

Village of Weston, Wisconsin
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLAN COMMISSION

held on Monday, October 14, 2019, at 6:00 p.m., in the Board Room, at the Municipal Center

AGENDA ITEMS.

- 1. Meeting called to order by Plan Commission Chair & Trustee Mark Maloney.**
- 2. Meeting called to order by Extraterritorial Zoning (ETZ) Committee Chair Loren White.**
- 3. Roll Call of Village Plan Commission by Secretary Parker.**

Roll call indicated 6 Plan Commission members present.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Present</u>
Maloney, Mark	YES
Sparks, Wally	YES
Gau, Duane	YES - Arrived Late
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Jordan, Joe	NO
Meinel, Steve	YES
White, Loren	YES

- 4. Roll Call of Joint Village & Town ETZ Committee by Secretary Parker.**

Roll call indicated 5 Plan Commission members present.

<u>Member</u>	<u>Present</u>
White, Loren	YES
Hull, Mark	YES
Christiansen, Randy	YES
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Meinel, Steve	YES
Olson, Milt	NO

Village Staff in attendance: Donner, Higgins, Wehner, Wodalski, Tatro, Maguire, and Parker.

There were about 9 people in the audience.

- 5. Approval of minutes from the September 16, 2019 – Regular PC and ETZ meeting**

Motion by Guerndt, second by Meinel: to approve the August 12, 2019, Regular PC Meeting minutes.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 2 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Maloney, Mark	YES
Sparks, Wally	YES
Gau, Duane	---
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Jordan, Joe	---
Meinel, Steve	YES
White, Loren	YES

Motion by Meinel, second by Hull: to approve the August 12, 2019, Regular ETZ Meeting minutes.

Yes Vote: 5 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
White, Loren	YES
Hull, Mark	YES
Christiansen, Randy	YES
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Meinel, Steve	YES
Olson, Milt	---

COMMUNICATIONS

6. Opportunity for citizens to be heard.

None.

7. Written communications received.

None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

8. Public Hearing – Project #20191337 – David Junion request to rezone approximately 31 acres at 228297 Camp Phillips Road in the Town of Weston within the Extraterritorial Zoning Jurisdiction of the Village from RR-5 (Rural Residential – 5 Acre) to RM (Rural Mixed) and grant a Conditional Use Permit to allow for an Artisan Studio, within the RM (Rural Mixed) District. (ETZ) – Deferred from September 9, 2019 Meeting – Withdrawn by Applicant.

White confirmed applicant withdrew his application. Higgins stated just a reference for ETZ. The applicant will be coming back with a Conditional Use permit.

9. Unfinished Business – Discussion and possible recommendation to the BOT on the petition to vacate an unimproved portion of the Dominika Street right-of-way laying south of Mary Lane.

Joe Muzynoski, 5803 Mary Lane, was present and read a letter (attached) that summarized this issue.

Donner pointed out he has met with and had discussions with Muzynoski about this. Donner pointed out how we brought this issue up with our attorney, and our attorney suggested Muzynoski find us a resolution that would involve acquiring the property on the west side from his neighbor to move the lot line and narrow the ROW to 60 feet. This suggestion came after this was first heard by Plan Commission, and Plan Commission did not feel it would be in the Village's best interest to vacate the right-of-way entirely, that it should be maintained for Village purposes. Donner stated recently, a potential developer approached staff about the land to the south, and during our discussions it was realized that the two outlots that are on the far sides, the east and the west, of the Wandering Springs Plat, have notation that states the outlots shown here are reserved for possible street extensions. Donner then pointed out an article, included in the packet, from Claire Silverman, of the League of WI Municipalities, that talks about what constitutes a dedication of right-of-way. Donner stated we have since shared what we have found with the attorney, and he believes those outlots would be considered dedications. Donner stated the question on the developer's note on the plat is whether those were in fact explicit dedications. Donner stated both of these outlots remain in the ownership of the original developer, Stan Budleski (who constructed Muzynoski's house). Donner stated there have been no taxes paid on the eastern outlot, off of Old Costa Lane, since the plat was adopted; however, the taxes have been paid on the outlot to the west. The west 33-feet of the west outlot has been connected to a lot now owned by Joe Buska. Donner stated he met with Budleski (present in the audience) today. Donner stated from his discussion with Budleski, it seems Budleski's perspective is that those two outlots were intended to be dedicated. Donner stated staff can do some additional follow-up with the two parties (Budleski & Buska) involved to see if we can make sure we have those two accesses. Currently, we cannot recommend vacating the right-of-way for Muzynoski because this has not been resolved yet.

