

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

March 18, 20

The Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by the Chair, Joseph Fetzer, at the Danbury Township Hall. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

The roll call showed the following members present: Chair, Joseph Fetzer, Vice-Chair, Loretta Grentzer, Ms. Sherry Roberts, Ms. Lisa Bauer and Mr. Clyde Shetler and Alternate, Ms. Patty Zsigo. Alternate Member, Mr. Gregory Huffman was excused. Also present was Kathryn Dale, Zoning & Planning Administrator. Visitors present were Mr. Christopher Overmyer, Mr. Don Leach, Dr. Alice Randolph, and Mr. Peter Corrado.

Ms. Dale read the rules of order for the meeting proceedings. The Chair asked Mrs. Dale if all the documents relating to the case had been received and were in proper order. She indicated that they were. The Chair swore-in the Zoning and Planning Administrator, Kathryn Dale.

The Chair asked Mrs. Dale to introduce the first case of the evening.

**Adjudication Hearing
Case BZA #2020-018
8682 E. Bayshore Road
Overmyer**

Request for an Area Variance from Section 3.5 to allow a Commercial Structure to encroach into the front-yard setback (23' proposed/ 70' required).

The Chair asked if there were any Board members who would have a conflict and wished to abstain from this hearing. Ms. Grentzer stated she would be abstaining. Ms. Zsigo was seated. Ms. Roberts moved and Mr. Shetler seconded the motion to open the public hearing. All were in favor and the motion carried.

The Chair asked the Zoning Administrator to give an overview of this application. Ms. Dale shared that the applicant is proposing to construct a new 30' x 54' Commercial Building with a 10' x 12' cooler/freezer entirely in the front-yard setback. The closest point of the building to the overhang will be 23' from the north, front property line where 70' is required.

Staff did reach out to the County Engineer to ensure there would be no issues with the placement of this structure due to the curve in Bayshore Road. He stated that the building itself will not negatively impact the roadway by its placement given it's on the outside of a curve. His only concerns raised were regarding parking spaces after the building is up and operational. He would not advise that any parking be permitted between the building and the street for visibility purposes and would suggest signage on the building indicating that as well, including any deliveries. Staff can work with the applicant on a parking lot arrangement, if the variance is granted, prior to the release of any permits.

The Zoning Commission is currently reviewing front-yard setbacks for the Commercial and Industrial zoning districts and whether they should or should not be reduced. When evaluating the existing setbacks for Bayshore Road setbacks vary. The closest commercial buildings are at 23' at Bill's Implement and 27' at Mike's Dockside. One commercial building is at 31', 3 buildings between 40'-49', 3 buildings are at 50'-51' with 5 other commercial buildings at 70' or more, including this property currently.

An additional notation mentioned was that there is a substantial change in grade from the front of the property to the rear of the property with almost a 10' southward slope difference. Ms. Dale concluded stating the Board would be reviewing the Duncan Standard decision criteria during their deliberations.

Christopher Overmyer, Owner/Applicant, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Overmyer reviewed the paperwork and stated it was as he submitted. Mr. Overmyer stated he is asking for permission to construct a 30' x 54' commercial building with a 10' x 12' connected walk-in freezer. The former commercial building we had on this property was Colonel Mustard Custard and the new building will actually sit back 6' further away from the road than the old ice cream shop. This building will allow for the expansion of our business. It will be a commercial building, but it will not service customers. The majority of our business is delivering and shipping live fishing bait. Mr. Overmyer stated they are raise exotic pet feeder for the zoos and animal rehab facilities. He said they are currently trying to expand those operations. Mr. Overmyer stated that they have looked to expand on other areas of the property that would not require a variance, but where we are proposing this building, that is what we would use the building for.

Mr. Overmyer stated he had spoken with some of his neighbors about the variances and they did not express any issues with it, with him. He said they are next to a large hotel and do have a residence on the property. As far as parking in front of the building, since they do not have customers visiting the location, then he does not see this as a problem for parking requirements or visibility issues.

