



301 East Main Street
Lowell, Michigan 49331
Phone (616) 897-8457
Fax (616) 897-4085

PLANNING COMMISSION-CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF LOWELL, MICHIGAN
AGENDA
FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF
MONDAY, OCTOBER 9, 2017 AT 7:00 P.M.
AT THE
LOWELL CITY HALL
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS
SECOND FLOOR
301 EAST MAIN STREET

1. CALL TO ORDER: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL
2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
3. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS
 - a. September 11, 2017 – Regular Meeting
4. PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA
5. OLD BUSINESS
 - a. Short Term Rentals
6. NEW BUSINESS
 - a. Zoning Ordinance Amendments
7. STAFF REPORT
8. COMMISSIONERS REMARKS
9. ADJOURNMENT

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
PLANNING COMMISSION-CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
CITY OF LOWELL, MICHIGAN
FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2017, AT 7:00 P.M.**

1. **CALL TO ORDER: PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE, ROLL CALL.**

The Meeting was called to order at 7:03 p.m. by Chair Barker.

Present: Commissioners David Cadwallader, Marty Chambers, Jim Salzwedel, John Gerard, and Chair Barker.

Absent: None.

Also Present: City Clerk Susan Ullery and Williams and Works Planner Andy Moore.

2. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA.**

IT WAS MOVED BY SALZWEDEL and seconded by CHAMBERS to approve the agenda as written.

YES: 5. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

3. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING.**

IT WAS MOVED BY CHAMBERS and seconded by CADWALLADER that the minutes of the August 14, 2017 Special meeting be approved as written.

YES: 5. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

IT WAS MOVED BY SALZWEDEL and seconded by CHAMBERS that the minutes of the August 14, 2017 Regular meeting be approved as written.

YES: 5. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA.**

No public comments.

5. **OLD BUSINESS**

a. **Public Hearing - Zoning Ordinance Revisions – Chapter 4 and Chapter 17**

Andy Moore of Williams and Works explained Chapters 4 and 17 amendments will be recommended to the City Council for adoption. Moore explained if the City Council approves the amendments, a notice of adoption will be published in the newspaper and then those amendments will be incorporated in the ordinance. Commissioner Salzwedel advised he would address the City Council.

6. **NEW BUSINESS.**

a. **City of Lowell Demographic and Housing Data.**

Andy Moore of Williams and Works explained they have reviewed and updated data from the 2007 Master Plan for consideration. The purpose of this review was to analyze the change that may have occurred within the City's population, which will aid in determining if an adjustment to the City's long range planning policies is warranted.

Commissioner Chambers would like all the City Council members to see the memo provided by Moore.

The Commission discussed the City of Lowell Demographic and Housing Data and Housing Data that was provided.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHAMBERS and seconded by CADWALLADER to approve the Master Plan 5 year review.

YES: Commissioner Cadwallader, Commissioner Chambers, Commissioner Salzwedel, Commission Gerard and Chair Barker. NO: 0. ABSENT: 0. MOTION CARRIED.

b. **Short Term Rentals.**

Andy Moore of Williams and Works explained the memo provided outlines the various issues and concerns surrounding the short-term rental of residential properties located in the City of Lowell. This issue is viewed from the perspective of both the residents and the rental property owner. A range of proposed options to address the issue are offered for the consideration of the Planning Commission and City Council.

First, the City must determine whether short-term rentals represent a problem in the community today or whether they may become a problem in the future as the nature of residential development in the community evolves.

Chair Barker advised he had experiences with this in a previous community and he stated that the noise level gets to be astronomical, but stated that Lowell would be a different atmosphere. Barker asked if Option #2, Public Information and Peer Pressure if Peer Pressure was possible? The City could have a check list of safety items for people renting.

Moore advised the City must have an ordinance to get residents to comply and cooperate.

There was further discussion from the Commissioners.

By general consensus, the Commission wanted direction from the Council. Moore advised he would be attending the Committee of the Whole meeting on Monday, September 18, 2017 at 5:30 p.m. when the Council will discuss Airbnb's.

7. **STAFF REPORT**

No further updates.

8. **COMMISSIONERS REMARKS**

Chair Barker congratulated Commissioner Chambers on being appointed to the City Council and staying on the Planning Commission as the City representative.

