



**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE REGULAR SESSION OF
THE BUILDING BOARD OF APPEALS
OF THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR
DECEMBER 13, 2006 – CITY HALL - SECOND FLOOR - COUNCIL CHAMBERS
100 N. FIFTH AVENUE, ANN ARBOR, MI 48104**

I. **MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – 1:32 P.M.**

II. **ROLL CALL**

Members Present: (5) Kenneth Winters, Samuel Callan,
Paul Darling, Roger Reik and Robert Hart

Members Absent: (0) None.

Staff Present: (3) Anthony Savoni, Kathleen Chamberlain
and Brenda Acquaviva

III. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Regular Session of November 8, 2006 – *Approved as Presented*

Moved by S. Callan, Seconded by R. Reik, “that the minutes of the November 8,
2006 Regular Session be accepted as presented.”

On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED - *UNANIMOUS*

IV. **APPEALS & ACTION - UNFINISHED**

None.

V. **APPEALS & ACTION - NEW**

1. **2006-B- 43 – 2016 Shadford Road**

**Susan Miller owner of this property, is requesting a variance from Sections
R305.1 of the 2003 Michigan Residential Code.**

The applicant is requesting a variance from the following:

Section R305.1 of the 2003 Michigan Residential Code that requires a
minimum 7 foot 0 (zero) inch ceiling height in a bathroom. Exception 4 states
“Bathrooms shall have a minimum ceiling height of 6 feet 8 inches over the
fixture and at the front clearance area for fixtures. A Shower or tub equipped
with a showerhead shall have a minimum ceiling height of 6 feet 8 inches
above a minimum area 30 inches by 30 inches at the showerhead.”

Bonnie Bona, architect and Susan Miller, owner, were present to speak on the
appeal.

51 B. Bona – The renovation to this home is all within the existing home. The variance that
52 we're requesting shows that the ceiling is currently as low as 6'3" along the side edge of the
53 tub, and we'll meet the 6'8" requirement within 7 inches. No showerhead in this tub – there
54 is a separate shower.
55

56 **Staff Report**

57
58 A. Savoni – With respect to the tub, staff is not supportive of the request. The Code
59 specifically states that the ceiling height over the fixture and the lowered ceiling could result
60 in a taller person hitting their head while in the tub. In respect to the toilet, we see no
61 problem with the situation, as the lowered ceiling is over the toilet tank and would not
62 interfere with anyone using the fixture.
63

64 K. Chamberlain – Defers to Building Department decision. Fire Department has no
65 concerns in regard to interference with our performance.
66

67 R. Hart – The wall that separates the water closet from that end of the tub where the spout
68 is, is a low wall, and that's why there is no showerhead there? (B. Bona – Yes).
69

70 S. Callan – Shouldn't be a problem with someone standing there, the low part is off to the
71 side.
72

73 K. Winters – But theoretically, it's against the code.
74

75 P. Darling – Was the tub in same location before? (B. Bona – No, the former bathroom has
76 been turned into a bedroom. The old bathroom was against the same wall in the room next
77 door, and the showerhead, in that case, was against the slope. In that case, this is an
78 improved situation from the existing).
79

80 K. Winters – Why couldn't tub be moved out 7 inches? (B. Bona – If you look at the floor
81 plan, there is only 2 feet, 7 ½ inches between the wall of the shower and the tub, and that's
82 a small 3' x 3' shower. It is a standard size tub, pushed up against the wall. This is to
83 provide clearance for walking in and out).
84

85 P. Darling – It appears from the sketch provided that if you took the very bottom edge of the
86 tub and not the lip of it, you're probably pretty close in having 6' 8."
87

88 K. Winters – Theoretically, when a variance is granted, it is granted because of three
89 reasons.
90

91 P. Darling – I think we could say that it meets the 'intent,' that the area of the fixture is the
92 standing portion of the tub and not the rim and not something else – you're not going to be
93 standing on the edge of the tub – you have the 6' 8" and you have to have 6' 7" at that point.
94

95 **MOTION**

96
97 Moved by R. Reik, Seconded by R. Hart, **“that a variance be granted for Appeal
98 Number 2006-B-43, 2016 Shadford Road from Section R305.1 of the 2003
99 Michigan Residential Code to allow a toilet and tub to be installed with a
100 minimum head clearance of 6'6" above the bowl for both fixtures. We find this
101 meets the intent of what the code requires.”**
102