Meinel questioned how it was possible for Buska to acquire that 33 feet? Higgins stated she believes it was from a deed transfer through Marathon County Register of Deeds that did not come through as a CSM (as it is supposed to be). Higgins gave some background on how Buska's overall lot was created from Mitch King. She stated we have had issues in the past where people have combined or reconfigured properties via a deed through Marathon County Register of Deeds.

Meinel confirmed that Buska would have to sell that 33 feet he got by mistake. Higgins stated we have not talked to him yet. Donner stated Budleski's perspective is those are to be dedicated to right-of-way. Donner stated the taxes need to be paid for the eastern outlot and discussions have to be made with Buska.

Meinel confirmed if two outlots were to come in, with Buska selling the 33 feet, the length of road would be 1,200 feet in length, and pointed out our Subdivision Ordinance only allows a maximum length for a block to be 800 feet. Donner stated in keeping in the letter of the code the road length, that right-of-way (west of Muzynoski) could be a pedestrian path, amounting to a partial vacation. Higgins stated when vacating in the past, we typically leave as an easement for sewer & water.

Maloney questioned with Option 3 in the Staff Report, would his driveway need to be altered, and if there would be enough room for a walking path. Donner stated it would be determined at the time of subdivision development through a survey.

Meinel questioned if we just maintain the easement for utilities, Muzynoski would have a conforming lot then. Meinel confirmed we would just need to get the two outlots transferred. Donner stated the building permit will meet setbacks.

Duane Gau arrived at 6:20 p.m.

Donner stated the petition to vacate would be through the Village Board. Maloney feels we should try to figure out the east and west accesses first.

Meinel feels if we can tie up the two outlots, he would be okay with vacating and deeding over, but retaining the utility easement. Guerndt questioned whose expense on driveway when utilities come through. Donner stated this would need to be negotiated and feels if a path goes in, this would be the opportunity to move the driveway over. Meinel questioned if a path is needed. Donner stated paths make neighborhoods more desirable.

Guerndt questioned if we need an access in the middle, if we can have those connections points on the east and west ends. Donner stated if we could get those two access points tied up and confirmed, it would be accessible to not pursue the street connection in the middle.

White stated we would have to modify our ordinance on the block lengths allowed. He feels we should not deed anything until we know for sure the other points will work, and then we need to modify our ordinance.

Meinel confirmed Budleski's intention is not to retain that outlot.

Guerndt questioned if we feel the Mary Lane extension would ever happen. Guerndt stated we could negotiate swapping of land. Higgins stated she felt the King's would want to keep the Mary Lane access. Donner stated the utility service could be a negotiation point to Buska. Wodalski stated watermain stubbed west of there, and sewer has a dead-end manhole at the property line.

Meinel questioned if we could table this for now. Higgins stated they can defer. The board will need to eventually act on the vacation but we didn't want to bring it to them the way things currently are as they would have to deny. Meinel confirmed that staff will work towards resolving the two outlots. Higgins stated she has

to look into the process the County would require for those outlots to be dedicated. She believes it can be done through a resolution through the Board.

Maloney questioned who drew the concept map for the subdivision to the south. Wodalski & Wehner indicated that they did, but developers and Mitch King have looked into this too and have similar layouts. Maloney questioned Tatro & Maguire if this, the home being built at the incorrect setbacks, is something that could happen again today. Tatro stated it is possible, but most likely would not as they verify setbacks in the field.

