

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4, 20 2024

The Danbury Township Zoning Commission was called to order at 6:30 p.m. at the Danbury Township Meeting Room by Chair, Susan Dress. The pledge of allegiance was recited. The roll call showed the following present: Ms. Susan Dress, Ms. Jodi Kopanski, Mr. Vito Kaminskas, Mr. Strauss, and Ms. Barbara Singer. Mr. Tuttamore and Mr. Huber were excused. Ms. Kathryn Dale, Zoning and Planning Administrator, and Dawn Connor, Zoning Assistant, were also present.

Approval of the November 6, 2024, Minutes

The Chair asked if all the Commission Members had had an opportunity to review the minutes from the last meeting. All indicated they had. Ms. Dress asked if there were any corrections or modifications. Mr. Strauss made a motion to approve the minutes from the November 6, 2024 meeting. Ms. Kopanski seconded the motion. All Ayes. The motion carried.

Public Hearing

There was none.

Unfinished Business

There was none.

New Business

There was none.

Other Business

Acceptance of By-Laws and 2025 Meeting Schedule

Ms. Dale advised the Commission Members that she had provided a copy of the bylaws and that there were no proposed changes. She stated they could make a motion to accept the bylaws. She also said that a copy of the proposed meeting schedule for 2025 and deadline dates had also been provided. No meeting dates appeared to conflict with 2025 holidays. Meetings around the holidays in January and July could be changed or cancelled if there were no hearings and nothing on the agenda. The Commission Members were reminded that as part of the zoning code and the bylaws, if a member lived or owned property within a certain radius of an application that had been submitted, they would automatically have to recuse themselves. Each member was provided with a map of their property and the surrounding properties that fall within the radius. They were additionally advised that if an application came in outside that radius, but was within their neighborhood or there was some other reason that they did not want to be involved in that decision, it was the Commission Member's prerogative to recuse themselves as well. Ms. Dale then asked if they were ready to make a motion on the bylaws and 2025 calendar. Mr. Kaminskas made a motion and Ms. Kopanski seconded the motion to accept the bylaws and 2025 meeting schedule. All Commission Members were in favor and the motion carried.

Election of Officers

Per the bylaws, Ms. Dale advised the Commission that the Chair, Vice-Chair and Secretary can be elected to that same position for a maximum of three consecutive years, after which then they had to abstain for a least one full year before being elected back to that same position. She stated that this was the first year for the current officers. She stated that the Commission could open the floor to nominations or reelect the same officers.

The Commission Members discussed amongst themselves. Ms. Singer made a motion that all positions would stay the same for 2025. Mr. Strauss seconded the motion. All Commission Members were in favor and the motion carried. For 2025, Ms. Dress will remain the Chair, Ms. Kopanski will remain the Vice-Chair and Mr. Kaminskas will remain the Secretary.

Work Session on Storage Regulations:

Ms. Dale provided possible language for a section 4.20 "Storage Areas" of the Danbury Township zoning resolution to cover existing and future storage facilities. She presented a visual display on the TV monitor of the GIS Mapping program of the properties in Danbury Township. In this display, for every property that had received a storage permit or was part of a plan for "Future Buildings", she had entered in their permit information or "Future Building" building footprint of each building, including their square footage size. At the November 6, 2024, Zoning Commission meeting, the Commission had asked her to look at parcels that are five acres or more by zoning district. In the display, Ms. Dale showed where vacant zoned parcels of five acres or more were located, that are zoned "R-C" (Recreational Commercial) and "C-2" (General Commercial) and could potentially be used for storage or any other commercial use. Ms. Dale went on to highlight several properties where there was ample room for expansion for additional storage buildings. She pointed out one property on the main 269 corridor that currently has two buildings on it, a permit for four more buildings and a proposal for

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4, 2024

nine additional buildings. Ms. Dale then zoomed out to show a map of Danbury Township showing that most of the commercial vacant land is along the main corridors. Ms. Dale then had the Commission Members refer to an Excel sheet that had been provided outlining 77-79 properties for storage that they know are coming or are already built. These properties were listed by their lot size. The first block shows properties under one acre, with the average acreage at just over one-half acre. The next block shows properties between one and two acres. The average size of these properties is one and one-half acre. Ms. Dale stated when looking at the remaining blocks on the excel sheet, with each block showing larger acreage, the average acreage for all 78 properties is three and one-half acres. Ms. Dale explained her concern that if a five-acre minimum was set for storage, it is more restrictive than what you find for all the existing storage and proposed average properties.

