



**TOWN OF CEDAR LAKE  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES  
March 8, 2018 7:00 P.M.**

Call to Order (Time): 7:00 p.m.

Pledge to Flag:

Roll Call:

Present Nick Recupito

Present Jerry Wilkening

Present John Kiepura

Present Jeremy Kuiper

Present Jeff Bunge

Present David Austgen, Town Attorney

Present Tim Kubiak, Director of Operations

Present Michelle Bakker, Building Administrator

Present Tammy Bilgri, Recording Secretary

**Minutes:**

A motion was made by John Kiepura and seconded by Jeff Bunge to approve the February 8, 2018 Public Meeting Minutes as presented.

Nick Recupito	Jerry Wilkening	John Kiepura	Jeff Bunge	Jeremy Kuiper	Vote
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5-0

**Old Business:**

**1. Mori-Developmental Variance**

Owner/Petitioner: Drew & Cheryl Mori, 14503 Lakeshore Dr., Cedar Lake, IN 46303

Vicinity: 14503 Lakeshore Dr., Cedar Lake, IN 46303

Legal Description: SOUTH SHORE SUB. LOT 75

Tax Key Number(s): 45-15-35-302-002.000-043

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Developmental Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title VIII-Residential (R-2); Section 4: C. Side Yard: there shall be two (2) side yards of not less than eight (8) feet, E. Building Coverage: Not more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the area of the lot may be covered by buildings and/or structures

***This Developmental Variance is to allow the Petitioner to add a 6'x8' attached mudroom and 24'x22' attached garage to existing house with a lot coverage of approximately thirty-five (35%) percent and side yard setback of less than eight (8') ft.***

- Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated this is a continued public hearing and the legals are in good order.
- Petitioner's Comments: Drew Mori, 14503 Lake Shore Drive. Has revised his plan and would now like to put a 28'x24' garage and eliminate the mudroom and push the garage up against the house. Eliminate 20'x10' feet of decking and the garage will be four (4') ft. off the north line instead of the south line. It will be twenty-four (24') ft. to the other structure and fourteen (14') ft. off the south property line. Should be able to get in and out of it then. There are no houses north or south of this property.
- Remonstrators: None
- Building Department's Comments: Tim Kubiak stated he was out there today and a few other times. This is a plan where he could reasonably pull in and out. Would have twenty-five (25') ft. from the garage to the boat house garage. Definitely the best option to make it work. Would be eliminating approximately 12x34 of that deck, so he would only be decreasing his request for lot coverage. Tim Kubiak stated it would be possible for a six (6') ft. side yard, if necessary and still make it work. The four (4') ft. would be better.
- Board's Discussion: Jerry Wilkening asked for more information about the lot coverage change. Tim Kubiak stated he is losing two hundred forty (240') ft. of deck and replacing that with garage. Michelle Bakker stated he is allowed to have 2252 and he will have 2416, he will be over 164 sq. ft. David Austgen stated approximately five (5%) percent over. Jeff Bunge expressed concern with possible expansion of the front deck. The Board discussed size of driveway. Tim Kubiak stated this is a much better plan then previous. Jerry Wilkening asked about the existing deck and its location of four (4') ft. from the property line. Discussion ensued on surrounding property. Nick Recupito

stated this proposal is better, with the garage being attached to the house and better use of the property. Jeremy Kuiper stated there is plenty of distance from the other structure. Jerry Wilkening stated we are setting precedent here. Jeremy Kuiper stated the property is already existing nonconforming. David Austgen stated you can decide when too much is too much. Have a lot of items here that somewhere along the way will be faced again, given the nature of the community. John Kiepura stated it makes it too crowded and hard to get in and out of the area.

A motion was made by Jerry Wilkening and seconded by Jeff Bunge to deny the request and to include the findings of fact: this does change the value of the adjacent property, does not go along with the master plan, there is no hardship or practical difficulties.

