

**LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**  
**OCTOBER 20, 2020**

THE LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MET IN REGULAR SESSION ON **TUESDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2020 AT 7:00P.M.** IN THE LAGRANGE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ROOM AT THE COUNTY OFFICE BUILDING

**CALL TO ORDER:** Tyler Young called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL:** Lynn Bowen, Nick Wilson, Rich Sherman, Tyler Young, & Jim Bugg. In attendance: Robbie Miller, Brittney Johnston, and Dustin Glick.

**ADOPT AGENDA:** Lynn Bowen made a motion to accept the adopted agenda, Nick Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried.

**MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:** Lynn Bowen made a motion to approve the previous minutes, Nick Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried.

**COMMUNICATIONS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**DEVELOPMENTAL VARIANCE**

*(Public Hearing)*

**WALCHLE, GARY & ROSA ~ By: Willie Miller (20-V-53):** Greenfield Twp., Sect. 22, T38N R10E, zoned L-1. Located at 6535 N 300 E, Howe. Application is for a 31.5' lakeside setback for a proposed porch.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Willy Miller, 9675 W 750 N, was present on behalf of the petitioner.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

Lynn Bowen made a motion to not allow enclosure of the porch, Rich Sherman seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried.

A roll call vote was taken:

***Developmental Standard Variance***

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

*The proposal is for the addition of an open lakeside porch that would have a minimal effect, if any, on the surrounding area. The proposal does not pose any risks to the health, safety, or general welfare of the community.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The proposed addition of a lakeside deck will not interfere or intrude on the use and enjoyment of adjacent property owners. The lakeside setback is in line with neighboring properties and will not cause any unnecessary obstruction of the lake view. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

*Strict application would prevent petitioner from constructing the deck addition on the existing home. Given the size, width, and layout of the existing lot it would be difficult to construct a lakeside deck on the property without a variance.*

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

*The proposed new deck is reasonably sized, minimally intrusive to neighboring properties, and does not interfere with the use and enjoyment of the lake.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**SNIDER, BRIAN & LINDA ~ By: Bruce Dyksen (20-V-55):** Johnson Twp., Sect. 31, T36N R10E, zoned L-1. Located at 7030 S 080 E, Wolcottville. Application is for a 31' roadside setback, a 6' Eastside setback, a 6' Westside setback and a 22' lakeside setback for a new residence.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Brian & Linda Snider, 7030 S 080 E, were present as the petitioners. Mr. Snider explained the reason for the variance, a family history of the property, and plans to use the property as a full time residence.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is to construct a new home on Petitioner's property with a slightly larger footprint than what existed previous. The proposed new residence location will allow for safe travel and sight on the roadway. The proposal will not pose any risk to the public.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The proposed new home will not substantially interfere or intrude on the use and enjoyment of adjacent property owners. The new residence, as proposed, does not unreasonably encroach on the lakeside of the property and does not interfere with neighboring landowners' lake view. New construction may increase the property values of neighboring landowners.*
3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.  
*Strict application would prevent petitioner from constructing a new home on the lot without the requested variance. Given the size and layout of the subject property, it would be difficult and/or impractical to construct a new home on the lot while meeting all required setbacks.*
4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

*The proposed residence is minimally intrusive to neighboring properties and does not interfere with the use and enjoyment of the lake. The residence, as proposed, will have similar side yard setbacks to other similar situated lake properties in the area.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**DUKES, BERNARD & PATRICIA ~ By: Patricia Dukes (20-V-56):** Greenfield Twp., Sect. 24, T38N R11E, zoned L-1. Located at 11765 E 600 N, Orland. Application is for a 31' roadside setback from CR 065 N for a new attached garage.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Patricia Dukes, 11795 E 600 N, was present as the petitioner. Mrs. Dukes explained the variance was requested to allow easier access to the garage and their vehicle for her husband and herself during inclement weather. Mrs. Dukes explained the current setup had proved hazardous for herself in the past when she had fallen while helping her husband get to their vehicle.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

Lynn Bowen questioned if the breezeway can directly access the garage.

