

**Board of Zoning Appeals
January 9, 2018
City Hall Council Chambers 5:15 p.m.**

The Board of Zoning Appeals met in City Hall Council Chambers on January 9, 2018 with the following Board members present: Josh Lonon, Jim Badger, Ryan Gaylord, Reed Teague, and Anne Poliakoff. Absent Board members: Don Bramblett and Leana Melnichuk. Representing the Planning Department: Natalia Rosario, Planner III, and Julie Roland, Administration Assistant. Buddy Bush City Building Official also attended.

Roll Call

Mr. Lonon called the meeting to order and said according to the Freedom of Information Act, notice of this meeting has been posted and provided to the media 24 hours in advance as is required. Let the record show that there are five Board Members present, two are absent. Therefore, we do have a quorum and can proceed with business of this body.

Mr. Teague moved approval of tonight's agenda, and he was seconded by Mr. Gaylord. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Disposition of the November 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes and the August 8, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Mr. Gaylord moved the November 14, 2017 minutes be approved as presented; and was seconded by Mr. Teague. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Mr. Gaylord moved the August 8, 2017 minutes be approved as presented; and he was seconded by Ms. Poliakoff. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Old Business

VAR 17-02-06 Variance Request from Leo Cadiz, Property Owner. The applicant is asking for permission for a recently constructed covered patio and small accessory structure to encroach 4.5' into the rear and side property lines. The property is located at 4 Grey Court and is further identified as Parcel 028.00 on Spartanburg County Tax Map Sheet 7-12-12.

Mr. Lonon said at this time, we are going to entertain a variance request which is VAR 17-02-06 from Leo Cadiz property owner. Now this is a matter which was tabled at the previous meeting. So, I believe we need a motion to remove this from the table to be heard today.

Mr. Gaylord moved to un-table this matter so we may review it, and he was seconded by Ms. Poliakoff. The motion was approved by a vote of 5 to 0.

Mr. Lonon said so we will now hear the applicant. This applicant is asking for permission for a recently constructed covered patio and small accessory structure to encroach 4.5 feet into the rear inside property lines. The property is located at Grey Court and is further identified as parcel 028.00 on Spartanburg County tax map sheet 7-12-12. I'll make one note, there are two Board members here who were not here at the previous meeting. So, for our benefit, we're going to start from scratch today. We want everyone to present their information as if the Board has not already heard it. And we'll consider it from there. So, Ms. Rosario. Please state your name for the record.

My name is Natalia Rosario. I am the City Planner for the City of Spartanburg, and she was sworn.

Ms. Rosario said you had an excellent introduction, you covered the basics. So, all I'm going to do right now is enter into the record as Exhibit A, the packet you received on the case last week as well as the additional renderings and photographs that Mr. Cadiz provided yesterday.

Mr. Lonon said is there any opposition to introducing that into the record. No opposition. We will include that as Exhibit A in the record.

Ms. Rosario said Mr. Cadiz and his contractor are here and they have additional information that the staff will provide in their recommendation.

Mr. Lonon said okay, thank you. Mr. Leo Cadiz, could you please come forward and state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Leo Cadiz of Grey Court, Spartanburg, came forward and was sworn.

Mr. Lonon said please proceed. So, we'll now hear your application. If you want to go ahead and explain to us the basis for your variance request.

Mr. Cadiz said basically at the last meeting I wish I had brought my neighbors with me because I did mention that I was going to build a patio but the contractor called, so we have to come in here and apply for a variance. But this time I just provided more complete drawings of what this will look like. So, the idea of this patio basically gives me a little bit more outdoor space to work with. But at the same time, I thought it would be the best place to create this structure, which is the area of the end of the driveway. And it's really more of a safety issue too, because there's a lot of trees in that area. And sometimes big limbs fall really big ones, and slightly damaged the roof, but that's part of the reason why I created that. But not to park my car there, have it more like a work area, entertainment. And at the same time the storage because we thought that would be the best place for it. We didn't have any other good location to put it on the property, considering it's a small size lawn. I think my neighbors are here to support me and I don't think they have anything negative to say on what I've been doing with this property since I moved there in April.

