

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

December 16,

20

The Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 6:34p.m. by the Chair, Joseph Fetzer. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

The roll call showed the following members present: Chair, Mr. Joseph Fetzer, Ms. Loretta Grentzer, Ms. Sherry Roberts, Mr. Clyde Shetler and Alternates, Mr. Gregory Huffman and Ms. Patty Zsigo. Ms. Bauer was excused. Mr. Huffman was advised he was free to leave the meeting. Also present was Kathryn Dale, Zoning & Planning Administrator. Visitors present were John & Carolyn Slager, Dennis Rospert, Jim Switzer, James Morrow and John Feick.

Ms. Dale read the rules of order for the meeting proceedings. The meeting is being held via Zoom due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Ms. Dale acknowledge everyone who joined the meeting and explained that prior to speaking, the Chair would call on everyone to give them the opportunity to speak. She asked that if they were not speaking to place themselves on mute so that any background noise was blocked. Ms. Dale explained that at the conclusion of the hearing during the Board's deliberation, the applicant and any members of the public would be placed in the "waiting room" of Zoom. She explained that they should not leave the meeting because the Board will come back and make their decision openly. 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 #2020-280**  
**425 Walnut**  
**Slager**

**Request for an Area Variance to Section 3.5 to allow for a front porch addition to encroach into the west, front-yard setback (10" proposed/ 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. Ms. Grentzer moved and Ms. Roberts 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 stated the applicant is proposing to construct a 4' x 16' enclosed front porch addition which will have an 18" roof overhang on it. The proposed addition with overhang will be 10" from the west, front property line where 5' is required. All other improvements being made will meet or exceed the zoning requirements since the house is conforming. There is currently a 4' x 8' stoop at the front door. The proposed enclosed porch addition will not be any closer to the street or front property line than where that stoop is. Ms. Dale concluded by reviewing the decision criteria the Board would be considering during their deliberations.

Mr. Fetzer asked if both Mr. & Mrs. Slager would be testifying. Mr. Slager indicated just he would be speaking.

John Slager, Owner, 11371 Donwiddle Drive, Loveland, was called upon and sworn in. Mr. Slager reviewed the paperwork via the "shared screen" option from Ms. Dale's computer and stated it was as he had submitted. Mr. Slager stated the property has been in their family for 21 years. The property was originally purchased by Carolyn's father, who has since passed. He stated at the time of the purchase, they had no idea they would be before this board, therefor they were unaware of any zoning restrictions. He stated they do currently live in Loveland, Ohio and have two college-aged daughters who basically grew up in Lakeside and spent their summers there as they grew. Mr. Slager said their family has a rich history at Lakeside with Carolyn's dad, her uncles and cousins all owning properties at some point in time, working at Lakeside for summer jobs and there are great memories and they are looking forward to creating more memories in the future. As noted and in summary, he stated they are here to request a zoning variance for a 4' x 16' enclosed front porch addition with an 18" overhang. Our plans indicate this is out of compliance by 4'2" to the 5' setback requirement in the front. In support of our request, on November 7<sup>th</sup> our plans were reviewed by the Lakeside Review Board and were approved, issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness (COA), and this is included in the Boards packets. Mr. Jim Switzer, Sr. VP of Lakeside supports our project. We have talked to him and he's here for the hearing as well.

Mr. Slager said that in terms of property analysis, it's a single-family residence built in 1933 and 89 yrs. old. He said it's old and it's tired. He said their plan is to upgrade, remodel and make improvements, including landscaping, all in an effort to increase the curb appeal, the quality of living, and preserve the legacy, all supported by the front porch addition. Mr. Slager said it was worth noting that their project would enhance comparable properties in the neighborhood and provide assessment revenue all of which will yield a reasonable return to both Lakeside and Danbury Township. He said they feel their request is not substantial for the following reasons; first the lot coverage will be at 31.7%

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

December 16,

20

of the 55% allowed at completion. Secondly, the front porch addition will be no closer to the road right-of-way than the existing 4' x 8' concrete stoop that currently exists. The front porch addition will have less impact on neighboring homes because the addition comes towards the street and not towards those neighboring homes. There is approximately 20' of greenspace from the home to the street, which is greater than any of the neighbors.

Mr. Slager said that they would ask that the Board consider that the neighborhood character will not be altered. They believe the front porch addition will enhance the neighborhood with style and features that uplift and add to the neighborhood characteristics. The front porch addition will not be a detriment to other existing properties and will have no negative visual impact, nor will it block the neighbor's windows from sun lights. It will not have a detrimental effect to any government services because it is currently serviced and would be continued to be serviced. Mr. Slager said at this point they cannot currently obviate the need for a variance feasibly.