103 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS – Variance Granted**
104

105 **2. 2006-B-44 - 310 E. Washington**

106
107 **J. S. Vig / McKinley, contractor/developer for this property, is requesting a**
108 **variance from Sections 601.3 and 1009.3 of the 2003 Michigan Building Code.**
109

110 The applicant is requesting a variance from the following two sections of the 2003
111 Michigan Building Code:

- 112 • Section 1208.2 states “*Occupiable spaces, habitable spaces and corridors*
113 *shall have a ceiling height of not less than 7 feet 6 inches.*”
- 114 • ~~Section 1009.3 states “*Stair riser heights shall be 7 inches maximum and 4*~~
115 ~~*inches minimum. Stair tread depths shall be 11 inches minimum. The greatest*~~
116 ~~*tread depth within any flight of stairs shall not exceed the smallest by more*~~
117 ~~*than 0.375 (3/8) inch*”~~ *Determined to be unnecessary
118
119
120

121 Jason Schaller, petitioner/contractor, and John K. Weiss, Executive Director of “The Teen
122 Center” operating at this address, were present to speak on behalf of the appeal. Mr. Weiss
123 expounded on the Teen Center and the Neutral Zone.
124

125 J. Schaller – Rise and run of the basement stairs do not meet the established code of a
126 minimum 7” rise and a 7” run on the stair tread. This is an existing staircase made of
127 poured concrete with steel nosing on the stairs. We did not do any alterations of this portion
128 of the building during our construction phase. The basement is used for storage only and
129 maintenance personnel and/or staff are the only ones using these stairs.
130

131 The second floor ceiling height is also an existing condition (with a drop ceiling) that has an
132 entry height of 7’ 2 ½ “ in the corridor (code requires 7’ 6”). There is a mechanical run that
133 comes from the two furnaces in the hallway at that location. The drop ceiling runs right to
134 the bottom of the duct runs in the ceiling. It’s not an easy fix to move those duct runs, and it
135 is an existing condition. The other areas of concern are the beams that are at 6’ 10 ½ “
136 through the main room on the second floor. Those are all structural beams that were in
137 place with the original construction of the building.
138

139 **Staff Report**

140
141 A. Savoni – With respect to the ceiling heights, staff is not supportive of this request. Both
142 lowered ceiling areas are over main egress areas and could cause problem with smoke
143 build-up in emergencies. Regarding the stair, the Building Code specifically states “Portion
144 of the structure not altered and not affected by the alteration are not required to comply with
145 the code requirements for a new structure.” The stairs are existing, and if it is determined
146 that the use of the basement from storage has not changed, there would be no need for a
147 variance.
148

149 K. Chamberlain – Concurs with Building Staff.
150

151 **Questions from the Board**

152
153 P. Darling – Is there a fire suppression system? (J. Schaller - Yes – We added in a full fire
154 suppression system and alarm detection system alongside that).
155

156 R. Hart – What is the space adjoining the stairway? It has a door on it and it looks like the
157 two ‘Reading Rooms’ on the drawing discharge into it.
158

158 Is that a 'useable space' or is this an extension of the corridor? (J. Schaller – That section
159 opens up into the reading room on one side, which is basically staff offices; on the other
160 side is a reading/study area).

161
162 R. Hart – (Asks about a section next to the stair on the drawing) It's essentially corridor
163 space? (J. Schaller - No, it's a room, a separate room within the second floor).

164
165 K. Winters – Is that something that you need labeled? (To A. Savoni). It's not on the
166 drawing.

167
168 A. Savoni – What is it used for? It's not labeled (J. Weiss - A library/reading room – It's a
169 quiet study space. We typically have a tutor there in the afternoon for teens that want one
170 on one help. On the other side are our administrative offices and what is labeled on the
171 drawing as the reading/study room is our board conference room. This is where our board
172 meets and we hold two programs there throughout the week. The majority of the programs
173 take place on the first floor in the large venue space and the café downstairs).

174
175 A. Savoni - So this reading/study area on the drawing to the left – it opens up, makes this
176 one big room. (J. Schaller – Yes, it's an open corridor, there is no door).