Ms. Roberts asked how far the freezer unit will be from the front property line. Mr. Overmyer said that the NE corner of the proposed building is shown at 23'. He said this is the closest corner. Due to the curvature of the road, the freezer will be on the far west end of the building and will actually be

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals**March 18,****20**

further away from the road than the 23' NE corner. He said he thought the freezer could be as far back as 40'. Ms. Roberts said she is assuming this freezer will be locked. Mr. Overmyer said that it will not have access from the outside, only from within the inside of the building. Mr. Overmyer explained that he originally wanted to make the building larger to incorporate the freezer inside the building, but due to a telephone pole near where this building will go. He said because of how the power lines are, he shrunk the building down, which is also why he has a 1.5 story building with a gabled roof instead of a full 2-story building, he didn't want power lines over the building.

Ms. Zsigo asked if he could clarify because he is referring to it as a telephone pole, so are there telephone or cable lines on that pole or electric. Mr. Overmyer apologized that it is indeed a power pole because electric lines are on it. Ms. Zsigo asked if he had any idea how high those lines are. He said he's not sure, but had he gone with the larger building, the roof would have been about 5' below those electrical lines. With this smaller building and gable roof style, the lines won't be over the building at all.

Ms. Roberts asked Mr. Overmyer why he wouldn't locate this building behind the house, instead of out in front of the house. Mr. Overmyer said because their septic system and two leach fields are behind the house and they cannot build over it. He said they are also still on a well system for water.

Mr. Shetler asked Mr. Overmyer if he could share more about their parking situation. Mr. Overmyer said that they do a lot of online orders. He said they have 15 websites they use such as Amazon, eBay, and Craigslist that they sell the live bait from. He said they do occasionally, very rarely, have a client or store come to pick up an order; he said they supply Back-to-the-Wild, so they send once a week a driver over, but they don't keep normal retail business hours that general public customers come in. Sometimes someone may want to save on shipping costs, so they may come over and pick up their order. Mr. Shelter asked what his anticipated employment level will be. Mr. Overmyer shared that they currently employ 9 on staff and they are hoping to hire 3 more by the end of the month. He said they will have about 15-16 employees during the season. He said their hope is to have that 15-16 become year-round employees and then hopefully go up to 20-25 jobs seasonally.

Ms. Loretta Grentzer, 2494 Port Pleasant, Marblehead, came forward and was sworn in. Ms. Grentzer said she is not objecting to him putting a business building in this area. She stated she lives two streets over and she appreciates that he wants to have a business. She shared that she used to buy a turtle swirl from the ice cream shop and her children babysat for his father's family. She said her question is to the Board; the 23', remember this Board is not a rubber stamp, 23' is very minimal to the 70' requirement. She said she doesn't care if the Zoning Commission is considering setbacks or not, at this point 70' is the requirement. Why would we have zoning boards if everything is going to get approved? Could he not move the building to the west and put it in a little closer and not so directly in front of his home? She said she doesn't see why he needs such a large building or why he could not move it over or back a little bit more. Ms. Grentzer said she just objects to 23' verses 70'.

Ms. Roberts asked Ms. Grentzer to come forward and point to where she is saying she thinks this building should go. Ms. Grentzer pointed to the aerial photo indicating the building should be moved to the west, closer to South Beach Resort. Ms. Roberts said that the building might then have to be a little smaller. Ms. Grentzer asked if the applicant could do that, Ms. Roberts replied that she didn't know, that's something they could ask the applicant. Ms. Grentzer said everything behind the property is a manufactured home park and she understands he can't put it in the back yard. She said she's suggesting that it be moved over to the west and she doesn't know if that's possible.

The Chair asked if Mr. Overmyer would like to address Ms. Grentzer's comments. Mr. Overmyer indicated he understood what Ms. Grentzer was asking because he described the location. Mr. Overmyer shared that he is working on what is needed to get a permit for another building in this same general location that Ms. Grentzer would like to see this building moved to. He said they have plans to construct a 40' x just shy of 100' L-shaped building in the area directly west of the house. Ms. Roberts clarified that he is looking to construct more than just this building to expand his business. Mr. Overmyer said that was correct. Mr. Overmyer said there are three new structures they will be building, the other two buildings will meet all the zoning requirements. Ms. Roberts asked where these are going. Mr. Overmyer approached and showed where the L-shaped building will be constructed on the west side of the house. He said on the east side of the house they will be constructing an attached garage for the house. Ms. Roberts said the question then is does the building he's applying for a variance on, does he really need a building of this size. Mr. Overmyer said yes.