Patricia Dukes confirmed the breezeway will be built to directly enter the garage.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

*The proposal is to construct an addition on Petitioners' existing home that will consist of an attached garage and storage space. The proposed addition will remain in line with the existing home line and the reduction of the roadside setback will not pose a risk to the public or general welfare of the community.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The proposed addition will make better use of the space available, while not moving any closer to the lakeside of the property, and also not increasing the side yard infringement on neighboring landowners. The new construction will be more aesthetically pleasing and may also improve the property values of surrounding properties. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

*Given the size, width, and layout of the subject lot, it would be impractical to construct an addition without the need for a variance. Petitioner would be unable to perform the proposed addition on the subject home, thereby limiting the value of the property.*

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

*The proposed construction is minimally intrusive and does not seek to move closer to the lakeside or reduce the side yard setback requirements more than what currently exists. The proposed garage location and size makes good use of the property without encroaching on the roadway or neighboring properties.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**YODER, MARCUS & RUTH ~ By: Marcus Yoder (20-V-57):** Newbury Twp., Sect. 05, T37N R08E, zoned A-1. Located at 10295 W 325 N, Shipshewana. Application is for a 2,400' setback from Cass Lake, 2,140' setback from Mudd Lake and a 1,780' setback from the L-1 zoning district on the West side of the Shipshewana Lake for a new CFO Miller Poultry broiler barn.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan. Mrs. Miller explained the zoning ordinance states a CFO must be half a mile from a body of water.

Melissa Lehman, Agronomic Solutions, was present on behalf of the petitioner. Mrs. Lehman explained to the board there is already a 12,000 head barn in existence on the property, with the proposed barn the total will be over 30,000 causing the operation to be categorized as a CFO. Mrs. Lehman also stated neighbor notifications have been sent to 79 neighbors during the IDEM permitting process and no responses were received.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

Tyler Young questioned how long Marcus Yoder has had the existing barn and if there is the possibility of adding another barn in the future.

Melissa Lehman stated it has been there since 1975 and no additional barns are planned.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community. *The proposal is to construct a CFO Miller Poultry barn on Petitioner's property which is located closer to nearby lakes and L-1 zoning districts than what is permitted. The structure, as proposed, is located well off of the roadway and well away from any neighboring residential structures. The proposal does not pose a risk to the general public.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner. *The proposed structure would serve to allow Petitioner to operate his CFO Poultry operation at his primary residence, which is located in a heavily rural/agricultural area. The site location, while within the required distances, is located well away from said waterways and will allow for sufficient filtering and runoff control at the site. The proposed structure will not interfere with adjacent property owners use and enjoyment of their properties. The property is quite large and the location of the proposed barn is located well away from any neighboring structures. No Remonstrators appeared.*

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.  
*Strict application would prevent Petitioner from constructing the CFO poultry barn on his A-1 property as proposed, thereby limiting the usefulness of his property and frustrating the purpose of the A-1 zoning district to be used for agricultural purposes.*
4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.  
*The proposal is reasonable in size and scope making the best possible use of the Petitioner's A-1 property. There is no place within the subject property where Petitioner could locate the CFO barn without the need of a variance.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**BRADBURY, ROYCE & MACHELLE~** By: Machele Bradbury (20-V-59): Milford Twp., Sect. 22, T36N R11E, zoned L-1. Located at 9465 E 570 S, Wolcottville. Application is for two 5.5' side yard setbacks for a new residence.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Machele Bradbury, 9465 E 570 S, was present as the petitioner. Mrs. Bradbury explained the property as a lake cottage lacking appropriate insulation for a full time residence. Mr. & Mrs. Bradbury wanted to utilize the property as a full time residence beginning the summer of 2021.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is for the construction of a new residence on a lot located in an L-1 zone. The proposed new residence does not cause any risk to the surrounding public, nor does it affect travel and sight on the roadway.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The proposed new residence will not substantially interfere or intrude on the use and enjoyment of adjacent property owners, as it is proposed in such a way to ensure that sufficient space exists on each side yard for emergency access. The new home, as proposed, will be located further from the lakeside of the property than what currently exists, thereby not interfering with neighboring landowners' lake view. No remonstrators appeared.*
3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.  
*Strict application of the zoning ordinance side yard setback requirements would prevent Petitioner from constructing a new home on the lot. Given the size and layout of the subject*

*property, it would be difficult and/or impractical to construct a new home on the lot without the variance requested.*

4. The variance granted is the minimum necessary and does not correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

*The proposed structure is minimally intrusive to neighboring properties and does not interfere with the use and enjoyment of the lake. The new home, as proposed, is reasonably sized considering the size and layout of the lot.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**LEWIN, TRAVIS & LISA ~ By: Travis Lewin (20-V-60):** Johnson Twp., Sect. 17, T10N R10E, zoned L-1. Located at 1070 E 455 S, LaGrange. Application is for 2' Westside setback and for an accessory building to be closer to the lake than the primary structures within 300'.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Travis & Lisa Lewin, 1070 E 455 S, were present as the petitioners. Mr. Lewin explained to the board a previous shed was removed and replaced with a new one, however, he was unaware of the setbacks and permit that were required.