177
178 R. Hart – (To A. Savoni) So, if this an open corridor, wouldn't the headroom issue fall under
179 the general means of the egress code (Headroom)?

180
181 A. Savoni – No, he has the problem at the top of the stairs, so everyone has to pass under
182 the low ceiling height to get down the stair and get out of there. You can come down 6"
183 under projections, but you can't come down to 7.' He also has a problem on the other side
184 - his office space everyone exiting has to pass under that space before they exit.

185
186 P. Darling – Take the ceiling out of there could give 2 or 3 inches additional headroom.
187 (J. Schaller – We would run into problems with the existing mechanicals and the way the fire
188 suppression system is mounted.

189
190 K. Winters – Both areas would require a 7'6" ceiling height, and they have 6' 10 ½" and 7.'

191
192 A. Savoni – You could come down to 7', but again, no more than 4' wide.

193
194 P. Darling – So the structural beam component at 6' 10" is a little bit below the 7' projection.

195
196 R. Hart – (To A. Savoni) – Section 1003, says it looks as though ceiling height and means of
197 egress should not be less than 7.' (A. Savoni - You're right. That would give it to them in
198 the corridor, but you would still have to deal with the offices).

199
200 K. Winters – Not just the beam, but also the area between the beam and the door.

201
202 Further discussion ensued by the Board to try to develop a solution for the petitioner.

203
204 K. Winters – What if the door from the stairway area going to the right side into the room
205 going toward the offices were moved towards the stairway so you could get away from the
206 area of the skylight and have the 7' 6" ceiling except for the width of the beam and grant the
207 variance of 1 ½ inches for only the beam? 6'10" is the beam as well as the area directly
208 around the skylight area. What is the discrepancy between Section 1003 and 1208.2?

209
210 A. Savoni – Section 1208.2 states that corridors have to have a 7' 6" ceiling height. That is
211 what we've always enforced. (P. Darling – A basic conflict in the code). (Agreed)

212 K. Winters – Would you be willing to relocate the door? (A. Savoni – But you’ve changed
213 the use of that space, and now it’s changed. You’d want the kids to be able to get out of
214 there in case of an emergency). It was formerly Commercial use (Colossus Printing). (A.
215 Savoni) It’s now considered “Assembly Use” from the kids gathering there.
216

217 J. Schaller – Cost is a factor since we are a ‘not for profit’ entity. We rely on donations, so
218 it’s my duty to try and make it cost effective.
219

220 K. Winters – It is our duty to enforce the code or equivalent. I don’t think we need the
221 appeal on the concrete stair to the basement.
222

223 P. Darling – Just two – the beam height and the egress through that existing door.
224

225 S. Callan – We want to make sure on the stairway that that area can ONLY be used for
226 storage. (A. Savoni – Don’t have to mention that – if that “use” changes and that is being
227 used for other than storage and the building department finds that, they’ll be issued a ticket).
228

229 Further discussion ensued between the Board and the petitioner regarding the stairs and
230 doors for fire rating.
231

232 **MOTION**

233
234 Moved by P. Darling, Seconded by R. Reik, “**that the Variance Request for 310 E.
235 Washington Street, Appeal No. 2066-B-44 be granted from Section 1208.2 to allow
236 a finished ceiling height under the beams at the second floor to be 6’10 inches
237 above the finished floor as indicated on the submitted drawings, provided that the
238 door or an additional door be relocated from the reading/study room 200 to below
239 where the ceiling height is 6’10.” (Moved closer to the stairway – NORTH). We
240 find that the building has a fire detection and suppression system and that this
241 meets the intent of the code.”
242**

243 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS – Variance Granted**
244

245 **3. 2006-B-45 - 320-322 E. Liberty**

246 **David Wilson, owner of this property is requesting a variance from**
247 **Section 704.8 of the 2003 Michigan Building Code.**
248

249 The applicant is requesting a variance from the following:
250

251 Section 704.8 of the 2003 Michigan Building Code which states “*The*
252 *maximum area of unprotected or protected openings permitted in an exterior*
253 *wall in any story shall not exceed the values set forth in Table 704.8.”*
254

255 Section 401.5 of the Michigan Mechanical Code that states “*Outside air*
256 *exhaust and intake openings shall be located a minimum of 10 feet from lot*
257 *lines or buildings on the same lot.”*
258