Mr. Overmyer explained that the existing front building on the east side of the property, which is shown as a 24' x 30' building on the aerial, he said is their packing room. He shared that right now he has 9 people working in that building just doing packing. Mr. Overmyer said they ship 1,000 packages per day and 3 delivery trucks go to the post office every day. He said they are expanding how much product they are raising and growing, so he needs more space to be able to set-up 6 separate tables and 12 people working as a time plus the packers. Like work packers. He said in the summer they have 7 foreign kids come, J-1 work visa's; he said he owns the Majestic Motel, so they stay at the

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

March 18, 20

motel, they work at the local restaurants and then they come work for him cupping worms. He said when he has 9 people packing all day and then 5 more in the summer, he said there is just no space and that is what he's looking to gain with new buildings.

Ms. Roberts said she had another question for Ms. Grentzer. She said, as long as he's still putting this building in the front, what difference does it make if he's putting in as he has shown or if he moves it to one side or the other? Either way, it's still in the front. Ms. Grentzer said she was just considering the distance to the property line and that maybe he could put it back further than 23' from the property line. She said she doesn't care where he puts it, but if it could be more than 23'. Ms. Roberts asked if he could move it back further. Mr. Overmyer said he can put it closer to the house if there's no objection to that. Ms. Dale explained that there would be a County Building Code requirement that they have to meet also which is going to be 10' or 20', she was unsure of what the exact separation requirement is, but there is a distance they will have to meet.

Ms. Zsigo asked if she understood him correctly that he wants to increase his staffing to 20-25. Mr. Overmyer said that was correct. He said they would like to increase it to 15 full-time, year-round and then in the season, up to 25. Ms. Zsigo asked if he was going to have enough parking for 25 cars. He said the seasonal worker do not drive, they are picked up and brought in. He said 6 employees are drivers who deliver from Erie, PA to Detroit, to Columbus every day. He said they have those delivery vans parked, then when the driver arrives, they essentially swap parking spaces with their personal vehicle. He said the larger building they intend to construct on the west side of the house, that's what that will be for, to store the delivery vehicles in and to be able to service them on-site, which will mean having our own full-time mechanic.

Mr. Shetler asked if the employees are shift work. Mr. Overmyer said all the packers come in at 7:00a.m. to prepare the shipping. Shipping Clerks work M-F from 7a-2p. Work Cuppers come in whenever they're available, which depends on when their restaurant shift is. He said cuppers typically come in early in the morning until 10a.m. but if they have a morning restaurant shift, then they will work evenings. Delivery drivers work during the day, except 2 who work nights. Mr. Shelter said the point is, the employment is staggered. Mr. Overmyer said yes, that the shipping clerks are there the most because they have to get their work done before the post office closes.

Ms. Roberts said she can't speak for the rest of the Board and doesn't know their positions, but for arguments sake, let's say this building; you are asking for a very large setback – but if this were turned down, would you be open to making the building smaller? He said that he could *maybe* go to a 24' x 54, but that would be the absolute smallest he'd be able to go to accommodate the space he needs.

There were no further questions from the Board and there was no one else with standing who wished to testify.

Ms. Bauer made a motion to close the public comment segment of the hearing, seconded by Ms. Roberts. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Ms. Zsigo motioned to recess into executive session to deliberate the merits of the case. Ms. Bauer seconded the motion and the roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Zsigo – yes; Ms. Bauer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. The motion carried and the Board recessed at 6:58p.m.

Ms. Roberts moved and Ms. Bauer seconded the motion to reconvene. The roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Zsigo – yes; Ms. Bauer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. The Board reconvened at 7:19 p.m.

The Chair asked Mrs. Dale to read the Findings of Fact for BZA Case #2020-018:

With regard to BZA-2020-018 being a request for an Area Variance from Section 3.5 to allow a Commercial Structure to encroach into the front-yard setback (23' proposed/ 70' required) for the property located at 8682 E. Bayshore:

1. The property in question **will** yield a reasonable return and **can** be used beneficially without the variance because the property can continue to be used for a mix of residential housing and commercial business operation with room for new construction on the property within the setback requirements.
2. The request **is** substantial because the proposed building is completely in the required setback.
3. The essential character of the neighborhood **would not** be substantially altered by the variance and adjoining properties **would not** suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance because there are a number of structures both residential and commercial that are close to the roadway.
4. There is **no** indication the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage, etc.) because utilities are existing to the property.