Commissioner Gerard advised on that September 29, 2017 he will be resigning from the Planning Commission.

Chair Barker stated Commissioner Gerard will be missed and thanked Gerard for his service.

Commissioner Cadwallader thanked Commissioner Gerard and stated he would be missed.

Commissioner Salzwedel also thanked Commissioner Gerard.

Commissioner Chambers stated he was pleased that Mayor DeVore asked him to stay as a liaison for the Planning Commission after being appointed to the City Council. He went on to state Gerard will be missed.

Chair Barker thanked everyone for the hard work on the zoning ordinances and other issues that have come up. Barker asked Moore to set up the next list of Chapters to review.

IT WAS MOVED BY CHAMBERS and seconded by CADWALLADER to adjourn at 7:54 p.m.

DATE:

APPROVED:

Bruce Barker, Chair

Susan S. Ullery, City Clerk

williams&works

engineers | surveyors | planners

MEMORANDUM

To: City of Lowell Planning Commission
Date: September 8, 2017
From: Andy Moore, AICP
RE: Short Term Rentals

The purpose of this memo is to outline the various issues and concerns surrounding the short-term rental of residential properties located in the City of Lowell. This issue is viewed from the perspective of both the residents and the rental property owner. A range of proposed options to address the issue are offered for the consideration of the Planning Commission and City Council.

The Issue

Owners living in single-family residences in a neighborhood environment normally expect that the other homes in the area will be occupied by other long-term residents with similar standards of housekeeping, behavior, and a general good-neighbor's concern for the other residents. On the other hand, within the limits of the law and local ordinances, a property owner is entitled to capitalize on the value of his home and land. Where there is a market for short-term rentals, the high earnings potential of the property can be enticing, especially in communities that tend to attract a number of tourists. With the increasing popularity of companies like Airbnb and VRBO, this is a significant issue in numerous communities throughout the region.

As a result of this tension, many communities have implemented some form of regulation of short-term rental housing. The following summarizes the reasons most often cited for short-term rental regulation, although all may not apply to the City of Lowell.¹

1. **Protecting a Single-Family Environment.** As outlined in the quote above, a frequent basis for regulating short-term rentals is a perceived need to protect the character of existing residential neighborhoods. These efforts are often driven by complaints from permanent residents about the disturbances that may be caused by short-term tenants, including excessive noise, late night parties, trespassing, increased traffic and parking, too many strangers coming and going, and other disruptive activities. Generally speaking, the rationale is that vacationers and guests who do not have ties to the local community are more concerned with maximizing their fun than they are with being a good neighbor.

¹ Much of the discussion on the reasons for short-term rental regulation is drawn from an issue paper prepared for the National Association of Realtors, by Robinson & Cole, LLP, 2011, and made available on www.realtor.org along with previous research and experiences of Williams & Works staff planners.

2. **Protection of Physical Characteristics and Property Values.** The need to protect the physical characteristics of their residential neighborhoods is often cited. The underlying rationale here is that short-term rentals are generally are not owner-occupied and therefore are less likely to be cared for to the same degree as permanent residences. The presumption is that absentee property owners are less diligent about the types of regular and routine maintenance tasks that owner occupants would provide. The result, would be a deteriorating community and declining property values, especially as more owners opt to make their properties available as short-term rentals and the perceived stability of permanent residents diminishes.
3. **Fairer Competition with Licensed Lodging.** Restrictions on short-term rentals can also be intended as a means of leveling the playing field between the short-term rental industry and conventional overnight lodging facilities, such as hotels and bed and breakfasts, which may be specifically regulated under state or local law. It is not uncommon for the hospitality industry to urge passage of regulations governing short-term rentals on the grounds that they are functionally the same as hotel units. The argument is that successful hotel operators devote large sums to maintenance and to comply with state and local requirements that should also apply to competing short-term rentals.
4. **Protection of Renter and Tourist Safety.** Occasionally, another reason for the adoption of short-term rental regulations is the protection of renter safety. The rationale is that operational restrictions (e.g., occupancy limits based on septic system capacity or fire code compliance) and inspection requirements are necessary to ensure the safety of occupants of short-term rental units who may not be aware if these limitations.
5. **Revenue.** Many resort communities around the country levy some form of Hotel Occupancy Tax, which may apply to short-term rentals. In Michigan, an occupancy tax of up to 5% of the room fee is allowed in properties that have 10 or more units. This tax requires local approval to implement and the funds raised must be largely used for tourism marketing, not basic municipal services. An alternative approach to revenue generation might be licensing and inspection fees, although typically such revenues must be limited to the amount needed to offset operating costs. And, of course, any such regulatory structure will also necessitate an administrative structure to implement it.