Robbie Miller clarified to the board that a complaint was reported to the Plan Commission office about the new shed.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan a length.

Tyler Young questioned the location of the shed.

Travis Lewin stated it was the same location as the previous shed, he said the old shed needed replaced due to appearance.

Nick Wilson questioned if there was a building permit issued.

Travis Lewin confirmed there was not a building permit.

Rich Sherman stated the correct setback is 10'.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval **will** be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community. *The proposed new shed is located on the lakeside of the residence, very close to the west side property line. When the new shed was constructed it was built closer to the property line than the prior shed that was removed. The location of the shed poses risks to the public and neighboring landowners.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner. *The proposed shed size is larger than the prior, nonconforming structure, and closer in proximity to the side yard property line than the prior shed. The new shed should not affect the property values of neighboring landowners in any discernable way. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance **will not** result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.  
*Strict application would not prevent petitioner from continued use of the property and relocating the proposed shed to another suitable location within the required setbacks. The petitioner possesses sufficient space on the subject property to locate the auxiliary structure at the required setback or further away from the side yard at issue, without the need of the variance requested.*
4. The variance granted **is not** the minimum necessary and **does** correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.  
*The proposed location of the auxiliary structure and the reduction from the required 10' side yard setback down to the proposed 2' is not the minimum necessary given that sufficient space exists to relocate the structure at the required setback without issue. The Petitioner by proposing/selecting the subject location has created its own hardship.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has not met its burden of proof and hereby denies the variance as requested.

The board required the shed to be removed within 10 months or moved to fit within the setbacks.

*(Public Hearing)*

**WATTIER, GREGG & LINDA ~ By: Gregg Wattier (20-V-62):** Milford Twp., Sect. 15, T36N R11E, zoned L-1. Located at 9245 E 490 S, Wolcottville. Application is for a 15' setback from the center of CR 490 S for a detached garage.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Richard Muntz, 3790 W 50 N, was present on behalf of the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance. Mr. Muntz elaborated on the neighboring properties and that the property across the road cannot be sold as a garage lot.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petitioner. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan at length.

Rich Sherman questioned the distance from the house to the garage.

Gregg Wattier estimated 6 feet.

Lynn Bowen remarked that the arrangement was too small, and Mr. Wattier had options to attach a garage or build a one car garage.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Developmental Standard Variance*

1. The Approval **will be** injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is for the construction of a two-car detached garage on the road side of Petitioner's property. The proposed addition will significantly encroach upon the roadway, may hinder and/or obstruct sightlines on the road, and may pose an unnecessary risk to the public and general welfare of the community.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance **will** be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The proposed detached garage will infringe on neighboring landowners' properties and cause obstruction of view on the adjacent roadway. The proposed location of the garage may cause safety issues for surrounding landowners. No remonstrators appeared.*

3. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance **will not** result in practical difficulties in the use of the property.

*Petitioners would be able to continue to utilize the property for residential use without the proposed detached garage and the variance requested. The strict application will not result in any practical difficulties to the Petitioner in the use of this property.*

4. The variance granted is **not** the minimum necessary and **does** correct a hardship caused by an owner, previous or present, of the property.

*The proposed construction significantly encroaches on the roadway and poses unnecessary risk to vehicles and individuals passing by. The petitioner by requesting to construct the garage addition in the proposed location, within the roadside setback, has created his own hardship.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has not met its burden of proof and hereby denies the variance as requested.

#### *LAND USE VARIANCE*

*(Public Hearing)*

**MATNEY, ANTHONY & KRISTINA ~ By: Anthony Matney (20-LUV-33/20-V-54):** Clearspring Twp., Sect. 24, T36N R09E, zoned L-1. Located at 5775 S 075 W, Wolcottville. Application is for a second accessory building in an L-1 zone and for the accessory buildings to exceed the footprint of the residence by 1,202 sq. ft.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Anthony Matney, 5775 S 075 W, was present as the petitioner and explained the reason for the variance.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petition. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

A roll call vote was taken:

#### *Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.

*The proposal is for the construction of a second auxiliary structure located on a lot zoned L-1. The variance requested does not interfere with neighboring properties and does not increase traffic or create hazardous situations to the public. The lot is quite large for the L-1 zone and there is ample space on the property to not affect the roadway or the lake.*

2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.