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

March 18,

20

5. The property owner states they **were** aware the Township had zoning.
6. The property owner's predicament **can** feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance by moving where this building gets placed on the property.
7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement **would** be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because there are a number of structures both residential and commercial that are close to the roadway, there is a substantial change in grade on the property, and the ability to construct in the rear yard is limited due to a septic system & leach field.

Mr. Shetler moved that the Board adopts and makes the findings of fact as read by the recording secretary and that after considering and weighing these factors, the Board finds that Decision Standards(s) (3) (7) weigh more heavily to show that:

- a. Practical difficulty **is** sufficient to warrant granting the Variance requested.
- b. There **is a** preponderance of reliable, probative and substantial testimony; and
- c. There is evidence that **does support** the applicants request for a variance.

Therefore, the Variance should be accordingly **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS** as follows:

- a. That, no parking spaces or deliveries are provided between the building and street.
- b. That, appropriate signage is placed in front of or on the building indicating no parking or deliveries can take place between the building and roadway, and
 - i. If the pavement in this area is removed and replaced with grass, making parking and deliveries impossible, then signage would not be required.

Motion Seconded by Ms. Bauer. Roll Call Vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Zsigo – no; Ms. Bauer – yes; Ms. Roberts – no; Mr. Fetzer – yes. Vote 3-2 the motion passed. The Chair stated that due to the uncertainty of future meetings during this unprecedented Covid-19 time, the Board would be signing the final decision sheet this evening and Ms. Dale will be in touch with the applicant's regarding permits.

Adjudication Hearing Case BZA #2020-019 408 Lynn Leach

Request for two Area Variances from Section 5.2.2 to allow for an accessory structure to be 0' from the south, side-property line (3' required) and 2' from the principal building (5' required).

The Chair asked if there were any Board members who would have a conflict and wished to abstain from this hearing. There were none. The Chair asked that the record show Ms. Grentzer would be returning to be seated for this hearing. Ms. Roberts moved and Ms. Bauer seconded the motion to open the public hearing. All were in favor and the motion carried.

The Chair asked the Zoning Administrator to give an overview of this application. Ms. Dale shared that the applicant is proposing to remove an existing metal shed that currently sits over the south property line and encroaches onto the neighboring property and replacing it with a 6' x 8' shed which will be 2' from the shed overhang to the principal building where 5' is required. The proposed shed will be 0' from the shed overhang to the south, side property line where 3' is required. There is currently only 10' between the house and south, side property line. If all requirements were met, a shed would only be able to be 2' wide with no overhangs. There are no other locations available on the property to locate an accessory structure.

According to the applicant's narrative statement, the metal shed is jointly shared with the property owner to the south via an agreement. The owners to the south installed a new shed in 2019 which meets the zoning requirements and are willing to enter into a new perpetual agreement to allow these applicants and any future homeowners, to have a maintenance easement for the purpose of maintaining this new, proposed shed, should the variances be approved. Ms. Dale concluded stating the Board would be reviewing the Duncan Standard decision criteria during their deliberations. There were no further questions from the Board for Ms. Dale.

Don Leach, Owner/Applicant, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Leach reviewed the paperwork and stated it was as he submitted. Mr. Leach said they have a small Lakeside lot and if they built a shed to replace the existing one, it could only be 2' wide. He joked that they could maybe accommodate a cot in it if he fell out of favor with his wife. He said the existing shed that they have is not particularly attractive and predates their ownership of the property. Mr. Leach explained that when they purchased the cottage in 2005, the shed was entirely on the neighboring property to the south. Two or three years ago, they acquired some additional land from that property to the south to add parking to our side yard. This accomplished a need for us, but also, that house to the south sat on two lots and there were concerns