Alternative Approaches

There are a number of responses to these issues or challenges that the City may consider, ranging from doing nothing to an outright ban on short-term rentals. Several of those alternatives are discussed below. In many cases, these alternatives are not mutually exclusive and aspects of one approach may be combined with another in devising an approach that is appropriate to the City.

1. **Do Nothing.** Currently the City's Zoning Ordinance defines the terms "single-family dwelling" and "family" quite broadly and an argument may be made that the use of one's home as a short-term rental is included as a permitted use anywhere single-family

dwelling are permitted, although we would disagree with such an interpretation. (Note: there has been legislation proposed in the Michigan Legislature that would do make consider a short term rental a residential use.) This is especially true where the practice has been a part of the local environment for a long time. In essence, this can be interpreted as an acknowledgement that a short-term rental has been considered a legitimate use of a residence and the Zoning Ordinance is written accordingly. Certainly, a property owner ought to be able to capitalize on a legitimate use of his/her property, so long as it does not unreasonably impact the neighbors. Such a perspective does not mean neighboring residents must tolerate unruly, messy or dangerous behavior by guests staying in the short-term rentals. When such behavior borders on criminal activity, Lowell's Police Department is empowered to evaluate the situation intervene by taking whatever action is needed.

Pros and Cons. The advantage of the "do-nothing" response is that no additional regulatory structure is needed and property owners are free to continue this use of their homes without additional oversight. To the extent particular guests or property owners create problems in the neighborhood, existing criminal statutes may be used to address those problems. The disadvantage of taking no action is the perceived problems associated with short-term rentals may get worse as the practice of renting out homes becomes more prevalent. Furthermore, has been the approach thusfar taken by the City, and with one complaint having arisen from a short-term rental, the City is justified in feeling compelled to take action.

- 2. Public Information and Peer Pressure.** The City might take action either independently or in conjunction with other local or regional organizations to mount a public information effort to encourage "good neighbor" property maintenance and visitor behavior. This could take the form of brochures sent to known short-term rental owners and asking them to post a few house rules intended to protect the neighborhood. Local volunteers could approach owners of problem properties to seek their cooperation to assure that a short-term rental in an otherwise single-family neighborhood is not disruptive. In most cases, people want to get along and will cooperate. Where such an approach is resisted or met with hostility, the Police Department can always be called in to address specific cases.

Pros and Cons. This response has most of the same advantages and disadvantages of the "do-nothing" response in that it requires no additional regulatory structure and may be only marginally effective. However, it does have the added advantage of proactively enlisting the involvement of neighborhoods to inform their leadership to the need to keep tabs of short-term rental activity and it provides some simple tools to use in response to emerging problems. Of course, the major disadvantage of this approach is the "lack of teeth" should someone simply flaunt the agreed-upon "good neighbor" standards.

- 3. Limits on Rental Duration.** One of the objections often expressed concerning short-term rentals in residential neighborhoods is the frequent influx of strangers into the area. Some communities adopt standards that prohibit very short-term rental leases, such as

nightly or only two or three nights. On the other end, some communities require that short-term rentals be rented for at least 7 days at a time. Then there are communities requiring minimum stays of two weeks or more, even up to 30 days. The rationale for this approach is the longer the term of the lease, the greater the likelihood that the guests will respect the rights of neighbors.

Pros and Cons. This approach is relatively simple to implement, although it may be difficult to police, as discussed below. Nevertheless, assuming that the majority of guests staying for several days are better behaved, many of the problems associated with short-term rentals could be addressed by this approach. Furthermore, visitors that want to come to the area for shorter periods would be directed toward conventional hotels and bed & breakfasts so that this approach works more cooperatively with those uses. Implementing this approach would require an amendment of the Zoning Ordinance and/or a new general law ordinance governing short-term rentals. In discussing this with other communities, it seems that the vast majority of the property owners either cooperate, or they advise their guests to not “make waves” in the neighborhood that would call attention to a rapid turnover or other problems with their occupancy.