Ms. Dress stated that on the other hand, it would take away a lot of the pressure in trying to control it. If the Commission stated that future storage developments could only be built on properties that are four acres or greater, it would cut out a lot that could be built. Ms. Dale answered that some of the properties, which may have a unique configuration and are under five acres, could possibly have storage placed at the back end of the property away from the main drive and that would not be terrible. Ms. Dale went on to state her concern is about creating too many nonconformities by requiring more acreage than the average lot size if the Commission were to increase the acreage minimums.

Ms. Singer asked if the suggestion would be to look at plots of land that are 3.5 acres or higher. Ms. Dale answered that it would end up including a lot more property to include vacant land, not just properties that have space available. Ms. Dale then showed the Commission, on the visual display, the properties that would encompass those parameters. Ms. Singer went on to inquire about how far someone would be able to haul their boat. Ms. Kopanski stated there were really two separate issues when comparing boat storage with mini storage units. Boat storage is going to require large, tall buildings that require the maneuverability to get the boats inside, which limits the number of buildings that can be built based on the available land on a particular property. Mini storage is smaller and can be crammed together which allows many more individual buildings to be placed on the same sized property. Ms. Kopanski went on to say that it appears that the storage that is being proposed looks to be more mini-storage than large boat-storage buildings or storage condos.

Ms. Dale pointed out another commercially zoned property on East Harbor Road that had been subdivided into three lots. The owner's remaining lot is in a "T" shape and the owner is planning to build a 15,000 square foot building across the back himself. That property is under five acres. She pointed out a couple of additional properties that are under five acres and could be developed for storage.

Ms. Kopanski questioned that maybe the Commission needed to put a square footage restriction, instead of an acreage restriction. She stated a floor area ratio may be more conducive because it would allow a property owner to construct a building, but not massive in size. Ms. Singer agreed, stating that the building would be proportional to the lot size and be pushed to the back of the property. Ms. Kopanski went on to state that it would give owners the option of one building that might be big enough for their needs and a bigger property could have more buildings.

Ms. Dale then pointed out another concern of setting a five-acre minimum is that there are a lot more properties zoned commercially and by setting that high of a minimum, it would essentially be taking a potential use away. She explained that she would prefer it if the Commission were going to set a minimum acreage, that they use the average of the properties, so as not to create a lot of nonconforming situations.

Ms. Dale went on to give an additional option which is to forego a minimum acreage size and focus more on the setback and percentage of the lot. She showed the Commission in a chart that she had broken down the parcels by acreage and then calculated the average floor area ratios based on that acreage. The average floor area ratio, building size to lot size, is 28%. This means they are using basically 28% of the lot on average under one acre. They are using 14% of the lot on average for between one and two acres. Those ratios adjust accordingly with the more acreage you have. The average floor area ratio based on all properties is 20%.

Ms. Singer stated that it will get the Commission closer to the one-third, one-third, one-third designation idea they talked about last month and closer to the desired square footage where the storage must fit the size of the lot and have better setbacks. Ms. Kopanski pointed out that the setback, landscaping and buffering did not necessarily have to be trees and shrubs, it could be other types of landscaping that hides the storage behind.

Ms. Dale said she had wanted to look at what the average depth was for the lots and what their average setback was. She stated that the average lot depth of a property that is under an acre is 220 feet, and the average setback is 104 feet. They are basically setting back 48%, or almost halfway back on the lot, for under an acre. She asked for additional time to continue that exercise to see what the average was for all 78 properties. Ms. Dress proposed that perhaps there could be a setback requirement that varies with the lot size. Ms. Dale pointed out that although she has not completed this exercise, some properties which are one to two-acre properties come in with a setback that is 50%-72% back the depth

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4, 20 2024

of the lot. Ms. Dale then asked for clarification on how the Commission wanted her to measure properties that are very deep. The options were to measure from their private streets or to the main streets. Ms. Kopanski questioned whether these property owners would be putting their own road through the property, if that road were an actual roadway and if their setbacks would start from that roadway. Ms. Dale affirmed all those statements. Ms. Singer stated that the setbacks from the major thoroughfares were more important than from a private road. Ms. Dale pointed out that the setback averages would have a dramatic difference based on the setback from the main road or from the private roads. Ms. Kopanski pointed out that some of the setbacks, if they were based solely on the main thoroughfares, would not take into consideration a property that does not butt up to a main road, but would need to be setback from other lots.

Ms. Singer countered that a configuration like that would lend itself well to residential development like barndominiums and it would be nice to tackle housing with these requirements, as well. Ms. Dale affirmed that residential is permitted in the commercial zoning districts. She went on to explain that in the visual she was showing, the vacant area she was showing was under the same ownership and equated to more than five acres, but each individual lot on their own was under five acres. That particular property could be reconfigured because it is owned by one person.