Motion by Meinel, second by Sparks: to defer this request. Q: White questioned the timeline for this deferral. Meinel stated just to have staff move along with the two outlots getting dedeed. Sparks agreed and feels if we can get those two access points locked up, it will give us room to work with. Meinel offered to contact Buska. Gau reminded that we will have to revise the subdivision ordinance. Motion passed.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Maloney, Mark	YES
Sparks, Wally	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Jordan, Joe	---
Meinel, Steve	YES
White, Loren	YES

Higgins stated staff will keep Muzynoski updated.

REVIEW OF REZONING & CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT PETITIONS

10. Public Hearing – Project #20191342 SC Swiderski Land Compancy, LLC, request to rezone a 2-acre parcel (PIN 192-2808-154-0979) of land in the Village from SF-L (Single-Family Residential – Large Lot) with WHP-B (Wellhead Protection – Zone B) Overlay District to MF (Multiple Family Residential) with WHP-B Wellhead Protection – Zone B) Overlay District (PC)

a. Open PC Public Hearing.

Maloney opened the public hearing at 6:35 p.m.

b. Presentation by Applicant.

Higgins stated they are asking for a rezone of this parcel from SF-L to MF. The Single-family home is existing, and they have no plans to incorporate this parcel into the development to the east. They may sell as a single-family home later.

c. Public Hearing/Public Comment Period.

No one present.

d. Close Public Hearing.

Maloney closed the public hearing at 6:37 p.m.

e. Discussion by PC Members.

White commented we all knew this was going to come. Higgins explained how she forwarded a housing research study recently. The study in the packet shows some of our zoning practices are hindering the developers with our lack of multi-family zoned property available and everyone wanting a ½ acre lot. White stated he lives next to multi-family, and is fine with what surrounds him, as he has just as much issues with single-family neighbors as he has with his multi-family neighbors.

f. Recommendation from Staff.

Staff recommends approval.

g. Action and Recommendation to the BOT by Plan Commission.

Motion by White, second by Gau: to approve the rezone request for Project #20191342.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Maloney, Mark	YES
Sparks, Wally	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Jordan, Joe	---
Meinel, Steve	YES
White, Loren	YES

11. Public Hearing – Project #2191348 – Riverside Land Surveying request to rezone 14,899 sq. ft. of 6303 Von Kanel Street (PIN 192-2808-211-0951) from SF-L (Single-Family Residential – Large Lot) with WHP-B (Wellhead Protection – Zone B) Overlay District to SF-S (Single-Family Residential – Small Lot) with WHP-B (Wellhead Protection – Zone B) Overlay District.

h. Open PC Public Hearing.

Maloney opened the public hearing at 6:41 p.m.

i. Presentation by Applicant.

Chris King-Wilcoz was present and explained she is buying that piece of land to add to their property.

j. Public Hearing/Public Comment Period.

None.

k. Close Public Hearing.

Maloney closed the public hearing at 6:42 p.m.

l. Discussion by PC Members.

None.

m. Recommendation from Staff.

Staff recommends approval.

n. Action and Recommendation to the BOT by Plan Commission.

Motion by Guerndt, second by Meinel: to approve the rezone request for Project #20191348.

Yes Vote: 6 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Maloney, Mark	YES
Sparks, Wally	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Guerndt, Gary	YES

Jordan, Joe	---
Meinel, Steve	YES
White, Loren	YES

Higgins stated will go to the Board of Trustees meeting on Monday.

NEW BUSINESS

12. Discussion and action on request to construct a new detached accessory structure (for residential use) between the principal building and the street right-of-way at 227011 Clearview Drive, per Section 94.4.09(2)10 (ETZ).

Maguire stated this request is to build an accessory structure for this lawn tractor, but to be located in front of the house. He stated the colors will match the house.

White confirmed this is the size building he wants (not bigger).

Maguire explained the setbacks and what was originally shown on the plan.

Maloney questioned why not just being issued a permit by staff. Higgins stated because the garage is being located in front of the house. This review is required by the ETZ Zoning Code. Prior to changes in the Code, this would have required a conditional use permit but now just needs ETZ approval.

Christiansen stated he has no issues, and this is no different than other town properties.