Nick Recupito	Jerry Wilkening	John Kiepura	Jeff Bunge	Jeremy Kuiper	Vote
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	4-1

**New Business:**

**1. Exner-Developmental Variance**

Owner/Petitioner: Charles Exner, 15022 Carey St., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Vicinity: 15022 Carey St., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Legal Description: Lynnsway Cottage Homes Lot 36  
Tax Key Number(s): 45-19-04-226-029.000-057

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Developmental Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title VIII-Residential (R-2) Zoning District: Section 4: D. Rear Yard: There shall be a rear yard on not less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the depth of the lot.

***This Developmental Variance is to allow the Petitioner to reduce the rear yard building setback from thirty ft. (30') to twenty-two ft. (22')***

- a) Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated the legals are in order for this public hearing.
- b) Petitioner's Comments: Jack Huls, DVG, representing Mr. Exner. This petition and the next two (2) petitions are similar. This petition goes along with Plan Commission and Town Council action that has been going along with these. We have Lots 33, 34, 35 and 36 which are the west most lots of the resub of Lynnsway Cottage Homes. There are duplex lots on the north and south of this, this area was redeveloped into cottage homes. That plat established a thirty ft. (30') easement in the back yard and also established a thirty ft. (30') building set back line. Over the last month have been in front of the Plan Commission and Town Council seeking a reduction in the rear yard easement from thirty ft. (30') to twenty-two ft. (22') on Lot 36. Will be back next month for Lots 33, 34 and 35. That was the result of the Plan Commissions request that we handle all the Lots the same. The reason for the petition is on Lot 36 there was an error made in some point of the process and there is an encroachment of the covered porch. Want to resolve this problem by doing an easement vacation and a developmental variance for an adjustment of the rear yard setback line, will allow this house to be in compliance with the Town Ordinances. Seeking developmental variances on the four lots together, there are three (3) owners. This will not decrease the value of the adjoining property owners; this is consistent with the master plan, were successful with the Town Council seeking the vacation. Have information from Comcast, AT&T and NIPSCO that they are not in need of that easement in the back yard.
- c) Remonstrators: Charles Exner, 15022 Carey St., Cedar Lake. Appreciate consideration in this matter. Home was already in construction when they signed on the property, covered porch was already framed, thought everything was ok. Found out it was in the easement when Mr. Kubiak came to check a fence.
- d) Building Department's Comments: Michelle Bakker stated that section is part of it's own subdivision. Tim Kubiak stated we requested them to do the three (3) additional lots, they have done everything we asked. These properties did have an excessive easement in the back. Normally it is a fifteen ft. (15') not thirty ft. (30').
- e) Board's Discussion: Discussion on surrounding lots ensued. David Austgen stated this is a setback variance, but they are going to apply for and process a platted easement vacation.

A motion was made by Nick Recupito and seconded by Jerry Wilkening to approve the Developmental Variance as presented and to include the findings of fact.

Nick Recupito	Jerry Wilkening	John Kiepura	Jeff Bunge	Jeremy Kuiper	Vote
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5-0

## 2. Prough-Developmental Variance

Owner/Petitioner: Michael Prough, 15004 Carey St., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Vicinity: 15004 Carey St., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Legal Description: Lynnsway Cottage Homes Lot 33  
Tax Key Number(s): 45-19-04-226-026.000-057

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Developmental Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title VIII-Residential (R-2) Zoning District: Section 4: D. Rear Yard: There shall be a rear yard on not less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the depth of the lot.

***This Developmental Variance is to allow the Petitioner to reduce the rear yard building setback from thirty ft. (30') to twenty-two ft. (22')***

- a) Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated the legals are in order and a public hearing may be conducted.
- b) Petitioner's Comments: Jack Huls, DVG. Here representing the petition, talked about this in the previous petition.
- c) Remonstrators: None
- d) Building Department's Comments: None
- e) Board's Discussion: None

A motion was made by Jerry Wilkening and seconded by Jeff Bunge to approve the Developmental Variance as presented and to include the findings of fact.