Mr. Slager said the porch is currently only 7' x 10' and only accommodates 4 people, which is extremely tight. Without the zoning variance they would have to cannibalize the existing house square footage by approximately 106 s.f. or move the house back which would substantially lessen the space between the house and the garage in the back, likely resulting in creating a different variance situation. Moving it would also add to architect and construction costs. Mr. Slager began to conclude by stating that they believe the spirit and intent of the variance would be met because it would not negatively impact surrounding properties. The front porch addition would have no negative impact on anyone including fire, safety, and/or utilities. Nor would it impose on other residents more than it does now.

Mr. Slager said some other relevant factors they would like to share is that Lakeside has asked them to remove the concrete steps to the street and replace the sidewalk with permeable pavers, redirecting the sidewalk to the driveway. This will allow for a road widening project scheduled to take place in 2-3 years as a result of a drainage project in Lakeside. He said they agree with this proposal and believe it is the best use of their investment, therefore they will update their plans accordingly. Mr. Slager said that in closing, the front porch defines the shape, size, details and appearance of the cottage. It will be the most distinctive feature of the house which today the house has no character. The front profile of the house has no style, character or distinctive features. It's a plain white box with a porch that only accommodates 4 people. The front porch is their favorite gathering place for friends and family. He finally wanted to thank the Board for the opportunity to present and hope they have provided enough information for the Board to vote favorably on their request.

Mr. Fetzer asked if any Board Members had any questions for Mr. Slager.

Ms. Grentzer said she did, and she understands the confinements of a 7' x 10' porch, but said this doesn't look like a front porch, but rather a part of the house. She clarified and said it looks like it is going to be an extension of their living room. She asked what they are going to do to distinguish the space from their living room to make it a porch. She said the porch is not open to the air and would be another enclosed area. Mr. Slager said that the space is separated by a wall and a door to the living room, so it is not an extension of the living room. He said it is a separate space in the front of the house. Ms. Grentzer asked if they looked into taking some of the living room space to make the porch bigger. There was no answer to that question. She asked if the porch is an outdoor area. Mr. Slager said it is not.

Ms. Roberts said she has a question. She said Ms. Grentzer was touching upon this and she certainly doesn't want to redesign their project, but she asked if they would be better off giving themselves more room by removing the wall inside and making it part of the house. She said she questions why, if they are spending this kind of money, why they wouldn't do that or why have they chosen not to do that. Mr. Slager said there will be windows and a door to the front porch and they have always enjoyed the opportunity to separate people to the front porch for privacy separate from the living room. He said that is the way it is presently and serves them very well.

Dennis Rospert, Agent & Production Manager with Zimmerman Construction on behalf of the Owner/Applicant, 141 Arlington Drive, Bellevue, was called upon and sworn in. Mr. Rospert said that their main concern is the front porch and a lot of people in Lakeside – the house isn't that big. At some point you want to have a space to get away from others. The bump out will allow more space for either family members or guests. He said if the A/C is on in the house, the windows on this porch will be able to be opened. Mr. Rospert reiterated that the new addition will not be any closer to the road than the existing stoop.

Mr. Fetzer asked if the Board Members had any questions for Mr. Rospert or Mr. Slager. There were none.

Mr. Fetzer asked if there was anyone with standing who wished to testify.

Mr. Jim Switzer, 526 Elm, Marblehead, Sr. VP of Lakeside Services indicated he would like to speak and was sworn-in. Mr. Switzer stated that on behalf of the Lakeside Association the Lakeside Design Review Board has issued a COA and MSC approved and supports this variance request for the front porch addition. Mr. Switzer said the road project Mr. Slager mentioned is only going to take 1-2

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

December 16,

20

feet of additional greenspace in front of their home. He said that if they asked them to move the house back for this project, they would be pressing to violate one of their own rules in Section 3.19F which states they should do everything they can to not cause any undue burden onto a homeowner.

Mr. Fetzter asked if the owner or agent wished to respond to Mr. Switzer's comments. They indicated they did not. Ms. Dale said to note for the record, that the applicant did submit the MSC request for deviation approval and HP-DRB COA with their application which Mr. Switzer was referring to.

Mr. Fetzter asked if there was anyone else with standing who wished to testify or other correspondence received. Ms. Dale shared that in order to ensure the adjoining property owners had a chance to have a say in this hearing who may not have been able to participate in the Zoom format, she allowed written statements due to the health crises situation. She reported that there was no one else on the Zoom meeting for this case and that she had not received any correspondence from any adjoining neighbors.