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

March 18, 20

in the neighborhood that someone could build on the vacant lot portion. So, our acquisition of some of that prevents that and the neighborhood thought that was great. But, as a result of that acquisition, the shed then became partially on our property and partially on theirs. We formed a “Shared-use Agreement” because that seemed like the right thing to do, to make sure it was clear as to who had responsibility of what and who could use it. Mr. Leach said they would like to replace this metal shed with something more attractive. He passed around a photo of what the new shed will look like, which was also included in the Boards packets. Mr. Leach said this new shed will also be smaller than the metal shed. He said the new shed will generally be in the same location, but just entirely on his property now and not crossing the property line. He said the neighbor to the south last summer put a shed on their own property. Mr. Leach said as a side note, he was talking this past summer to a neighbor across the street who has been here forever and they said that metal shed had originally been in their backyard; they had set it out at the street 25 years or so ago and when they came back up, it was where it is located now. Mr. Leach said the shed has a long history in the neighborhood which they would now like to end.

Mr. Leach said that the materials they have been given summarize the standards, so he won't take the time to repeat them, Lakeside has approved both the look & design of the shed and the variance requests from their perspective. He said generally the reason for having side-yard requirements is to help protect the property to the south and the other is access so they can maintain the shed if they were to build a fence or something along the property line. He said both of those issues will be addressed thru a “Maintenance Agreement” or easement that we have agreed to with the neighbor. Mr. Leach said he was hoping to have that for the Board tonight, but due to the current state of affairs in the country has disrupted things. He said they have all agreed on the language of the document and he would be happy to provide a copy of it, but it is not yet signed or recorded. He said the language will provide him with access from the south property line to the south side of the shed. He said the shed will sit 1' off the property line, but because of the roof overhang, which is 1' wide, it's considered for zoning purposes to be on the property line. Mr. Leach said the other variance they are seeking is from the 5'' building separation requirement of 5' down to 2'. He said he was at the property today and looking at this and said he would like to amend his request because he thinks it will make more sense for them to have a shed that is 5' x 9' instead of 6' x 8' that he originally submitted and have a 3' separation from the house, which can't hurt.

Mr. Fetzer clarified that he would still be 0' from the property line, but further away from the house. Mr. Leach said that was correct. They could still gain the same amount of space for storage by elongating the shed and still meet the rear setback.

There were no further questions from the Board and there was no one with standing who wished to testify.

Mr. Shetler made a motion to close the public comment segment of the hearing, seconded by Ms. Bauer. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Ms. Grentzer motioned to recess into executive session to deliberate the merits of the case. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion and the roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Ms. Bauer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. The motion carried and the Board recessed at 7:35 p.m.

Ms. Roberts moved and Mr. Shetler seconded the motion to reconvene. The roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Ms. Bauer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. The Board reconvened at 7:44 p.m.

The Chair asked Mrs. Dale to read the Findings of Fact for BZA Case #2020-019:

With regard to BZA-2020-019 being a request for two Area Variances from Section 5.2.2 to allow for an 5' x 9' accessory structure to be 0' from the south, side-property line (3' required) and 3' from the principal building (5' required) for the property located at 408 Lynn:

1. The property in question **will** yield a reasonable return and **can** be used beneficially without the variance because the property can continue to be used as a single-family residence.
2. The request **is not** substantial because some sort of variance would be required to fit a shed on this property, an encroachment over the property line would be eliminated and the owner has worked out an agreement for maintenance with the neighbor to the south.
3. The essential character of the neighborhood **would not** be substantially altered by the variance and adjoining properties **would not** suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance because the proposed structure is smaller in size and in the same general location as the existing shed and the neighbor's shed.
4. There is **no** indication the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage, etc.) because all utilities are existing and no utilities are proposed to be extended to this new shed.

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

March 18,

20

5. The property owner states they **were not** aware the Township had a zoning restriction.
6. The property owner's predicament **cannot** feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance because there is only 10' available on this side of the property and the restrictions would only allow for a 2' wide structure.
7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement **would** be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because the encroachment of the existing shed would be eliminated, the restrictions are such that a reasonable or standard structure cannot possibly meet the requirements and there is no negative impact of allowing a smaller shed in the same general location on the property.

Ms. Roberts moved that the Board adopts and makes the findings of fact as read by the recording secretary and that after considering and weighing these factors, the Board finds that Decision Standards(s) (2) (3) (7) weigh more heavily to show that:

- a. Practical difficulty **is** sufficient to warrant granting the Variance requested.
- b. There **is a** preponderance of reliable, probative and substantial testimony; and
- c. There is evidence that **does support** the applicants request for a variance.