4. **Special Land Use.** Short-term rentals could be treated as special land uses under the Zoning Ordinance subject to a set of review and approval standards and a public hearing prior to receiving a zoning permit. Short-term rentals might be allowed as special land uses in some residential districts-but not necessarily in all. The standards could also include an established maximum occupancy, property maintenance and management standards and even isolation between short-term rentals to prevent a concentration of them in a particular neighborhood.

Pros and Cons. A primary advantage of this approach, once it is implemented, is that all the surrounding property owners would be advised that a short-term rental was being considered in their area. The input at a public hearing often influences the conditions that are applied to special land uses and can be a useful governor on otherwise objectionable features of a proposed use. The fees and escrow requirements for special land uses should support the cost of administering this approach. A special land use regulatory approach has “teeth” in that failure to operate a short-term rental in compliance with the special land use approval can result in suspension or revocation of the approval. Of course, the steps necessary to rescind a special land use can be cumbersome and could result in expensive litigation. A structural weakness in regulating short-term rentals as special land uses through the Zoning Ordinance is that all short-term rentals previously in existence are “grandfathered” as legal nonconforming uses. Applicants for new special land uses may see themselves as unfairly singled out if their “grandfathered” neighbor is able to conduct his business in an unregulated manner.

A further difficulty with this (and other) approaches is finding the illegal short-term rentals in the City to bring them into compliance. Many advertise on VRBO.com, or Airbnb.com or other sites and could be identified with some diligent research. Others may be

identified by neighbor complaint, but still others could exist illegally without the knowledge of the neighborhood or the City. Critics of this approach might argue that if the use has not made itself known by its operation or the guests' behavior, there is no purpose in regulating it.

5. **Licensing and Inspection.** Through a general law ordinance, the City could establish licensing standards for short-term rentals. Those standards could regulate the entire spectrum of short-term rental operations from number of occupants, duration of stays, property maintenance and management procedures (even including a required minimum operating reserve fund to assure property maintenance), among others. The ordinance could also establish a maximum number of licenses that might be issued at any time. It would also require periodic inspections of the units to assure continued compliance. Licenses would be of limited duration and would only be renewed with continued compliance with all requirements. For greatest effect, a licensing and inspection approach would be coupled with special land use permitting under the Zoning Ordinance. In this way, only licensed units would be eligible for consideration as a special land use and in order to be licensed, a unit must have an approved special land use. This overcomes the "grandfathering" issue outlined above.

Pros and Cons. With a properly prepared and administered licensing approach, the City should be well-equipped to address virtually all of the perceived problems surrounding short-term rentals. Clearly, this approach is far more extensive than most other land use techniques currently employed in the City. In addition, as the City of Lowell is one of dozens of communities in the area where there is some demand for short-term rentals, implementing such an approach while other communities do not will likely be seen as unfair to local property owners.

Most frequently, a licensing approach is undertaken in larger, urban jurisdictions that encompass most of the local marketplace. It should also be apparent that this approach would necessitate a fairly robust administrative structure to implement. Licensing fees could help to offset administrative expense, but if fees are too excessive, City property owners will certainly object to the inequity if other communities do not implement a similar approach.

6. **Prohibit short-term rentals.** As indicated above, under the current Zoning Ordinance there is an argument that a short-term rental use is allowed as part of owning a single-family dwelling, particularly if there are short-term rentals being utilized currently. Whether the City is (or could be) susceptible to an exclusionary zoning claim remains to be seen, but if the City were inclined to permit short-term rentals in some capacity the Ordinance could be coupled with a short-term rental definition as either a permitted or special land use (see #4 above), to avoid such a claim. For example, it might be that short-term rentals would be permitted only in one particular zoning district. Alternatively, a short term rental of less than 30 days could be prohibited in residential districts.

Pros and Cons. If the use were effectively eliminated from the City, the perceived problems associated with short-term rentals would be eliminated as well. If they were

not eliminated, but were confined to a certain area or zoning district, any problems associated with them would be contained. However, as outlined above, any existing short-term rental must be treated as a legal nonconforming use and might continue for years despite an outright ban. Furthermore, enforcing a ban will could be difficult, costly, and may open the City to an exclusionary zoning claim.