259 Patrick Macoska of Neumann/Smith Associates Architects, David Wilson,
260 Denali Development and owner as well as Dave Hackman, Mechanical
261 Engineer on the project were present to speak on behalf of the appeal.
262
263
264

264 P. Macoska – This is an appeal to locate two flues for two unit heaters at the south wall on
265 the first floor of this project (which is a five story building built up to the lot lines). We've
266 previously been granted a variance in 2005 to locate a louver in this south wall (for a CO2
267 exhaust system), with the stipulation that we would have an alternate way to route that
268 exhaust to the outdoors if a another building would be built up to that south wall.
269
270

271 The second floor, and all the subsequent floors of the building 'step back' from this first floor,
272 so there is a means by which we can bring ductwork up the back of the building and be
273 within our property. This is a request to vent two flues for two unit heaters in the same
274 manner. The reason is, originally we were going to route these up two duct shafts that were
275 adjacent to the stairs in the interior of the building and take those up to the roof, and the
276 mechanical inspector requested that those flues be within their own 'rated' shaft. We had
277 provided a 3' x 3' shaft for those flues plus some other duct work. It would have meant
278 creating a rated shaft within a shaft, and because of the concentration of ductwork within
279 and the fact that they were roughed in at this point at the openings in the floors; we couldn't
280 fit the 'rated' shaft within the shaft. In meeting with the city, this alternative of venting
281 directly - horizontally out the back of the building was suggested, based on the 2005 appeal.
282

283 **Staff Report**

284

285 A. Savoni – In 2005, the Board granted a similar request for this building. A variance was
286 granted for a louver on the south end of the face of the building to exhaust the enclosed
287 parking garage. Petitioner is now requesting a second variance for two additional vents to
288 exhaust two unit heaters within the first floor garage. Once again, petitioner states that if an
289 adjacent building is built within ten feet of the property line in the future, the louver will be
290 closed and rerouted vertically on the south face of the building.
291

292 The Board granted the previous variance "to allow the first floor parking structure to be
293 serviced by a rear louver to exhaust the space into the outside, with the following
294 contingencies:
295

- 296 1. If an adjacent building is built within 10 feet of the property line in the future, the louver
297 will be closed and routed vertically through the building. The dedicated location of the
298 future shaft will be indicated on the building permit drawings.
299
- 300 2. One sprinkler head will be located on the inside of the opening per Fire Marshal
301 approval."
302

303 Staff is supportive of this request with the above contingencies, however, we probably need
304 to modify the original variance, as they stated they were going to route it *within* the building,
305 and now they're saying that in the future they will reroute it on the *outside* of the building.
306

307 K. Chamberlain – Concurs with the Building Department.
308

309 R. Hart – You're right up to the property line? (The first floor is, yes). So, how do you route
310 it outside the building in the future? (P. Macoska - The second floor and the other floors are
311 'set back' from the first floor where there is actually a terrace for the second floor unit. This
312 is about 10' deep, and there is space there where we could bring duct work or create an
313 enclosure and route something up the outside of the building and be on our property.)
314 So... you'd be coming through the roof of the garage and cut across horizontally? (No, just
315 go straight up the south wall of the building, which is set back from the property line).
316

317 So, somewhere inboard of the south wall of the garage. I'll ask the obvious question.
318

318 Why are you going through all of this instead of taking care of it now? It's a brand new
319 building. (P. Macoska - Well, the plan was in fact to route it up to the roof in a duct shaft
320 which was set up for that purpose, but with the additional request that that flue be in its own
321 rated enclosure, we couldn't create that rating around it within the spacing that we had
322 designated and get all the additional equipment, which Dave can speak to. As I recall, there
323 are at least a couple we're bringing down to service the corridors and the basement storage
324 area).

325
326 D. Hackman – The original plans that were approved back in April had supply and return
327 ductwork and a chimney in each shaft. It was the new Inspectors' interpretation that the
328 chimney needed a separate shaft to enclose it from the other ductwork that was in the fire
329 rated shaft.

330
331 R. Hart – And these shafts are in-board.

332
333 K. Winters – Why not do the construction outside now, rather than in the future?