Board Questions for applicant

Mr. Gaylord asked Mr. Cadiz with the prior meeting, we discussed and asked if there will be other proposals, other variations on what has been designed that may be considered and presented. Have any other variations been considered.

Mr. Cadiz said not at this point. I mean. We've thought about it, but I wanted to come in here with the same idea believing that this structure really isn't ruining the neighbors existing property. And I mean, if it comes down to that, we have to do something different. But at this time, the only thing I have is to show you is what the structure will look like. And having my neighbors back me up.

Mr. Lonon said Mr. Cadiz you may be aware of this, especially already having a hearing before this one. But we're very restricted as a Board, in my opinion, as to what we can do. So, we operate under a State Statue and an Ordinance that requires that we can only grant a variance if we find that five conditions are met. And I believe that those five conditions were in your application; they are: 1.) There exist extraordinary and exceptional conditions pertaining to a particular piece of property, that conditions do not generally apply to other properties in the

vicinity; 2.) The application of the ordinance to the particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property; 3.) The authorization of a variance will not be of substantial detriment to adjacent property or to the public good; 4.) The character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance; and 5.) Orientation and spacing of improvements or structures can also be considered.

Do you have any information that you want to present to us as to those factors so that we can consider whether or not your application meets those requirements.

Mr. Cadiz said I really didn't get what you're trying to explain to me there.

Mr. Lonon asked do you have a copy of your application.

Mr. Cadiz said yeah.

Mr. Lonon said sure if you can look at the application, on the last page of the application, you see there are five underlying conditions. So, what I was explaining to you is, our hands are tied by Statute and by Ordinance. We can only grant a variance if these conditions are met. So, what I'm asking you is, do you have any information to present to this Board that these conditions are met so that we can consider that and whether or not we should grant the variance.

Mr. Cadiz [inaudible] can I get-

Mr. Lonon said well, I will say that the application is to be limited to five minutes. So, I think those five minutes have passed. So why don't we hear from the City and let them speak to the applicant and we'll go from there. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Cadiz. So, we'll now hear from the City, Ms. Rosario.

Ms. Rosario said she would show slides as she gave the rest of the presentation. As far as staff's recommendation and answer to those five extraordinary and exceptional conditions to the property, the first which is actually "extraordinary and exceptional conditions," the property at 4 Grey Court which is outlined here, is substantially a smaller parcel than the already generally small parcels found in Converse Heights. It already has upon it two structures and a brick patio in between those two structures, and there is little space for the addition of a patio that does not remove green space from the property. So, this is the rear studio, this is the main home, this is the brick patio and the grass area here. There are trees and plants. And this right here is where the structure in question is located. So unlike parcels for the report, this is a little bit zoomed in and I should have made clearer pictures of the parcels nearby. As far as the "conditions not generally applying to other properties in the vicinity." They do not generally apply specifically in terms of size and usable area. As you can see in a slide of a near-by property this home has lots of wall and a small amount of yard space, they still have more than 4 Grey Court does. "The application of the ordinance of that particular piece of property would effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property," and in staff's opinion, the application of the ordinance to this piece of property does not effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property as a residence. The other option that Mr. Cadiz has is to remove what he has already built and either build a smaller patio five feet away from his property lines, and to move the storage building elsewhere on the yard. "So, for the authorization of the variance will not be a substantial detriment to adjacent property, or to the public good and the character of the district will not be harmed by the granting of the variance." In staff's opinion, the granting of the variance will not be of substantial detriment to the adjacent properties either from a functional or aesthetic point of view. The ordinance calls for a five-foot setback for accessory structures and if

Mr. Cadiz chooses he can remove a part of the roof that extends to the property line, leaving a part of the patio exposed and little longer, technically a structure per the Zoning and Building standards. Mr. Buddy Bush, Building Official, is here. He can speak more to the building standards on this case. "The orientation and spacing of improvements of structures." Staff feels that the orientation and building of the patio suits the character of the district, and the storage building is attractive and relatively innocuous in its current location. Permitting of the structure by the Building Department is dependent on the Board's permission to maintain that in that location. So, they haven't been permitted yet, but if the Board was to approve this variance then they would need to meet all applicable building standards. That being said, in terms of Converse Heights, most of the lot lines are very tight. And again, staff's opinion, five-foot distance is somewhat of a retrofitting of zoning onto an existing neighborhood that has these kinds of characteristics. Therefore, staff recommends the Board free to approve the request as presented. And I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Lonon said so Ms. Rosario, I've noted in the application that even though staff is recommending that the Board approve the request, that number three in the factors that we should consider that the City readily admits that this application does not meet that required finding. It says the application to the ordinance to this piece of property does not effectively prohibit or unreasonable restrict the utilization of properties or residents. So, are we to disregard that factor or what.