Hull pointed out north of this lot is Renee Radcliffe's property, and how she built her home up over the hill with farm structures in between. There is still a need to show the lot line from the structure to the north, to be sure there is the 15 feet setback. He is concerned they will not meet the setback on the (north) interior side property line. Hull pointed out how ETZ would be approving this based on an approved site plan of what's being built.

Hull brought up the Muzynoski issue that came before us tonight, and how this could turn into the very same thing. He is nervous with not having a to-scale drawing. Hull stated he has no issues with the location of the structure, just nervous about not having the exact lines and having some guarantees on where this building will be placed. Hull stated if he approves this tonight, it will be with a contingency of building dimensions shown along with actual setbacks, that staff signs off on, stated they looked at this, and it meets setbacks. Hull stated the north line needs to be greater than 15 feet; they should stick with the 60 feet to the front line (as being represented in the drawing); and having a site plan that staff approves before the permit goes out.

Meinel agrees with Hull, that we should have a better handle on this, as to him this is a "napkin" drawing. White also agrees with Hull. Higgins clarified ETZ is basically approving their being allowed to place this structure in the front yard, and then the building inspectors will get the proper plans submitted before the permit is issued.

Motion by Hull, second by Meinel: to approve the building permit application to construct the accessory structure as proposed by the applicant at 227011 Clearview Drive, contingent on a site plan to scale, that shows a setback of at least 15 feet to the north property line and at least 60 feet to the right-of-way. Q: Christiansen question the finished floor elevation and if there are any requirements on that. Tatro and Maguire both confirmed there is not a requirement on the finished floor elevation for an accessory structure. Christiansen stated that the water runoff does drain in that direction. Christiansen stated he is concerned if we get similar rain this coming March as this past spring, where the ground is still frozen, and then all of a sudden it becomes a municipal problem. He stated if the builder follows the lay of the land there, it will be too low and water will run through it. Tatro stated that typically when they pour the slab, they will berm the ground up first to keep the drainage away from it, and probably will be swaled behind or in front. Wodalski stated looking at the contours it

appears everything slopes to the front. Guerndt questioned if we want to add the drainage concern in on the motion. Hull stated if there is not a requirement, he is not sure how we can add that. It was stated as long as this is verbalized to the contractor and owner. Guerndt pointed out how Christiansen does not want to get that call 6 months or a year from now how there was nothing in writing stating the drainage needs to be planned to go away from the building. Hull stated staff will have to relay this to them. Christiansen stated ultimately it will be the contractor and owner's problem. Tatro pointed out the proper motion here is to approve or not approve the location. Motion carried.

Yes Vote: 5 No Votes: 0 Abstain: 0 Not Voting: 1 Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
White, Loren	YES
Hull, Mark	YES
Christiansen, Randy	YES
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Meinel, Steve	YES
Olson, Milt	---

13. Presentation by North Central Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (NCWRPC) on Housing Study (NCWRPC).

Dennis Lawrence and Carrie Edmondson, of NCWRPC, were present to give a presentation on the Weston Housing Assessment Report (Housing Study).

Lawrence stated that Act 243 requires all municipalities with a population of 10,000 or more to do a Housing Assessment Report. He stated there is also a Fee Report, but that is basically just to be sure the fees being assessed related to the land use regulations are online and posted. Lawrence stated this housing assessment report looks at a variety of trends over the last several years and doing a projection for the future by looking at what the current demands are and future demands are. He stated this report shows many different statistics and demographics, then gets into the review of the development process (and possibility of streamlining it) that the Village goes through, cost of housing and affordability issues, and housing stock.

Edmondson then went through the report (included in the packet) explaining the statistics given.

White stated that people who own rental property are pretty happy, as they are not having a hard time filling their units. Guerndt stated this also indicates that there is still room for growth. Guerndt commented on when the Village was not allowing any more multi-family. Higgins stated that is probably part of where we are at now, but there has been a shift and the board has been more open to multi-family. Higgins explained a meeting Donner and ED Coordinator Chartrand had recently with Mark Matthiae, of Crystal Finishing, and how Matthiae is having a hard time finding housing for his workers. Guerndt commented on how Abbyland Foods is building their own housing for their employees.