334
335 D. Hackman – Our thoughts were, and it was a recommendation because we had a
336 variance for the parking garage that was venting CO2 out of there. This was recommended
337 by the manufacturer and the mechanical inspector. The manufacturer of the unit heaters
338 said “eventually, you could run them vertical,” and they approved the calculations, but it was
339 recommended to us because of the core construction to vent them out the south wall.

340
341 P. Macoska – Because of esthetics, we would prefer not to have them going up the back
342 wall of the building. It's less noticeable to simply penetrate out high on the first floor than to
343 carry these up the back wall of the building.

344
345 R. Hart – So, what happens in the future? Who is going to build the ugly enclosure?

346
347 P. Macoska – That's the contingency – if something is built within 10' of our property, we
348 would have to change it and route it up the building.

349
350 R. Hart - These are condominiums, yes? (P. Macoska – Yes)
351 So, who's going to do it? (D. Wilson – It is part of our by-laws. The condominium
352 Association would be responsible).

353
354 P. Darling – Do you have concern about the talk of building a new city hall or a court facility
355 at that adjacent property? (D. Wilson - There was discussion early on regarding that during
356 the original planning stages and site plan approval. Our thought regarding this variance is
357 because we received the original variance, we did take on the responsibility to make that
358 change for the exhaust ducts in the garage, that is really the meat of any change that would
359 have to be done later. These two small exhaust ducts are relatively minor in relationship to
360 what would be required for the duct that is currently there, so again, when and if that change
361 is made, to do this piece of the revision is not that great. It just made sense to agree to the
362 arbitrated solution to the problem we had with the original design).

363
364 S. Callan – Do the condominium owners know that in the future they may have to pay for
365 this (D. Wilson – Yes, it's part of our documents). But do they know? (They should).

366
367 P. Darling – Do you escrow it or something? Do they end up paying the cost of it then? (D.
368 Wilson – Yes).

369
370 K. Winters – They would be responsible for the parking garage exhaust – to redo that as
371 well as these two unit heater exhausts? (D. Wilson – Yes).

372 R. Hart – Is the shaft for the first exhaust – is there something in place for that, or is that
373 also going to be added to the back of the building in the future? (P. Macoska – The
374 drawings on the architectural attributes show a future vertical exhaust along the exterior
375 walls).

376
377 K. Winters – This was previously approved as an ‘interior.’

378
379 A. Savoni – That’s the way they presented it, but it changed in the field.

380
381 P. Macoska – That goes back to the original duct, these are two different ducts.

382
383 K. Winters – No, that does not go back to the original.

384
385 A. Savoni – This is why I stated that you needed to modify their original appeal or an
386 alternative.

387
388 Additional discussion ensued between the Board and the Petitioner regarding the original
389 appeal and this appeal, in order to ensure that in the future the condominium owners are
390 aware of the possible costs that might be incurred as well as adhering to the variance
391 specifics and complying with follow through on rerouting the exhausts properly.

392
393 Petitioners – Restated that these original designs were approved at all levels (planning,
394 building, etc.) as submitted, and late in the project, and new inspector did an inspection and
395 decided that he did not agree with this design. The variance is what we all felt was a
396 solution to a very complex problem, and it’s the reason we’re asking for this variance.
397 Everything else is done.

398
399 K. Winters – The fact that you have discussed putting the duct going up through the building
400 on the first variance, and the additional two ducts going up on the outside, can something
401 be put on the permit documents that this is a location for a 10” diameter opening, a 2’ x 3’
402 diameter opening or whatever’s required? (Yes, we could amend the documents and
403 resubmit to the city for the record). By elevation, you will design something to show that if in
404 the future these ducts or louvers are ever forced to be closed? (Petitioners - Yes).

405
406 A. Savoni – It might be better if that were included as a part of this variance. It has a better
407 chance of being filed and looked at in the future than some drawings in the vault that may
408 be overlooked.

409
410 K. Winters – You would provide copies of the drawings to be included with the variance
411 language? (Petitioners - Yes).

412
413 D. Wilson – Stated that there were many changes that happened over the course of the
414 project, and that they typically do what is called a ‘consolidated master deed,’ which
415 documents anything that changes according to the requirements on the drawings and this is
416 something that we do on a regular basis. (Answering question from the board – There is no
417 ‘process’ for the individual condominium owner to ‘sign off’ on all the individual changes, but
418 they get copies and are informed of changes).