Ms. Rosario said no, I leave that to the Board to assess and I guess just it would be up to you all to weigh that with all the other facts of the case and what staff has presented. I do think that this would allow Mr. Cadiz additional utilization of his property, but it doesn't restrict the main use of the property as a residence. She said the renderings she presented tonight were new. Both the renderings and the additional photographs are new. I believe what Mr. Cadiz has shown is a Hardie plank siding. And so that is to add to the fire rating that's required by the Building Department. And Mr. Bush can provide the details on exactly what would need to be done or what is acceptable.

Ms. Poliakoff said I'll just comment that I think this does enhance our ability to look at what the final product is going to be if they get the building application and they get this approved. And this is as I recall, basically, we asked for more clarification, and I think this just helps a lot I think to see the final product.

Mr. Lonon said Ms. Rosario, did you say Mr. Bush was here to provide information; I think now would be the proper time for that.

Mr. Buddy Bush, Building Official for the City of Spartanburg was sworn.

Mr. Bush said Thank you. Well; basically from a Building Code standpoint, we've talked about this before in the same Board, anything less than five feet, you end up having to fire rate the exterior wall closest to the property line as far as the property line, I mean both sides of the wall. So, the code I was reading it while you folks were talking; this is considered a structure. And either it could be a carport, for instance, it's not regardless if it were a carport, or any type of structure, it's got to make that fire way. And obviously it's attached to the house as well. So, it could obviously, if you had a fire, it could catch the house on fire as well, possibly, who knows. But point being anything within five feet, you've got fire way at the wall, and are limited on the amount of openings on that exterior wall as well. If you're within three feet, you can't have any openings. If you're three feet or five feet you can have 25% openings, that allows it but

everything else has to be one hour fire rating. So, and the overhang likewise, anything on the overhang within two feet, or three feet or five feet, you have to one hour fire rating. So, like the little piece of overhang that juts out there, you would have to fire rate that portion as well. So, anything within five feet, you're kind of stuck with having a fire rating. The only way you get out of it push it back five feet. Maybe just a smidge past five feet. There's no exception. He might take it to the Board to seek a variance, but to be honest with you, it's pretty black and white. I don't think the Construction Board would be agreeable to alter that, because you've got fire way there, whatever it might be.

Mr. Lonon said so this structure as it would be completed, would be fire safe or not.

Mr. Bush said no. Presently where it's located now, is within half a foot, to my understanding. So no, this is not correct at all. You'd have to build that exterior wall at one hour fire rated materials. And about the only material you can use is something non-combustible like concrete block, you could use wood stud or fire rated sheet rock on either side, or even maybe Hardie Plank is a cementitious type product that I would allow outside of the wood stud. On the inside, you'd have to put fire rated sheet rock, which is a mix. Everybody uses sheet rock or dry wall is pretty much fire rated, that fire rated sheet rock doesn't cost a lot more. But the overhead light again, I said it would it would likewise have to be one hour fire rated. So, anything within five feet, you're kind of stuck with that situation.

Mr. Lonon said so even if we were to grant the variance, there's still may be an issue as it's designed.

Mr. Bush said yeah. He would not end up with that view right there. He wouldn't be able to do that. That wouldn't happen. And once you get past that wall, you know everything 180 or 90 degrees to that, I don't worry about and who doesn't worry about, the front and the back, because you're 90 degrees to the property. If you're at 45 or something like that they'd be considerable not this way. The fire load is invisible, and what's inside.

Mr. Lonon asked why are we here today after construction has already occurred.

Mr. Bush said because the work was begun without a variance, and he put a stop work order on the work as an option. His first step would be going here to this Board. Having said that, I mean, even if it got the variance, he would have to do what we asked him to do per the code. So, if you did run it, he could do it, hopefully that to fire rate it, it wouldn't look like that on this side of the wall.