Ms. Zsigo 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. Mr. Shetler seconded the motion and the roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Ms. Zsigo – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Mr. Fetzter – yes. The motion carried and the Board recessed at 7:05p.m. Ms. Dale reminded the applicant and other non-board members that they would now be placed in the Zoom waiting room and not to disconnect from the meeting.

All participants were removed from the waiting room and brought back into the meeting. Mr. Shetler moved and Ms. Roberts seconded the motion to reconvene. The roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Ms. Zsigo – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Mr. Fetzter – yes. The Board reconvened at 7:20p.m.

The Chair asked Mrs. Dale to read the Findings of Fact for BZA Case #2020-280:

**With regard to BZA-2020-280 being a request for an Area Variance from Section 3.5 to allow for a front porch addition to encroach into the west, front-yard setback (10' proposed/ 5' required) for the property located at 425 Walnut:**

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 and since the existing home is conforming, improvements are not limited.
2. The request **is not** substantial because the porch will be no closer to the front property line than the current stoop.
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 encroachment will have no visual impact on the neighboring homes, such as blocking neighboring windows. Furthermore, there is less impact to surrounding properties with the addition coming towards the street as opposed to a neighboring home.
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 available to the property.
5. The property owner states they **were not** aware of the zoning restrictions at the time they purchased the property.
6. The property owner's predicament **cannot** feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance because to move the house back in order for the porch addition to meet the front-yard setback would reduce the spacing between the house and existing garage, likely resulting in other variances.
7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement **would** be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because it does not negatively impact surrounding properties.

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) (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**.

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

December 16,

20

Motion Seconded by Ms. Grentzer. Roll Call Vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Ms. Zsigo – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. Vote 5-0 the motion passed. The Chair stated that the application has been approved and the applicant can pick up permits following the Board’s next meeting which is January 20, 2021.

Ms. Dale explained that the applicant from this case was now free to leave the meeting or they were welcome to stay on to watch the Board complete the rest of their regular business.

### **Adjudication Hearing Case BZA #2020-285 335 Central Morrow**

#### **Request for an Area Variance to Section 7.12.3.A to allow more square footage than allowed onto a nonconforming structure (20%; 220.90s.f. allowed/ 26.3%; 290.13s.f. proposed).**

The Chair asked if there were any Board members who would have a conflict and wished to abstain from this hearing. There were none. Ms. Zsigo moved and Ms. Roberts 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 stated the applicant is proposing a 7’ x 12’3” addition onto the rear of their home on the 1st floor. In 2009, the property owners applied for and received an Area Variance (BZA-2009-122) to remove an existing shed roof over the 1st floor, single story living space at the rear of the home with a pitched roof and keeping the overhang distance the same to the north property line. In this 2009 application, they also had two additions onto the south side of the house totaling 204.33sf. or 18.5%. The owner came to us in 2018 (BZA-2018-239) for a 2nd floor addition, to enclose a portion of the porch that was already under roof and to enclosed a small exterior stairway area on the NE corner of the house. In 2018 they needed a north, side-yard setback variance, to exceed the 20% addition limitation and a front yard setback for the addition on the 2nd floor. The owners decided to forego these requests and project. This most recent application for 85.8s.f. of additional living space will now exceed the 20% limitation onto the original structure (1,104.49s.f.) by 69.23s.f. or 26.3%. All other zoning requirements in regards to setbacks and lot coverage will be met or exceeded. Ms. Dale concluded by reviewing the decision criteria the Board would be considering during their deliberations.

Mr. Fetzer asked if any Board Members had any questions for the Ms. Dale. There were none.

James Morrow, Owner, 335 Central Avenue, Lakeside, was called upon and sworn in. Mr. Morrow reviewed the paperwork via the “shared screen” option from Ms. Dale’s computer and stated it was as he had submitted. Mr. Morrow thanked the Board for listening to their proposal. Mr. Morrow said they have downsized and moved here from the Cleveland area after 40-some years. He said they have sold their home there and are now living here year-round, but once they moved here, they realized they were very short of storage space. He that is what is prompting the need for an addition. He said it became apparent once they moved here that their prior project ideas from 2018 would be more practical and appropriate to be on the ground floor instead of the second floor. Mr. Morrow said he doesn’t think it would be a hindrance to any of the cottages next to them since the addition isn’t getting any closer to the property lines than the existing house.