Most communities find that enforcement of its restrictions is only feasible in response to complaints. Finally, a ban or stringent restrictions will certainly be seen as an intrusion onto the rights of property owners who might need to generate some income from their properties and take advantage of the emerging draw to the City as a destination, or see the ability to use the property as a short-term rental as a selling feature which enhances its value.

Recommendation. There is no obvious correct approach to this issue. First, the City must determine whether short-term rentals represent a problem in the community today or whether they may become a problem in the future as the nature of residential development in the community evolves. If the problem is seen as relatively isolated and generally a matter of guest behavior rather than land use, then alternatives 1 or 2 may be appropriate. On the other hand, if there is a sense that short-term rentals and the behavior of guests are threatening the character of the City in a fundamental way, then a more extensive approach should be considered.

Regardless of the approach taken, there should be a solid community consensus to support it. Our experience suggests that implementing a comprehensive and effective approach to short-term rentals will require a broad effort to form a community consensus and involve interested and/or affected property owners and community stakeholders on the scope and nature of the issue and the most appropriate response to deal with it.

As always, please let me know if there are further questions. When the City agrees upon a recommended approach, we would be happy to work with its legal counsel in drafting regulatory language, if desired.

MEMORANDUM

To: City of Lowell Planning Commission
Date: October 4, 2017
From: Andy Moore, AICP
RE: Zoning Ordinance Amendments

At the September planning commission meeting, it was requested that we suggest some additional sections of the zoning ordinance that need revisions. Based on the audit we prepared in 2016, we offer the following suggestions for zoning amendments for the Commission's consideration:

1. District Standards (Chapters 5-13, 16, and 16A). In all districts, the planning commission could review setbacks, lot coverage requirements, permitted and special land uses, and other requirements. As noted in the audit, the lot coverage standards are ambiguous and in some cases, unrealistic and overly restrictive. Further, there are occasional instances where we question required setbacks, particularly in older neighborhoods.
2. Parking. We completed a downtown parking study in 2015 for the DDA that examined if there was sufficient parking in the downtown area, but some of the suggestions from this study have not yet been implemented. The Planning Commission could review the parking standards (Chapter 19) to ensure they are sufficient for the City's needs. Further, the City could review parking requirements for all land uses, discuss parking lot construction standards, and related topics.
3. Signs. Although the sign chapter (Chapter 20) was comprehensively re-written in 2013, the City could review and update this chapter to eliminate content-based regulation, is was declared unconstitutional by the US Supreme Court. (*Reed v. Town of Gilbert, 2015*) This review would likely be limited in its scope to eliminate content-based regulations to ensure consistency with the Supreme Court's decision.
4. Administration and Enforcement (Chapter 22). This chapter could use some expansion to address topics such as performance guarantees, zoning permits, guidelines for evaluating rezoning requests, public hearing and notice procedures, and similar topics. These standards are generally simple to write and will not likely require significant involvement or editing from the planning commission.
5. Short term rentals. At the meeting of the committee of the whole on September 18, the Lowell City Council directed the planning commission to develop a zoning amendment to address short-term rentals as a special land use. This would likely the form of an

amendment to various district chapters along with regulatory standards added to Chapter 17. Among the topics the Planning Commission should discuss include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Minimum duration of stay
- b. Zoning district limitations
- c. Minimum lot area requirement
- d. Minimum floor area requirements
- e. Maximum number of guests
- f. Additional parking requirements

I look forward to discussing potential amendments with you at the next planning commission meeting. As always, please feel free to contact me if there are any questions.