Mr. Lonon asked so more to the point was a permit pulled before construction.

Mr. Bush said no.

Mr. Lonon said again.

Mr. Bush said there had not been a permit pulled. We'll have to deal with that. This gentleman has to be a Licensed Residential Builder to do the job. So, all those things have to be done. This was a sort of a claim to allow him to seek this before he... I mean, we could have said to have it demolished. But we're trying to give him an opportunity to go through the steps.

Mr. Lonon said right. Anything further for Mr. Bush.

Board Questions for Mr. Bush

Mr. Gaylord said Mr. Bush to make sure I understand clearly, you mentioned that in the fire rated area that there were limitations on gaps, or spaces or openings.

Mr. Bush said openings. Yeah, the code is kind of funny, but the code allows if you get three foot away from that property line. Let me grab my book because I want to explain correctly.

Mr. Lonon asked Mr. Bush while he was getting his book, if I might add to that; so, the openings that we currently see in this plan that avert, basically the property line would not be allowed to exist.

Mr. Bush explained you could actually have...it says openings and walls, if he were to pull it back three feet, that's only if he were to pull it back three feet, you could have 25% of that wall area. Yeah, the property line side. You could have 25%. You got 25% of that whole wall area open if it were pushed back three feet. But that's if you were three feet back from the property line. If use four to five feet, half a foot, you can't do it. You'd have no openings. So, the curb makes it less restrictive, obviously, the farther you get away from that property line. I mean, it's straight up table here. It's based on five studies. So yeah, you would not end up with that, it would be totally covered, I mean the little overhead would be fire rated as well.

Mr. Lonon said anything further for Mr. Bush. Thank you, Mr. Bush. Anything further from the City. Okay. Having heard from the applicant and from the City, we will now open the matter up for the public hearing. So, this will be a time for anyone who is for or against the variance request to come and speak before the Board and state your reasons. To start, I will ask for anyone who is for the variance requests to please come forward. We'll take one at a time, obviously. So, if there's anyone here who would like to speak. Yes sir. Please come forward.

My name is Allan Foreman.

Mr. Lonon said okay I will not need to swear you in.

Alan Foreman came forward and said I am actually the one who helped Leo design the building. The variance is asking for the setback to be challenged more varied to your requirements. The fire rating, there's many different coatings, we can put on any of the materials. The fire issues to do with this, there's many materials that I can get that we can coat all of the wood structures, and give them up to a 2 -hour fire rating. Or any part of the wood to do with that can be painted with a 2-hour fire rating paint. So, I mean once we get through the variance, then I'm going to deal with Mr. Bush and we will work out what we need to do to make this meet the Fire Code Regulations. In my opinion, I don't think I'm going to have too much trouble doing that. The picture that you're looking at, may change a little bit. This is the ideal, this is what Mr. Cadiz is looking for. But I think we can do this and leave it set where it is. He came up with a very nice plan, we made a mistake and didn't get a permit first, that's why we're here today. And we're trying to correct that.

Board Questions

Mr. Badger said you said you helped build on this.

Mr. Foreman said yes.

Mr. Badger asked on this picture there're two posts there, one's got a birdhouse on top of it. How far apart are those two posts.

Mr. Foreman said those are eight feet apart from each other.

Mr. Badger said okay, so eight feet. Then it looks like the fresh concrete is forward. Is that there on the left.

Mr. Foreman said yep, there was five feet of concrete.

Mr. Badger said five feet of concrete. So, when you poured the concrete you knew about the five-foot limit then.

Mr. Foreman said no, I did not.

Mr. Badger said but it was five feet.

Mr. Foreman said the concrete slab that's there is five feet away from the original concrete slab is five feet away.

Mr. Badger said five feet away. Okay, and then the two posts are eight feet.

Mr. Foreman said yes.

Mr. Gaylord asked Mr. Foreman did that five-foot difference between the existing concrete [inaudible] put you on notice of any potential issue on encroaching into a setback on.

Mr. Foreman said no, I would have never and the concrete wouldn't have had any setback to it at all.

Mr. Gaylord asked are you a licensed Home Builder.