Nick Recupito	Jerry Wilkening	John Kiepura	Jeff Bunge	Jeremy Kuiper	Vote
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5-0

## 3. Diamond Peak-Developmental Variance

Owner/Petitioner: Diamond Peak Homes, 1313 White Hawk Dr., Crown Point, IN 46307  
Vicinity: 15010 Carey St., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
15016 Carey St., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Legal Description: Lynnsway Cottage Homes Lot 34  
Lynnsway Cottage Homes Lot 35  
Tax Key Number(s): 45-19-04-226-027.000-057  
45-19-04-226-028.000-057

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Developmental Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title VIII-Residential (R-2) Zoning District: Section 4: D. Rear Yard: There shall be a rear yard on not less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the depth of the lot.

***This Developmental Variance is to allow the Petitioner to reduce the rear yard building setback from thirty ft. (30') to twenty-two ft. (22')***

- a) Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated the legals are in order and a public hearing may be conducted.
- b) Petitioner's Comments: Jack Huls, DVG. Representing the petitioner. Statements made previously will stand in the record for this petition.
- c) Remonstrators: None
- d) Building Department's Comments: None
- e) Board's Discussion: None

A motion was made by John Kiepura and seconded by Jerry Wilkening to approve the Developmental Variance as presented and to include the findings of fact.

Nick Recupito	Jerry Wilkening	John Kiepura	Jeff Bunge	Jeremy Kuiper	Vote
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5-0

## 4. Summer Winds Development-Developmental Variance

Owner: Cedar Lake Ventures One, LLC, 1001 E. Summit St., Crown Point, IN 46307

Petitioner: Summer Winds Development LLC, 40 E. Joliet St., 1B, Schererville, IN 46375  
Vicinity: 9730 Lincoln Plaza Way, Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Legal Description: Lincoln Plaza West Lot 4 **and** Lincoln Plaza West Lot 5 **and** Lincoln Plaza West Lot 6 Ex. S.123.43ft. **and** Lincoln Plaza West Lot 7 Ex. Pt. of S.243.43ft.  
Tax Key Number(s): 45-15-28-227-006.000-014 **and** 45-15-28-227-007.000-014 **and** 45-15-28-226-005.000-014 **and** 45-15-28-226-004.000-014

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Developmental Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title XI-Planned Unit Development (PUD) Zoning District: Section 7: A. District Area Minimum: Ten (10) acres

***This Developmental Variance is to allow the Petitioner to use the PUD Zoning District for a commercial parcel consisting of 4.0 acres***

- a) Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated the legals are in order and a public hearing may be conducted.
- b) Petitioner’s Comments: Jack Huls, DVG, 1155 Troutwine Rd., Crown Point, IN. This a vacant parcel on 133<sup>rd</sup> in Cedar Lake. The ordinance states that a PUD Zoning district can only be used on a ten (10) acre parcel or greater. This parcel is 4.4 acres. We have been in front of the Plan Commission discussing this project. The plan is to have two (2) buildings in retail. Retail space to the north on 133<sup>rd</sup> and Elmwood, the east side is Stracks parking lot, will be connecting through the Stracks parking lot. It has been advised to us by the Town to handle this as a PUD. We will need a variance for the size. Mr. Huls discussed the ingress/egress easements in the parking lot. There is plenty of access to the parcel.
- c) Remonstrators: None
- d) Building Department’s Comments: Tim Kubiak stated as Mr. Huls stated the Plan Commission has nudged them into this direction to go with the PUD Zoning due to the uniqueness of this property. The road frontage accessibility is through the common road, so it fits the profile.
- e) Board’s Discussion: David Austgen stated this is a unique parcel, the Plan Commission has spent a lot of time with Mr. Huls and this developer group and as Tim has indicated it was worked through as the best process to go through. They will be back in front of the Plan Commission with a development plan, this is negotiated zoning, they are working on this. This is just the threshold step, if this was not approved there would be no sense in going through the other steps. John Kiepura stated the Plan Commission was pretty enthusiastic about this, it is a good looking project and have answered all our questions at the Plan Commission. David Austgen stated any action the Board considers tonight should consider any approval be subject to all other land use approvals being given to this project. Everything has to happen for this to be an approval. There will be a PUD Zoning Ordinance Amendment, a one (1) lot subdivision and not sure what else. Jeff Bunge asked if the retention pond will be expanded. Mr. Huls stated they will not be expanding the pond, but will provide detention facilities. Jerry Wilkening stated this has been discussed at the Plan Commission. Discussion ensued on possible detention facilities.