Lawrence stated Weston is uniquely situated, being a fairly new village with a lot of new housing stock. He questioned with regard to the development process side, if PC is hearing from the developers any issues, such as too long to get subdivision approved, rules being hard to understand, or fees being too high, etc.

Sparks those issues are things we have been discussing for the past year, and are trying to streamline the process and reach out to developers and promote things that have been changed. White commented on the report from WRA. Guerndt commented on the costs to develop.

White commented this report discusses an appeals process that goes to the State not the Municipality. Lawrence stated if municipalities can streamline the process then the developers will be less likely to go to the State.

Higgins stated the subdivision ordinance is something that will need to be updated based on Act 243, which will come to the Plan Commission. She stated we had to do a park facilities needs assessment for parkland dedication fees. She stated staff met on this last Friday with Mark Roffers and in next few months will have something to bring before Plan Commission and Parks & Recreation Committee. Higgins pointed out that staff typically meets with a potential developer ahead of their application to work with them on what is required. Guerndt stated he was happy with the quick review on his subdivision, his only issue was the requirements and the expense. Maloney confirmed Guerndt is referring to the Parkland Dedication Fee. Maloney questioned if Parks are being utilized anymore? Higgins stated the need for parks is the quality of life issue that we are hearing about from some of the business owners. Their workers want amenities, such as parks, close to where they live. Higgins clarified that the Parkland Dedication Fees collected are to be used only to purchase park land, not for maintenance or anything like that. Donner commented how he has heard people talking about their children wanting to go to parks in other communities because we do not have enough parks and park amenities that appeal to them.

Donner pointed out through his discussions with Matthiae, that to bring people here, they need things to do. Donner stated Matthiae also commented to him how employees do not want to drive any further than 12 or 15 miles.

Lawrence stated he will be back in December with the final draft of the Study.

14. Discussion on future process for providing feedback on permits and site plans.

Sparks stated he requested this topic be placed on the agenda, based on feedback he has received. He would like to see more two-way communication when it comes to contacting applicants on their permits. If there is an issue with a permit, he would like staff to first place a phone call explaining the issue to the applicant, prior to sending the e-mail, which could then document the discussion.

Higgins stated we typically bring the contractor or project manager in to discuss the project. We have found issues come up when the owner inadvertently gets copied in on the e-mails, as they are not typically part of the submittal/review process and therefore have no idea what the emails mean. Guerndt stated he feels the process can be confusing. Higgins stated if something is confusing the applicant should ask for clarification.

Guerndt stated he has heard some positive things from contractors lately. Higgins stated how she used to write up the review letter based on everyone's comments to her, but now with Evolve, each person is responsible to add their own comments in before the review letter is sent out.

Roman commented with the Clearview Drive submittal, how he tried calling the contractor three times. Because we did not want to delay this particular project, we chose to keep it on the agenda hoping to receive contact from the contractor. The contractor did finally contact him, and they were able to sit down and discuss the plans this morning. Maguire stated we are working with people on the issues we come across.

Higgins stated sometimes, like the Clearview garage situation, we have issues with getting correct plans from the contractors. Donner stated there are also cases where we do not have phone numbers, where e-mail is the only contact information we have.

STAFF REPORTS

15. Acknowledge Report re: September 2019 Staff-Approved Certified Survey Maps and Site Plans.

16. Acknowledge Report re: September 2019 Building Permits.

17. Acknowledge Report re: September 2019 New Business Occupancy Permit Issuance.

Motion by White, second by Gau: to acknowledge Reports #15, 16, & 17.

Yes Vote: 6

No Votes: 0

Abstain: 0

Not Voting: 1

Result: PASS

<u>Member</u>	<u>Voting</u>
Maloney, Mark	YES
Sparks, Wally	YES
Gau, Duane	YES
Guerndt, Gary	YES
Jordan, Joe	---
Meinel, Steve	YES
White, Loren	YES

18. Update on 2019-2020 projects/tasks for Plan Commission.

Higgins stated this is just a standard monthly update.

MISCELLANEOUS

19. Next meeting date

a. Monday, November 11, 2019 @ 6pm – Regular Meeting.