Mr. Fetzer asked if any Board Members had any questions for Mr. Morrow. There were none.

John Feick, Agent & Architect on behalf of the Owner, 224 E. Water Street, Sandusky, was called upon and sworn in. Mr. Feick said it was almost 2 years ago this month that variances were granted for different variances for this property. At the time of that application, the Morrow’s were looking to move here permanently, which they now do. It was pretty apparent to them once they moved in that the storage they were going to pick up on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor was not really as big or convenient. He said having the storage off the back of the existing house will make it much more accessible. He said they have been back before Lakeside and the Design Review Board had very few question since all the materials will match including the roof pitch. Mr. Feick addressed the decision standards. He acknowledge that it will still remain as a single-family, but it is no longer a cottage and now a full-time residence. The addition is not large in scale, but it will give them the room they need. The footprint will be enlarged, but assuming it gets approved, it will be very difficult to tell an addition has even been put on. It is straight off the back and no work is to take place anywhere else on the property or house. There are other places that an addition could be put on, but this is the most logical location with the least impact on surrounding properties.

Mr. Fetzer asked if any Board Members had any questions for the Mr. Feick. There were none.

Mr. Fetzer asked if there was anyone with standing who wished to testify.

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

December 16,

20

Mr. Jim Switzer, 526 Elm, Marblehead, Sr. VP of Lakeside Services indicated he would like to speak and was sworn-in. Mr. Switzer stated that on behalf of the Lakeside Association a COA has been approved as of November 10, 2020 for the design and materials. Mr. Switzer said the COA from 2018 had expired, but that was for a different project as well. He said the prior approval by MSC in regards to exceeding the 20% addition limitation is still in effect because their decisions don't ever expire. He said they also had approved more square footage back in 2018 than what is being proposed now. Mr. Switzer said he wanted to take a moment to thank this Board for all they do for the community and commended them for being very supportive this year with all the cases they've had before them, especially with Covid this year. He wished them all a happy holiday. Ms. Dale said to note for the record, that she does not have the recently approved COA. Mr. Switzer said he would make sure she received that.

Mr. Fetzer asked if the owner or agent wished to respond to Mr. Switzer's comments. They indicated they did not. Mr. Fetzer asked if any Board Members had any questions. There were none.

Mr. Fetzer asked if there was anyone else with standing who wished to testify or other correspondence received. Ms. Dale shared that in order to ensure the adjoining property owners had a chance to have a say in this hearing who may not have been able to participate in the Zoom format, she allowed written statements due to the health crises situation. She reported that there was no one else on the Zoom meeting for this case and that she had not received any correspondence from any adjoining neighbors.

She did share that one of the neighbors called about 1½ hr. prior to the start of the hearing demanding that the hearing be continued because they had just received today their postcard notification in the mail. Ms. Dale said the neighbor did not identify herself. Ms. Dale said the neighbor was rude, but more so acted as though she has never seen this request. Ms. Dale explained to the neighbor where the information could be found on the website that notices went out November 30, 2020. All legal requirements were met and notice was also published in the newspaper. She said, as many of us are probably experiencing, there have been some major delays in postal deliveries due to Covid-19, the new vaccines being distributed, a major snow storm that recently hit and general holiday deliveries. She said she can't answer why it would have taken so long for the post office to deliver this one neighbor's postcard. She has no idea when other neighbors received their notices. Ms. Roberts asked if the neighbor was aware that this was being held via Zoom and still could have joined. Ms. Dale explained she shared that all this information including the packet and drawings were available on the Township website but the neighbor acted like she didn't have time to look. Ms. Roberts said if it was that important to the neighbor, they could have chosen to join. The fact that they chose not to join, she told Ms. Dale not to be concerned and that we should move on. Ms. Dale said she's not concerned since the legal requirements were met and the delivery is out of our hands, but she just wanted to make it known on the record that there was a complaint lodged about notice, not about the project.

Mr. Feick stated that part of their review process before the Lakeside Design Review requires that neighbors receive notice via certified mail, which includes a copy of the plans, so all neighbors should be well aware of this project.

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

Ms. Roberts motioned to recess into executive session to deliberate the merits of the case. Ms. Zsigo seconded the motion and the roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Ms. Zsigo – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. The motion carried and the Board recessed at 7:50p.m. Ms. Dale reminded the applicant and other non-board members that they would now be placed in the Zoom waiting room and not to disconnect from the meeting.