A motion was made by Jerry Wilkening and seconded by John Kiepura to approve the Developmental Variance as presented contingent all land use approvals by the Plan Commission and to include the findings of fact.

Nick Recupito	Jerry Wilkening	John Kiepura	Jeff Bunge	Jeremy Kuiper	Vote
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5-0

**5. Jacob-Developmental Variance**

Owner/Petitioner: Donald D. Jacob, 12539 Parrish Ave., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Vicinity: 12539 Parrish Ave., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Legal Description: Decker (Re-Sub of Lot 2) Lot 1  
Tax Key Number(s): 45-15-21-229-006.000-014

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Developmental Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title XXIII-Accessory Regulations: Section 1: A. 5) There shall be a minimum six (6’) foot setback from any and all side and rear property lines and a minimum ten (10’) foot separation or distance from all other buildings.

***This Developmental Variance is to allow the Petitioner to add a roof to an existing deck five ft. (5') from the existing garage***

- a) Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated the legals are in order and the public hearing may be conducted.
- b) Petitioner's Comments: Donald Jacob, 12539 Parrish Ave. Has a 16'x16' deck, Champion a company that does sunrooms has a roof I would like to put on the deck. Have low tolerance for sunlight. Nice design would be in line with the roof. This will not be enclosed, just the roof. Very light systems, but very durable, covered in aluminum sheeting. This would be covering an existing deck. According to contractors the deck is very structurally sound. Roof line will be five ft. (5') back, not all the way to the end. Will follow current roof line. The deck was there when house was bought two (2) years ago.
- c) Remonstrators: None
- d) Building Department's Comments: Tim Kubiak stated the five ft. (5') from the garage is a concern and do not know the condition of the deck and if it could support a roof. Accessibility should not be an issue. There should be a ten ft. (10') separation between the deck and garage. Will need to research the deck, happened before I was here. Could not see under the deck. Will not issue a building permit until can look at the structure of the deck.
- e) Board's Discussion: The Board discussed the amount of weight being added to the deck. It was suggested this be deferred to get further information about the roof and the structure of the deck. David Austgen suggested Tim Kubiak do an inspection on the deck.

A motion was made by Jerry Wilkening and seconded by Jeff Bunge to defer to the April 12, 2018 Public Meeting.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0

**6. McClymont-Developmental Variance**

Owner: Eileen Butcher, 10600 White Oak Avenue, Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Petitioner: Bobby McClymont, 3725 W. 105<sup>th</sup>, Crown Point, IN 46307  
Vicinity: 13913 Lakeview Point Rd., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Legal Description: LAKEVIEW POINT LOT 3  
Tax Key Number(s): 45-15-27-476-002.000-014

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Developmental Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title VIII-Residential (R-2) Zoning District: Section 4: B: Front Yard: 4) On all other streets a distance of thirty (30) feet; C. Side Yard: On each lot, except as otherwise specified, there shall be two (2) side yards, each having a width of not less than eight (8) feet ; D. Rear Yard: There shall be a rear yard on not less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the depth of the lot; E. Building Coverage: Not more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the area of the lot may be covered by buildings and/or structures

***This Developmental Variance is to allow the Petitioner to have a front yard setback of twenty ft. (20'), one (1) side yard setback of five ft. (5'), a rear yard setback of twenty-three ft. (23') and lot coverage over twenty-five percent (25%)***