20. Future Meeting Topics

a. Continued discussion of needed amendments to Chapter 94 Zoning.

b. Unfinished Business – Discussion and Action on Planning & Development Department Draft Customer Service Survey

21. Remarks from Staff, Committee, and Commission Members.

None.

ADJOURNMENT

22. Adjournment of ETZ.

Motion by Guerndt, Second by Meinel to adjourn at 7:36 p.m.

23. Adjournment of PC.

Motion by Sparks, Second by Meinel to adjourn at 7:36 p.m.

Mark Maloney, Plan Commission Chair & Village Trustee

Jennifer Higgins, Director of Planning & Development

Valerie Parker, Recording Secretary

Hello, My name is Joe Muzynoski. My wife Laurie and I own the home at 5803 Mary Lane which is the address affected in this issue. I would like to give you all a short summary of why we decided to file a petition to vacate the southern extension of Dominika Street.

This home was built in 2005 by Budleski Builders. A little over a year ago we decided that it was time to downsize. After contacting a real estate agent, he pulled up a map showing a satellite picture of our home with an overlay of the lot lines. We hadn't seen these images before and were shocked to see that our home had been built without proper setback guidelines to the Dominika Street extension on the west side of the house. In fact, our home is sitting only 3.5 feet away from the lot line which puts nearly our entire driveway onto this right of way.

We have been trying to find a solution for over a year now with no success. All I have heard is that it is my problem is somehow our fault. It seems that everyone wants to pass the buck and hope this problem magically goes away. I have talked with the builder and he doesn't know how this could have happened.

It was proposed that I try to buy land from my neighbor to the west so that a potential new road could be shifted a few feet in that direction. This idea will not work because my neighbor to the west is not interested in selling any of his property. Even if he would, this plan would only give our home a 20 foot setback on the driveway side, which is usually considered the front of the home. A typical parking space is 20 feet.

We have spoken with three different lawyers to discuss our legal options. We are told that there are options we could take, but to be prepared for a very long court battle which could even take years to settle.

The lot is simply not big enough for the home to be built on, and permits should never have been issued in the first place. With timely inspections, there were many opportunities for this error to be caught and construction halted. This simply did not happen.

When buying a home, one puts faith in the professionals to be sure permits and laws are followed, and then you have the assurance that if mistakes are made, the municipality has inspectors whose job it is to check and correct these types of errors before an unsuspecting buyer purchases a home that is in noncompliance.

Without placing blame on anyone at this time, the fact is that even in this era of planning and zoning, checks and cross checks, mistakes are still made. When they are, those who have the authority, need to correct them so innocent people are protected.

We have been counting on the equity we have earned all these years to be able to afford to downsize, but now, while we are still expected to pay full value in property taxes, this problem greatly devalues our home, and in fact, makes it unsellable.

We decided to petition for vacating the Dominika Street right of way because we felt it can be a viable solution to this problem. This currently unimproved extension to Dominika Street had been put into the design of this neighborhood in the event that it possibly would be needed someday for access to the south. However, should the area to the south ever be developed, there are two other main access roads planned for southern access. Old Costa road on the east end, and Municipal street on the west end.

The area to the south consists of about 33 acres, much of which consists of wetland. There are suitable building sites for at most a few dozen homes, which lends one to believe that the main arteries on the east and west ends, would adequately serve this potential subdivision.

If this unimproved extension to Dominika Street is vacated, then half of it would go to 5803 Mary Lane (my address) and half would go to my neighbor to the west. My neighbor has indicated in a letter to the village that while he has no interest in selling any of his existing property, he would be willing to forfeit any portion of his half that is currently being used for my driveway.

It has been 16 months now since this issue was discovered, it has been on the agenda of these meetings twice before with no clear solution. You all have the power to make this problem go away and move on with the stroke of a pen. We hope that you will decide that Old Costa Street on the east and Municipal street, 300 yards to the west are sufficient, and to vacate this right of way in the middle. This would allow our driveway and home to remain unchanged.

If you plan to vote against vacating this right of way, please don't do so without offering a solution that you would feel is fair if this were your home. Thank you.