2017

<u>Open Date</u>	<u>Close Date</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Name/Business</u>	<u>Subject</u>
08/22/2016	02/07/2017	128 S. Monroe	Granite Company	Addition
02/16/2016	01/13/2017	318 E. Main	Big Boiler	Brewery
01/12/2017	01/16/2017	2179 Gee Drive	John Baar	Finish Basement
01/19/2017	01/23/2017	1410 W. Main	John Curtis	Addition
01/26/2017	02/02/2017	1375 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
01/26/2017	02/02/2017	1353 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
01/24/2017	02/02/2017	315 Sherman	Adam Bassett	Fence
01/18/2017	02/02/2017	200 N. Monroe	Library	Deck
03/10/2017	03/10/2017	1224 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
03/10/2017	03/10/2017	1268 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
03/23/2017	03/23/2017	140 S. Broadway/149 S. Hudson	King Milling/Phase 1	MCC Building/ Dryer Foundation
04/20/2017	04/21/2017	12080 Gee Drive	Matt and Laura Garrison	Porch Addition
04/21/2017	04/25/2017	312 E. Main	Main St. Dev.	Demo - Garage
04/24/2017	04/24/2017	1376 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
04/24/2017	04/24/2017	1365 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
04/24/2017	04/24/2017	137 S. West	GH Improvements	Decks (2)/Fence
05/05/2017	05/08/2017	273 Donna	Donald Mullins	Shed
05/05/2017	05/08/2017	186 S. Pleasant	Melood Abugasea	Fence
04/26/2017	05/09/2017	305 High	Kelly St. John	Fence
05/10/2017	05/10/2017	2535 Gee Drive	Howard Barriger	Roof/Siding/Windows
05/10/2017	05/12/2017	925 N. Monroe	Joseph VandenBerg	Fence
05/11/2017	05/16/2017	937 Lincoln Lake	Don Kelly	Fence
05/03/2017	05/22/2017	2350 W. Main	Lake Mi Credit Union	New Construction
05/22/2017	05/23/2017	1335 W. Main Suite B	H&H Management	Remodel
06/08/2017	06/08/2017	109 Riverside	Jeff Altoft	Reroof

04/28/2017	06/12/2017	269 S. Broadway	LYFL	New Scoreboard
05/18/2017	06/13/2017	1347 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
06/01/2017	06/13/2017	1370 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
06/06/2017	06/19/2017	1238 Highland Hill	Keven Krieger	Deck
06/12/2017	06/20/2017	149 S. Hudson	King Milling	Restroom Renovation
06/16/2017	06/20/2017	704 Lafayette	George Watson	Reroof
06/26/2017	06/26/2017	618 Lincoln Lake	Bob & Elly Bassinger	Remodel
06/20/2017	06/30/2017	1359 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
06/20/2017	06/30/2017	1346 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
06/30/2017	06/30/2017	318 Lincoln Lake	Casmir Delnick	Fence
06/30/2017	06/30/2017	318 Lincoln Lake	Casmir Delnick	Deck Stairs
06/30/2017	06/30/2017	1364 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
06/29/2017	07/17/2017	1218 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
07/11/2017	07/18/2017	1352 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
07/18/2017	07/18/2017	431 James	Pat Murphy	Reroof
07/18/2017	07/18/2017	516 Howard	Marlene & Tracy Kroft	Shed
07/26/2017	07/26/2017	2535 Gee Drive	Howard Barriger	Remodel
07/19/2017	07/26/2017	1353 Highland Hill	Mark Elve	Deck
07/27/2017	07/27/2017	2186 W. Main	Todd Gillan	Reroof
08/02/2017	08/04/2017	505 W. Main	Mary Harrison	Remodel
07/31/2017	08/04/2017	John Steffens	John Steffens	Reroof
07/24/2017	08/04/2017	125 James	Sable Homes	New Home
07/24/2017	08/04/2017	113 James	Sable Homes	New Home
07/24/2017	08/04/2017	920 High	Sable Homes	New Home
07/18/2017	08/09/2017	1371 Highland Hill	Allen Edwin	New Home
08/16/2017	08/28/2017	1349 Jane Ellen	Jonathan Holmes	Demo/Garage
08/16/2017	08/28/2017	1349 Jane Ellen	Jonathan Holmes	Demo/Garage
07/31/2017	08/29/2017	209 North	Annette Belanger	Fence
09/01/2017	09/07/2017	340 Donna	Vivian Reid	Window expansion

08/30/2017	09/08/2017	1800 W. Main	Key Vista MHP	Fence
09/12/2017	09/13/2017	106 W. Main	Rookies	Front
09/12/2017	09/12/2017	818 Grindle	Donald Lafler	Steel Roof
09/21/2017	09/21/2017	113 Riverwalk Plaza	City of Lowell	Renovation
09/19/2017	09/25/2017	212 N. Broadway	Mike Hale	Front Porch
09/22/2017	09/25/2017	620 High	Marilyn Wert	Lean - Too
10/04/2017	10/04/2017	312 E. Main	Greg Canfield	Demo
10/06/2017	10/06/2017	1010 Grindle	Dan Nixon	Shed