Mr. Foreman said I am this time, yes. I was not when we started.

Mr. Gaylord said how did you solicit this business if you weren't a licensed home builder at that time.

Mr. Foreman though another contractor.

Mr. Gaylord said so you've practiced under that person's license then.

Mr. Foreman said no, I was practicing with it. That was actually working with him.

Mr. Lonon said so another contractor began the construction.

Mr. Foreman said I got Leo's name from the guy I worked for. That's how I began what I'm doing today.

Mr. Lonon said I'll just make a comment, it put the Board in an awful position when we have to consider these things after the fact. Because it puts us in a position to where, because the rules weren't followed up front, we either have to figure out a way to figure out something to do, fit a square peg in a round hole, or the homeowner ends up having to demolish what's been done. It's a horribly awkward position for us. Is there anything further for Mr. Foreman.

Mr. Teague asked you said you're licensed, are you insured.

Mr. Foreman said yes.

Mr. Gaylord said Mr. Foreman I'd just ask generally, if you appreciate the position of all members of the Board, even those who may not be present of the situation this places us and if you're aware that that may be a concern that all members of this Board hold, even as one presidency.

Mr. Foreman said I do appreciate that. I'm not here to create ill feelings, or continue ill feelings. I'm here to help Mr. Cadiz and that's it.

Mr. Badger asked on this presentation, these cross slats, is that for privacy.

Mr. Foreman said it is. Yes.

Mr. Badger said because having been out there and seen it. Is having the solid walls absolutely necessary out there. It doesn't look like there's that many people around watching what they're doing.

Mr. Foreman said no and I don't think it is absolutely necessary. It's a request. It's a desire to have privacy I think anybody wants a little bit of privacy. And that area of Mr. Cadiz's property is probably the most appealing when it comes to entertainment and things like that. And he utilizes the roof that's there to work on. And he does a lot of his own furniture building and things like that. The tree branch that came down the other day went right through that steel roof. And if the steel wasn't there, and he was standing there, that could have been an issue. So, it has helped him already.

Ms. Poliakoff asked would you be able to adapt the design. Because if I understand Mr. Bush correctly, you would no longer potentially be able to have openings on that side.

Mr. Foreman said I want to be able to work in Converse Heights. I have a lot of friends and acquaintances that actually live here. It's a beautiful area. We lived on the west side. I have now purchased a piece of land in Pauline and I'm building my own house out there. But I'd like to continue in the city. I want to be one of the good guys, not one of the bad guys.

Mr. Lonon said thank you. Thank you, Mr. Foreman. Okay is there anyone else here to speak for the variance request.

My name is Bethany Cecil I live on 535 Gadsden Ct property. And I just want to say it's been a real asset having him there and was in support of this request. This is a very small parcel of land. And it I think with his design it really utilizes every inch of the space, and allows not only him the aesthetic beauty, but also for the neighbors as well. So, as a neighbor, I want to say thank you to him for what he's trying to bring to our neighborhood.

I'm Alice Smith. I live right behind Leo; of 526 Lucas Court. He's been a very good neighbor. We adore him. And so, the building in the back is actually backs up to my property. I'm good with it.

My name is Angie Wallace and I live right across the street from Leo, I'm at number 1 Gray Court. And I agree with my neighbors that we are so excited that Leo came and bought this piece of property that was there for a long time because nobody could decide what to do with it. And he did. So, we appreciate it.

I am William Granger, III and. I live 525 Lucas Court. Most of the pictures y'all seen today, I share the fence. I share the fence where the wall's being done. And in no way does it bother me whatsoever. And I actually enjoy it and enjoy getting to know Leo.

Mr. Lonon said thank you, sir. Is there anyone else here to speak in favor of the variance request. Okay, there being none, I will then ask if there is anyone here to speak against the variance request, please come forward. Okay, let the record show that we've not had anyone appear to

speak against the variance request. Ms. Roland has anyone contacted the City for and against otherwise.

Ms. Roland said no.

Mr. Lonon closed the public hearing and said they would now move to Board Deliberation.

Board Deliberation

Ms. Poliakoff said I am satisfied with Mr. Rosario's summary of the criteria. I think it is a unique situation. I would support the variance.

Mr. Lonon said anyone else.