- a) Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated the legals are in order and the public hearing can be conducted.
- b) Petitioner's Comments: Bobby McClymont, builder for Eileen Butcher. Asking for the three (3) variances on the side yard of five ft., (5') front yard twenty ft. (20') setback and rear yard of twenty-three ft. (23'). As far as lot coverage, because of her owning the property across the street, I think we are ok. David Austgen stated this is inclusive for coverage purposes, so do not need the lot coverage variance. It is a very tight lot, by setting it closer to the road she will have a little more back yard.
- c) Remonstrators: January Michels, 13939 Huseman St., Cedar Lake, IN. Purchased home ten (10) years ago and with her home she purchased the south ten ft. (10') of Lot 3, five ft. (5') easement and Lot 4 and an addendum to the property to purchase the portion of the land on this side of the road in the lot he just bought of Lot 3. Steps from home and sprinkler systems were run all the way down to the street were sold as one (1) parcel. In her sale she was sold that portion of the lot to go with her home. Last year the brothers that sold them their lot took out her sprinkler system and steps saying it did not get recorded properly. Now has a legal dispute with the title company because it did not get recorded with her lot. Has all the paper work stating

she owns it. The whole portion of her yard that got her to the lake is in dispute. Bought property in 2008. Discussion ensued on if this is recorded on her plat. David Austgen stated it appears that the title is clouded and that the boundaries are unclear. It is unclear where ownership is in the boundaries, we need this clarified, deed instruments, title work, verification at the County. What was presented is a lot with a brown line around it and appears to be owned by these folks and seek the variances, we have a dispute regarding the clouding of title and it has to be clear. We do not know what easements or lesser rights are included in this ownership. Ms. Michels stated she has paperwork at home to show all of this. Discussion ensued on what steps need to be taken to proceed.

Dave Godzecki, 13913 Lakeview Point Rd. the lot just south of property in question. Wanted clarification on the variances. Jeremy Kuiper stated their hardship is the drainage easement. Has an issue with the five ft. (5') side yard setback.

- d) Building Department's Comments: Tim Kubiak stated they have a ten ft. (10') drainage easement on the north side of the property they have to maintain on that side. The front yard setback was a recommendation, that lot is not that deep and if you follow the building line around the cul-de-sac that is what created needing the twenty ft. (20') setback. The depth of that lot decreases as it goes to the north. This is resort zoning, which is a seven ft. (7') side yard. Have worked with the builder to try to figure out the best plan. Michelle Bakker stated he should only need a rear yard setback on one side of the property. In the past they have done different ways of measuring, they will divide it and get an average for the two.
- e) Board's Discussion: Discussion on setbacks on neighboring property ensued. Jeremy Kuiper stated the rear yard setback would be based off the meander line and not the actual shore line. Mr. Kubiak stated yes, we have to use the meander line on every property. Jeremey Kuiper asked David Austgen to clarify what action we can take. David Austgen stated you have been presented information in this hearing of cloud of title by way of ownership interest, do not have verification of proof. The fact that it has been raised and due to the sensitivity to the size of this lot and the improvements proposed to be made, it certainly begs of the necessity of knowing what we have on our hands as to the legal rights of the subject property and how they impact ownership so construction improvement Lot 3 specifically can be made particularly to the variance requests being made. There is some homework to be done, if preceded without that we do not know what the end result will be. There is a dispute between them, but that is not for you to resolve, that is for them to resolve. Proceeding forward on an application such as this without having some better sense of the ownership of the land, it is not advisable. Jerry Wilkening asked if the deferral is granted, what information do we need to move forward. David Austgen stated if he was directed to do it, would pull the mapping off the county GIS and research the deed, looking for ownership and lesser rights, so can ascertain whether the rights of the Michels need to be protected in the assessment of the variance application. This is their responsibility not the Boards. Mr. McClymont asked for clarification on what they need to do to proceed. David Austgen suggested they need to get the deed instrument, title policy and any other documentation that shows who the ownership is in. The Board would want to have copies of any easements that are described; a record should be made here if there are any impacts on the ownership of the lot. Discussion about the walking path ensued. The petitioner has requested a deferral.

A motion was made by Jerry Wilkening and seconded by Nick Recupito to defer to the April 12, 2018 Public Meeting per the Petitioner's request.