Therefore, the Variance should be accordingly **APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITION:**

- 1.) That, a copy of the recorded agreement is provided to the Zoning Inspector at the time a permit is applied for.

Motion Seconded by Ms. Grentzer. Roll Call Vote was as follows Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Ms. Bauer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. Vote 5-0 the motion passed The Chair stated that due to the uncertainty of future meetings during this unprecedented Covid-19 time, the Board would be signing the final decision sheet this evening and Ms. Dale will be in touch with the applicant's regarding permits.

Approval of February 19, 2020 Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting Minutes

Ms. Roberts made a motion to approve the February 19, 2020 meeting minutes, Mr. Shetler seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Signing of Decision Sheets

The Chair asked the Board if they had the opportunity to review the Decision Sheets presented for the following cases. There were no corrections or modifications. Ms. Grentzer made a motion for approval of the decision sheets as presented for the following cases. Mr. Shetler seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion carried.

- a. **BZA-2020-005 63 Erie Beach Road.** Request for an Area Variance from Section 5.1.C.ii to allow an accessory structure to be located in the rear-yard setback (5' required/ 3'7" proposed). **Colette & Mark Twarek, Owners/Applicants.**
- b. **BZA-2020-006 240 Tibbels.** Request for an Area Variance from Section 7.9.3.A to allow for an addition onto the nonconforming home to exceed 20% of the original square footage [291s.f. allowed/ 588s.f. all new (47%) or 1,260 w. garage attachment (86%) proposed]. **Roy Edward & Diane Veley, Owners/Applicants.**
- c. **BZA-2020-009 7487 E. Harbor Road (Rock Harbor Cottages).** Request for a Conditional Use in accordance with Section 3.1.10.C.v & 4.4 to designate an additional parcel (PIN# 0141175415717000) & the property as a Resort. Area Variances requested from Sec. 4.4.1. for side-yard setbacks on the additional lot (45' required/ 5' proposed), and Sec. 4.4.5. to allow less than minimum acreage requirement (5 ac. required/ 2.8 total ac. proposed). **Bradley Miller, Owner/Applicant.**
- d. **BZA-2020-018 8682 E. Bayshore Road.** Request for an Area Variance from Section 3.5 to allow a Commercial Structure to encroach into the front-yard setback (23' proposed/ 70' required). **Christopher Overmyer, Owner/Applicant.**
- e. **BZA-2020-019 408 Lynn.** Request for two Area Variances from Section 5.2.2 to allow for an accessory structure to be 0' from the south, side-property line (3' required) and 2' from the principal building (5' required). **Don & Jane Leach, Owner/Applicant.**

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

March 18, 20

Old Business

There was none.

New Business

Ms. Dale shared that future meetings during the Covid-19 pandemic would be decided on an as needed basis. She said she would likely do everything in her power to try to cancel an April meeting, but in the event that it cannot be or this lasts longer, we would need to start figuring out alternative ways to conduct a meeting. She shared that the State of Ohio Attorney General distributed a letter that meeting could take place electronically. She asked them if they have ever used a platform like Skype, or if they all had facetime capabilities on their phones. Mr. Shetler said there is a platform called Zoom and WebX that he frequently uses for video conferencing. He suggested we look at these options as they are relatively very easy to use and if you have a smartphone or computer, you would be able to join. He said some of them even have recording capabilities. Ms. Dale said she would try it out with Mr. Shetler, then let the other members know via email what was decided and to try it altogether someday as a test run.

Other Business

There was none.

Reports and Communications from Members and Staff

There were none.

Adjournment

Ms. Roberts moved to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Grentzer seconded the motion. All in attendance were in favor and the motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:03p.m.

DocuSigned by:
Kathryn A. Dale
ED35AE19AC2B4FE
RECORDING SECRETARY

DocuSigned by:
Phyllis Shetler
9F11FFDB62F44E2

DocuSigned by:
Gregory Huffman
CEDEF60D70AC431

DocuSigned by:
Joseph Fetzner
9505C61929A54B0...

DocuSigned by:
Lisa Bauer
42350FCB4D64445

DocuSigned by:
Sherry Roberts
A437A8FB9094424...

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS