step up to the podium so everyone could hear him. Dr. Wood introduced himself as one of the tenants and identified the medical professionals that he knew within the complex. He also offered his support of the variances.

Chair DeLossa asked a question of Dr. Wood as to how this proposal would affect him if a tenant took up a larger amount of sign space resulting in a smaller amount for him.

Dr. Wood stated that with this proposal, his sign would probably not change. The tenants all agreed that the signs should look professional, uniform, and have a similar color so it would have a nice professional appearance.

Mr. Allison added that he would like to make a comment in reference to Mr. DeLossa's question as to whether this sign plan would address the issue of one tenant coming in and taking all the signage. Mr. Allison believed that yes, in fact it would. He said that what they are trying to do is to make sure that there is an appropriately sized sign for each one of the businesses, which is not possible with the C-O sign standards. They wanted to make sure the signs were the appropriate scale, the right size, and are in the right location, so they would be attractive on the buildings and would be adequate for the businesses, which would also have a positive impact for the neighborhood. He said there is a lot of detail in the signage plan about exactly what can go where as far as sizes. Therefore, it should not be a free-for-all once this is approved, should the Board be inclined to do so.

Boardmember Ligon wondered why they were only concerned with the traffic on 51st Avenue, and not the freeway traffic. Mr. Allison stated the signs were designed for the people on 51st Avenue and not the freeway. Mr. Ligon also inquired if there were any large objects or trees blocking the signs. Mr. Allison explained that there is landscaping on the west side that will block the signs from the neighborhood, but there are no trees blocking the signs from the street. He stated that he believed that the signs at the scale they were requesting would be visible and functional, but not overwhelming.

Chair DeLossa asked if there were any other questions from the Board or if there was anyone else who would like to make a statement concerning this particular case.

Boardmember Barker asked Ms. Stovall if he would be correct in saying no one else could put up a sign in this complex as it stands right now. Ms. Stovall agreed, and stated that because the majority of the 24 square feet per building has been taken up by one or two tenants, it is difficult for other tenants in the same building to have signs that are of a square footage that are adequate and that are visible enough for people that are looking for their suite. Mr. DeLossa asked if there is any equality at all, that could be given to a tenant who does not have enough space for a sign. Ms. Stovall explained that the tenants that have existing signs, those existing signs comply with the master sign package that will be approved if this variance is approved. Therefore, it will not affect the signs of existing tenants and it will allow other tenants in the same building to have a similar area of square footage of sign. It will really allow tenants to have equal areas of signage.

Chair DeLossa opened the floor for Public Comment. As there were no comments, the public hearing was closed.

Chair DeLossa called for any other questions or discussions from the Board. The Board had no further questions; therefore, he asked Mr. Russ Romney, Deputy City Attorney, to proceed with the findings.

Based on the facts and evidence presented, Mr. Romney requested a voice vote from the Board. He then went on to ask the following questions and waited as the Board responded after each finding.

Finding One: Does the Board find that there are special circumstances or conditions applicable to the property including its size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings, which were not self-imposed by the owner;

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding One. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Two: Does the Board find that due to the special circumstances, the strict application of the Zoning Ordinance would deprive the property of privileges enjoyed by other properties of the same classification in the same zoning district,

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Two. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Three: Does the Board find that the variance is the minimum necessary to alleviate the property hardship; and

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Three. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Finding Four: Does the Board find the granting the variance will not have a detrimental effect on the property, adjoining property, the surrounding neighborhood, or the city in general?

Mr. Romney asked that if based upon these findings, does the Board wish to grant a variance on VAR08-14 subject to the comprehensive sign package, which includes all the stipulations date stamped February 17, 2009?

Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote on Finding Four. The Board responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”.

Chair DeLossa polled the Board. They responded with a 4 – 0 vote of “Aye”. Case No. VAR08-14 was APPROVED.

Chair DeLossa called for Other Business.

Boardmember Lundberg wanted to say for the record that as a Boardmember he had been treated very well. He complimented the Planning staff by saying the communication had been very positive, very customer service oriented, and that staff was doing a professional job. He also added that he was proud to be a resident of Glendale.

Chair DeLossa called for the Planning Staff Report.

Ms Pickering requested the Board make a Motion to Vacate the June 11, 2009, and the July 9, 2009 meetings, as there were no cases currently scheduled.

Chair DeLossa called for a Motion. Boardmember Barker MADE a MOTION, and Boardmember Ligon SECONDED the MOTION. Chair DeLossa called for a voice vote. The Board responded with a 4 - 0 vote to approve.

Chair DeLossa called for Comments and Suggestions from the Board.

Ms. Pickering thanked Boardmember Barker from the Yucca District for his service to the Board of Adjustment. She stated Mr. Barker submitted his resignation because he is moving out the city. Chair DeLossa also thanked Mr. Barker and stated he was sorry to hear he was leaving Glendale.

Chair DeLossa called for New Business. As there was none, the meeting was adjourned at **8:08 P.M.**



Marilyn Clark, Recording Secretary