Mr. Gaylord said I'm curious as, the point that he brought up [inaudible] and not all is quitting the City's findings. Not all conditions will allow the granting of the variance exist for the City's findings. If anybody has any additional thoughts on that conditions number three as to how this may reasonably.

Mr. Lonon said yes, I think you know, it has been the practice of this Board too, when we do grant a variance, that we also specifically state if we are adopting the findings of the City. So, I am bothered for myself, I'm concerned if we grant the variance, and we adopt the findings of the City and the City says that one of the requirements has not been met, where does that leave us legally. And could someone come along down the road and appeal our decision if they decided that they didn't like the granting of the variance or try to overturn it. The question in my mind is what does effectively prohibit or unreasonably restrict utilization of property. Is it unreasonable to not allow this property to have a carport. Because it seems to me that I don't know if you could fit a car in here and still meet the setback lines, meet the setback requirements.

Mr. Badger said well if those poles are eight feet, and it looks like there's another two to three feet, between the one with the birdhouse and the existing building, well, that's big enough to get the car in. Because most [inaudible] will be less than six feet. So, if it's going to be a carport, then those five upright posts would have to be moved back five feet. Attached to the existing roof and then there could be a carport. If it's going to be a privacy area, as some of these depictions are, it has these walls up. I don't know if that meets the fire codes, although 25% if I understand it correctly, that above them where these privacy boards are, you'd have your 25%. But I think it's still there's room for a carport, there's room for a barbecue and there's room for everything else out there between the two eight foot polls.

Mr. Gaylord said I am reminded of something that a realtor once told me, that if a house sits on a market too long, sits unsold for too long, if the market is spoken as to some condition of it be at price or some physical condition of it. I wonder if perhaps the layout of this lot and the position of it, particularly considering just how it's almost awkwardly laid out within the surrounding lots, if that might create an unreasonable restriction as to the use of the full property. Perhaps the ability to build some kind of structure that, again, assuming a structure that would be in compliance with the applicable building codes. But in that we heard at least one neighbor mentioned that this property has been unoccupied for some period of time.

Ms. Poliakoff said I think that's a good point. It does seem to be a unique [inaudible] uniquely positioned in a very small block for most of it.

Mr. Lonon said okay. So, in my mind, there's no question that it does not effectively prohibit the use of the property, but perhaps it unreasonably restricts the property and the size of the lot could maybe effectively make it unmarked or not likely to be sold.

Mr. Gaylord said correct. Although I suspect that perhaps its absence or its prolonged period on the market, absence of an owner there or occupant perhaps could have been what Mr. Cadiz is trying to address here. And that is just the general layout, the location and size of the lot. The use of the full area of lot would be needed to effectively and reasonable utilize the property.

Mr. Lonon said I certainly don't want to see empty houses in this parking lot.

Mr. Teague said I think we've met all five. Sounds like to me now. I think based off of what the City's provided, based off of the neighbors, nobody's speaking in opposition that the spirit of the Ordinance hasn't been met. I would agree and I might be favoring the request.

Mr. Lonon said at this point, I would ask if we're ready for a motion that's in a state of motion that also addresses the five required factors.

Mr. Gaylord said I moved that we adopt the findings of the City as to conditions one, two, four, and five. That we do not adopt the findings of the City as to condition number three, and instead find that the application of the Ordinance to this particular piece of property would unreasonably restrict the utilization of the property in consideration of the property's location and size, and then necessity of utilizing full area of the lot.

Mr. Lonon said so there's a motion on the floor to grant the variance and adopt findings one, two, four, and five of the City. Not adopt finding number three, but rather base that grant on the fact that application of the ordinance to a particular piece of property would unreasonably restrict utilization of the property based on its size.

Mr. Lonon asked is there a second.

Mr. Teague seconded, and the motion was approved by a vote of 4 to 1, with Mr. Badger opposed.

Mr. Lonon said okay, so the variance request has been granted. Obviously, and variance requests that we grant, any construction is still subject to Building Codes from the City and any other requirements and procedures of the City. Ms. Rosario will be in touch with the applicant for further steps. Thank you everyone for coming tonight.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:15 p.m.



Ryan Gaylord, Chair

Minutes edited by Tia Beatty and Julie Roland