Roll Call Vote: 5-0

## **7. Grand Prize Cars-Use Variance**

Owner: ARDT III, 917 Aaron Ct., Crown Point, IN 46307  
Petitioner: Grand Prize Cars, 13318 Wicker Ave., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Vicinity: 11109 W. 133<sup>rd</sup> Ave., Cedar Lake, IN 46303  
Legal Description: Pt. NW.1/4 NW.1/4 S.28 T.34 R.9 1.236Ac  
Tax Key Number(s): 45-15-28-101-004.000-014

Request: Petitioner is requesting a Use Variance from Zoning Ordinance No. 496, Title XIII-Community Business (B-2) Zoning District

***This Use Variance is to allow the Petitioner to store vehicles ready for sale and to have three (3) businesses on a lot in a Community Business B-2 Zoning District***

- a) Attorney to Review Legals: David Austgen stated the legals are in order and a public hearing may be conducted.
- b) Petitioner’s Comments: Andy Tylka, representing ARDT, 11109 W. 133<sup>rd</sup> Ave. Want to utilize the parcel on Rt. 41 for vehicle storage for Grand Prize Cars. There will not be any signs other than the required signs by the state in the cars. He is leasing the first quarter acre that could fit approximately fifteen (15) cars. Paved lot, not adding signs. The customers would go to Grand Prize Cars lot and he would bring the cars to them. This would be for overstock vehicles.
- c) Remonstrators: None
- d) Building Department’s Comments: Tim Kubiak stated he recommends putting a set number of cars to be on the lot. Concerns with parking along 41 to look at the cars, recommends some no parking signs for safety.
- e) Board’s Discussion: Concerns with customers viewing cars and parking next to Rt. 41. Jeremy Kuiper stated for clarification, Tom and Ed’s was approved for two (2) businesses, one being autobody and one being rental, the third business would be the car parking/display. If granted, would like to see it stay with this business only, only use for vehicle storage. Jeff Bunge stated this is a variance of use, so would this stay with the owner of the land or the business. David Austgen stated that is up to the Board. The Board asked for clarification of how many cars would be there maximum. Discussion ensued on the number of cars to be allowed. The Board discussed the different safety issues involved. Jeff Bunge expressed concern if this would be considered a third business. Tim Kubiak replied that stipulations were put on the body shop on where the storage, wrecked cars and rental cars would be. Jeremy Kuiper stated that as Mr. Austgen stated, that we can impose reasonable restrictions and if they have to be outside of that we can hear any additional uses. Mr. Majesky of Grand Prize cars stated they will try to keep customers off that lot. The customer would be at his office location and they will bring the car they are interested in to them. Nick Recupito asked if this is just for storage, do they need the signage on the vehicles. Mr. Majesky stated with it being across the street the customer would not know where to go to get information about the vehicle. There is currently no access to the property from Route 41 at this time. The Board is concerned with people parking on Route 41. The Tylka’s are willing to put up no parking signs. David Austgen noted that Tim Kubiak does monitor these businesses and the amount of vehicles on the lot.

A motion was made by Jerry Wilkening and seconded by John Kiepura to send a favorable recommendation to the Town Council to store a maximum of twenty-five (25) vehicles ready for sale, no parking signs next to Route 41, viewing of vehicles with proprietor of business only and to have three (3) businesses on a lot in a Community Business B-2 Zoning District and to include the findings of fact.

Nick Recupito	Jerry Wilkening	John Kiepura	Jeff Bunge	Jeremy Kuiper	Vote
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	5-0

**Public Comment:** None

**Adjournment:** Time: 9:16 p.m.

**Press Session:** Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting – April 12, 2018 at 7:00pm

\_\_\_\_\_  
Nick Recupito

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeff Bunge, Vice Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jerry Wilkening

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeremy Kuiper, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
John Kiepura

\_\_\_\_\_  
Attest: Tammy Bilgri, Recording Secretary

*The Town of Cedar Lake is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding accessibility of the meeting or the facilities, please contact the Town Hall at (219) 374-7400.*