Ms. Kopanski stated that in looking at properties on the main thoroughfares, the setbacks were particularly important. She went on to say that if you are looking at a setback from a private road though, it may not be as important, because you don't know what the lots in front will be. There could be a lot of different things to include residential, restaurants, etc.

Ms. Dale went on to state there are a lot of smaller properties that are zoned commercial. There can be drastic differences in averages based on how they are calculated. Ms. Singer suggested that if a proposed storage building were on a major thoroughfare, that specific setbacks be instituted along with a restriction on building it towards the back of the lot near the owner's private road and desire to have a different type of buffer in front of it. Ms. Dale pointed out a particular property area that based on how it is configured, the back of the lot would be Rte. 269. Ms. Kopanski stated it would depend on where your frontage is. Dependent on whether it is the main thoroughfare, or the private road makes a difference. Ms. Kopanski also said that some lots could not use the main thoroughfare as their frontage. Ms. Dale and Ms. Kopanski recognized that some areas on Rte. 269 would change based on the planned roundabout that will be installed in 2025.

Ms. Singer stated she believes that specifying the percentage of property, set back from major thoroughfare according to size and proportion of the lot, gets the Commission closer to their goal, which is both fair and a better standard. Ms. Dale adjusted her visual to show the front yard setback, principal street frontage and how far they are from a major thoroughfare. The Commission would need to agree on what streets would constitute a major thoroughfare. Ms. Kopanski did address small private roads that only lead to their own property and their own storage. Ms. Singer suggested having a caveat that if the storage is off a private road, requiring a minimum setback and landscaping. Ms. Dale expressed this is already set in the zoning code.

Ms. Singer continued that she is not opposed to putting the 3.5 acre minimum in place, as it seems fair and in the middle when considering the storage property averages. She believes it will make it a little more difficult for someone to just put storage and contribute to the storage sprawl everyone keeps seeing. It also gives a generous buffer from private or major thoroughfares if they are putting it back away. Ms. Dale voiced her concern again that basing it on five acres, when the average is 3.5 acres, would be creating quite a few nonconforming situations. Ms. Dress asked for clarification that if there was damage to the property, such as a building burning to the ground, they would have to get a variance in order to rebuild. Ms. Dale answered in the affirmative and said that if you were talking about the average based on her visual, 51 properties would become nonconforming. Ms. Singer suggested that instead of looking at the average, that the Commission should look at the frequency. She stated that if the minimum acreage were set as low as three acres, it would lower the number of properties that would be nonconforming, based on what they hope to accomplish with the Land Use Plan, but more would be conforming. Ms. Dale figured out the standard deviation which is 3.49. Ms. Singer stated it was a more accurate mean for statistical variation, but was not a measure of frequency. Ms. Singer continued that she is more concerned about what portion was going to be nonconforming and her belief that the bulk of storage tends to be on property that is three acres or higher, with the mean average being 3.5 acres. Ms. Dale said that if they went to 3.0 acres, it would cause thirty-nine properties to become nonconforming, as opposed to 51. Ms. Dale stated that she would need to do some additional research if they were going to put a percentage of property or setback in place, but if they were going to do a minimum acreage size, the current research shows that at 3.49 acres would be sufficient. Ms. Kopanski stated that 3.0 acres would probably be better because it would lower the nonconforming numbers by an additional ten or eleven properties out of it.

Ms. Singer expressed that she still has concerns about marinas; the storage they require due to the size of their land and commercial land available around them. Ms. Dale pointed out several of the marina properties and stated none of the marinas in Danbury Township have available property next

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4, 2024

door to them. Ms. Dress asked if they wanted to build additional storage if it would have to be built completely off site. Ms. Dale confirmed it would because very few are over 3.5 or 5 acres. Ms. Kopanski pointed out that some marinas own property, but it is not on the main marina property. There was discussion regarding some marinas having vacant areas on the property, but those spots are not big enough to put a storage building on.