All participants were removed from the waiting room and brought back into the meeting. Ms. Zsigo moved and Ms. Roberts seconded the motion to reconvene. The roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Ms. Bauer – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. The Board reconvened at 8:00p.m.

The Chair asked Mrs. Dale to read the Findings of Fact for BZA Case #2020-285:

**With regard to BZA-2020-285 being a request for an Area Variance from Section 7.12.3.A to allow more square footage than allowed onto a nonconforming structure (20%; 220.90s.f. allowed/ 26.3%; 290.13s.f. proposed) for the property located at 335 Central:**

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 the addition will be no closer than the existing house to any of the surrounding homes and will be at the rear of the property, not visible to most of the public.

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

December 16,

20

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 for the same reason as stated above in standard #2.
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 available to the property.
5. The property owner states they **were not** aware of the zoning restrictions at the time they purchased the property, but are aware zoning exists in the Township due to prior improvements made.
6. The property owner's predicament **cannot** feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance because since moving to the house permanently, they need more storage.
7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement **would** be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because all other requirements of the zoning code are met with regard to lot coverage and parking, the addition is not impactful, there is little to no noticeable change to the structure and it is the minimum variance needed to accomplish the applicant's goal.

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) (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**.

Motion Seconded by Ms. Grentzer. Roll Call Vote was as follows: Mr. Shetler – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes; Ms. Zsigo – yes; Ms. Grentzer – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes. Vote 5-0 the motion passed. The Chair stated that the application has been approved and the applicant can pick up permits following the Board's next meeting which is January 20, 2021.

Ms. Dale explained that the applicant from this case was now free to leave the meeting or they were welcome to stay on to watch the Board complete the rest of their regular business.

### **Approval of November 18, 2020 Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting Minutes**

Ms. Roberts made a motion to approve the November 18, 2020 meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Shetler seconded the motion. All were in favor, motion carried.

### **Signing of Decision Sheets**

The Chair asked if the Board had the opportunity to review the Decision Sheets presented for the following case. Mr. Shetler motioned for approval of the decision sheet as presented. Ms. Grentzer seconded. Ms. Zsigo Abstained. All were in favor and the motion carried.

- a. **BZA-2020-260 904 E. 4th Street.** Request for an Area Variance from Section 5.10.3.A.i to allow for the alleviation of one (1) of the two (2) required on-site parking spaces for a single-family dwelling. Also a request for an Area Variance from Section 3.5 to allow for a deck to encroach into the west, front-yard setback (1'11" proposed/ 5' required). **Thomas & Donna Edwards, Owner/Applicant; Terry Ross, Architect/ Agent.**
- b. **BZA-2020-266 228 Leddy Lane.** Request for an Area Variance from Section 5.2.1.C.ii to allow for a replacement 12' x 16' shed to encroach into the west, rear-yard setback and south, side-yard setback (2' proposed/ 5' required) and to allow the structure to be less than 5' from the principal structure (3' proposed). **Thomas Warner, Owner/Applicant.**

### **Old Business**

There was none.

### **New Business**

There was none.

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

December 16,

20

### Other Business

#### Election of Officers:

Ms. Roberts made a motion to keep the positions the same for the 2021 year. Mr. Shetler seconded the motion. There were no other nominations. All were in favor, none opposed. Motion passed. Mr. Fetzer will be Chair, Ms. Grentzer Vice-Chair and Ms. Bauer Secretary. At the end of 2021 new officers will have to be selected for each position due to term limitations in the by-laws.

#### Acceptance of By-Laws and 2021 Meeting Schedule:

Ms. Dale shared that the only change she was recommending to the by-laws were some cross-references made to the Zoning Resolution so they referenced the correct sections of the code. She stated when the code was updated at the end of 2019, some of the section numbers changed.

Ms. Zsigo made a motion to accept the 2021 Meeting Schedule and the By-laws update. Ms. Roberts seconded the motion. All were in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

### 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 8:11p.m.

  
RECORDING SECRETARY

  
dotloop verified  
01/20/21 9:13 PM EST  
NZYR-2W7S-SJBV-ZBHU

  
dotloop verified  
01/21/21 1:04 PM EST  
WHHH-DKMZ-KFHY-VQUW

  
dotloop verified  
01/21/21 8:46 PM EST  
9OQZ-OC7-TAVQ-1BGP

  
dotloop verified  
01/21/21 7:03 AM EST  
D5IL-THRN-COSJ-NSW4

  
dotloop verified  
01/21/21 8:39 PM  
EST  
OITF-KVJS-IAFD-SHJR

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

**Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals**

**December 16,**

**20**

[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]