419
420
421 S. Callan – Before we grant the variance, we need to get them to sign off and we need this
422 design drawing submitted to us, correct?

423
424 A. Savoni – Yes. It becomes part of the variance.
425

426 Board – Suggested that this be tabled with the understanding that this would be approved
427 once the petitioner submits the modified permit drawings, and that a Motion be formulated
428 now so that it is simpler later to approve the language of the variance without great
429 additional discussion at its next hearing. (Agreed). Petitioner asked if this could be done
430 with the contingency that this variance take effect immediately upon submitting the new
431 drawings rather than waiting until their next hearing. The Board was not in agreement with
432 that suggestion, as they preferred to see the actual revised drawings prior to granting the
433 variance.
434

435 Mr. Wilson suggested that this be approved when the revised drawings were submitted, as
436 they currently have tenants moving into the building and this could be disruptive to the
437 homeowners and could become more complicated than it is now. He stated “We have a
438 registered P.E. here today who would stamp the drawings and we have worked well with Mr.
439 Savoni in the past. We would follow up on our commitments.”
440

441 K. Winters – I think that you should also check to see that the size of openings promised
442 can actually be made. Depending on the depth of the plank, you can only put a certain
443 width of opening. A 6” opening will work fine in a *specific* location. The larger opening, I’m
444 not sure. You can’t header off to an adjacent plank if these adjacent planks haven’t been
445 designed for that. This should probably be part of a shop drawing, if not the structural
446 design drawing to be presented also, so that we know that your location of those openings
447 can physically be made.
448

449 S. Callan – I don’t think we can do anything until we have that information.
450

451 R. Hart – You can’t make the motion in principal?
452

453 K. Winters – The motion will be made, and then tabled.
454

455 **MOTION**

456
457 Moved by P. Darling, Seconded by S. Callan, “**that the Board grant a variance for**
458 **Appeal Number 2006-B-45, 320-322 East Liberty Street, from the 2003 Michigan**
459 **Building Code, Section 704.8 and from the 2003 Michigan Mechanical Code,**
460 **Section 401.5 to allow this shaft to be deferred in construction to allow ventilation**
461 **through the outside wall on the south side of the property, provided that sealed**
462 **design documents be submitted to the Building Department to be attached to this**
463 **variance, indicating how the duct work will be vented if a building is built on the**
464 **adjacent property. This is also contingent upon:**
465

- 466 a). **Having one sprinkler head located on the inside of the opening, per the Fire**
467 **Marshall’s approval.**
- 468
- 469 b.) **Changes documented and submitted on architectural, structural and**
470 **mechanical drawings for all three ducts/mechanical components.**
- 471
- 472 c.) **That this information be included in the Condominium Association Master**
473 **Deed for the condominium owners to be aware of possible future costs and**
474 **changes and their responsibility for same. The Condominium Association**
475 **will be responsible for describing the size and shaft and location of these**
476 **future changes.”**
477

477 Moved by P. Daring, Seconded by S. Callan, “to Table the Motion until revised information can
478 be submitted by the petitioner that satisfies the requirements set forth by the Board for
479 granting a variance. Tabled to the January 10th, 2006 Regular Session or later, dependent
480 on when petitioner submits the required drawings or the next regularly scheduled meeting
481 of the Board at a later date. “

482
483 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION TO TABLE PASSED – UNANIMOUS – Variance TABLED.**

484
485 VI. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

486
487 None.

488
489 VII. **NEW BUSINESS**

490
491 None.

492
493 VIII. **REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS**

494
495 Mr. Carl Hueter, who represented the owner of 616 Church Street at the November
496 2006 Regular Session (the issue was Tabled) has requested that this appeal be
497 postponed until the January 2007 meeting.

498
499 IX. **AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION – GENERAL**

500
501 None.

502
503 X. **ADJOURNMENT**

504
505 Moved by R. Hart, Seconded by S. Callan “that the meeting be adjourned” -
506 3:35 p.m.

507
508 **On a Voice Vote – MOTION PASSED – UNANIMOUS**

509
510 ***(Submitted by: Brenda Acquaviva, Administrative Support Specialist V –***
511 ***Building Board of Appeals)***