*The new construction proposed would be aesthetically pleasing to neighboring properties and may also increase their value. Petitioner's lot is quite large and has more than sufficient space to house a second auxiliary structure without encroaching on or interfering with neighboring landowners. The proposal meets all setback requirements. No remonstrators appeared.*



3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved  
*The geographical location of the property as it currently sits in an L-1 zone would prevent the Petitioners from having the proposed auxiliary structure without the removal of the existing auxiliary structure located near Petitioner's residence.*
4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.  
*Strict application would prevent Petitioners from building the auxiliary structure as proposed and utilizing the full potential of their property.*
5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan  
*The proposed variance and the proposed auxiliary structure requested is not in conflict with the comprehensive plan. The proposal is reasonable and makes good use of the available space on Petitioner's property.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested.

*(Public Hearing)*

**WINGARD, HARLIN & LINDA / SCHWARTZ, MERLIN & CHRISTINA ~ By: Rob Yoder (20-LUV-35):** Clearspring Twp., Sect. 02, T37N R08E, zoned B-3. Located at 485 E. Country Lane, Shipshewana. Application is to construct a 40' x 60' pole style horse barn in a B-3 zone.

Robbie Miller introduced the petition and reviewed the site plan.

Rob Yoder, 7740 W SR 120, was present on behalf of the petitioner, and explained the reason for variance, and the use of the proposed barn.

Tyler Young asked if there was anyone in favor of the petition. No others appeared in favor of the petition. Mr. Young asked if anyone would like to remonstrate against the petitioner. No remonstrators appeared.

The public hearing was subsequently closed.

The board discussed the site plan.

A roll call vote was taken:

*Land Use Variance*

1. The approval will not be injurious to the public health, safety and general welfare of the community.  
*The proposal is for the construction of a horse barn on Petitioner's lot located in a B-3 zone. The variance requested does not interfere with neighboring properties, the structure is located well off the neighboring roadway, and does not increase traffic nor does it create hazardous conditions for the public.*
2. The use and value of the area adjacent to the property included in the variance will not be affected in a substantially adverse manner.  
*The proposed structure is a pole barn to be used for housing four (4) large animals and other agricultural related items. There are minimal neighboring landowners nearby and Petitioner's property. The Petitioner previously had approval for the auxiliary structure, but the operative time elapsed before it was constructed. No remonstrators appeared.*
3. The need for the variance arises from some condition peculiar to the property involved

*The unique geographical location of the proposed auxiliary building as it currently sits in a B-3 zone would prevent the construction of the proposed auxiliary structure as proposed.*

4. The strict application of the terms of the zoning ordinance will constitute an unnecessary hardship if applied to the property for which the variance is sought.

*Petitioner would be unable to construct the auxiliary structure on the lot, as it currently exists due to the zoning that exists on the property. Strict application would require the Petitioner to rezone his property or relocate to the auxiliary structure to another location.*

5. The approval does not interfere substantially with the Comprehensive Plan

*The proposed variance and the proposed auxiliary structure requested is consistent with the comprehensive plan and will not interfere with the B-3 zoning, given the low likelihood of business development near the Petitioner's residential property.*

For all of the foregoing reasons, on this 20th day of October, 2020, the LaGrange County Board of Zoning Appeals finds the Petitioner has met its burden of proof and hereby approves the variance as requested

**OTHER BUSINESS:** The board discussed possible candidates for a new Board of Zoning Appeals board member.

**ADJOURNMENT:** Lynn Bowen made a motion to adjourn, Nick Wilson seconded the motion. A vote was taken, motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:49 p.m.

LAGRANGE COUNTY, INDIANA

ANTI-DISCRIMINATION NOTICE STATEMENT

The County of LaGrange does not illegally discriminate because of race, color, national origin, sex, religion, disability, or age with regards to admission, participation, or treatment in its facilities, programs, activities, or services, as required by Title III and Title VI of the American Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and their related statutes, regulations, and directives. The County has established an Anti-Discrimination Compliance Division to ensure compliance with these laws. If you would like more information concerning the provisions of these laws and about the rights provided thereby, or if you have a suggestion on how the County can better meet the needs of persons protected thereby, please contact the Division at 300 E. Factory St., LaGrange, IN 46761 or by telephone at (260)499-6352.

LAGRANGE COUNTY BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tyler Young, President

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Jim Bugg, Member

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Lynn Bowen, Member

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Nick Wilson, Member

BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
Rich Sherman, Alternate Member

BY: \_\_\_\_\_ ABSENT \_\_\_\_\_  
Freeman Miller, Alternate Member