The Commission focused on one marina, off North Shore Blvd., which owns storage property on the south side of that road. The existing storage buildings and property are on land that is zoned part commercial and part residential. When you are looking at setbacks, one building would conform and the other two would not. That piece of property runs from North Shore to Rte. 163. Ms. Dale pointed out that it was a perfect example of a property having possible frontages on two main thoroughfares and how you determine which is their primary road. Even though the current configuration has their frontage on North Shore Blvd., there is nothing to stop them from coming off from Rte. 163. Ms. Singer said this was the importance of having setbacks off the major thoroughfares. Ms. Dale stated with a piece of land such as this one, with both borders being major thoroughfares, the buildings would have to be constructed in the middle of the property. She also expressed her concern with giving a property owner a fair amount and reasonable setback since they are getting "double socked" due to their location between two major roads. Ms. Kopanski countered that with a property such as this, the property owner could argue that the shortages are in the front part of that property. If they wanted to put houses in the back, there would be a weird island of storage in the middle. Ms. Dale then said that you would have to drive through a residential area to get to the storage. Ms. Kopanski stated that as it currently stood, that piece of property does not have access to Rte. 163 and the owner would have to be approved for access. There is also no access from the side of the property because of the private residential street with houses there.

Ms. Dale advised the Commission that she would map out the vacant three-acre parcels and continue with the setback information in her chart. Ms. Singer asked about square footage ratio to the size of the land. Ms. Dale stated that the average to that was 20%. Ms. Dale said the Commission would need to decide on a potential setback amount for major thoroughfares. That setback figure could then be used to take a couple of sample properties and see what that would look like if an owner is only allowed to use the back 20% of their property. Ms. Dress pointed out that everyone would need to keep in mind that with the average Floor Area Ratio of 20%, an owner would be restricted to 20% of the property to include the buildings and infrastructure. All the infrastructure - roads, parking, and entrances - would be included in that 20%. Ms. Dale used a current storage facility, with future buildings planned, to illustrate what this would look like on their property. She stated the current zoning codes state that their buildings cannot occupy more than 60% of their property. Once you take into consideration all the driveways, concrete, pavement, and everything else, 100% of their property is developed. Ms. Dale asked if you limit them to 20% that can be developed for storage and the average floor ratio is 20%, does that include the infrastructure too? Ms. Dress stated that if you do, it leaves them only 15% for buildings. Ms. Dale responded that if the restriction were for 33% of the property, with the average building square footage of 80,000 and all the driveways and everything, it would probably get them to about 20% average for the buildings.

Ms. Singer asked about the current setback for major thoroughfares. Ms. Dale responded that for "R-C" it is 40 feet and for "C-2" it is 50 feet. Ms. Singer queried if it would be restrictive or discriminatory if the setback was changed to 60 or 75 feet. Ms. Dale stated that that it had been changed to 40 feet and 50 feet from the original 70 feet based on the average setback seen through all the commercial buildings in Danbury Township. Ms. Singer then asked if just considering property that was going to be used for storage, could they put a bigger setback on those properties to 75 feet or 80 feet? Ms. Dale answered that it would not be discriminatory against storage, because any new storage properties were going to be put in as Conditional Use. This will require them to go before the Board of Zoning Appeals and the Commission can make greater setbacks on a Conditional Use property, similar to what is done for campgrounds and resorts. Ms. Singer asked what the setback was for those properties. Ms. Dale answered that she believed it was 60 feet. Ms. Singer responded that maybe it would be okay to require a 75 feet setback and some landscaping buffer. Ms. Dale stated that it could be done because it is going into the conditional use category.

Ms. Kopanski then stated that the Commission is worried about storage sprawl. She pondered if the Commission is more worried about the number of buildings or having them everywhere. Ms. Kopanski said if they add these conditions onto the building of storage, instead of one property with ten buildings, you could have three properties with three buildings on each. The Commission needs to consider which is more important when looking at sprawl. If they want to limit the amount of storage buildings or where they can be built. They must be careful because it could potentially cause more sprawl by saying you cannot put all these buildings on the same property. Ms. Kopanski expressed her concern that it could possibly be making this a wider area covered with storage, when you might have originally only had one property on the street that had nine buildings and now you have three properties with three buildings each. Ms. Singer said if they have a five-acre parcel and there is a 75-foot setback

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4, 20 2024

with landscaping buffer, those bigger lots have a chance to be dense. Ms. Dale countered that then you would be getting away from a percentage and the Commission could just leave the current regulations as they are and just increase the setback. They could still make it a Conditional Use and it would not be as easy for them to get approved administratively. The regulations from "R-C" and "C-2" would be the same, but with a bumped-up setback. Ms. Singer stated if the Commission stuck with a three-acre minimum lot size and had a 75-foot setback, with total build including roads, this would get them to 33%. Ms. Kopanski responded by stating you still might be causing more sprawl by limiting them on how much of the property they can use. If the owner wants a certain number of buildings, they are going to get them no matter what. They can buy one property and put a multitude of storage buildings on them, or several properties with a limited amount of storage buildings on each. Ms. Singer emphasized that the main concern must be whether the goal is to have big complexes in a few places or a scattering according to where the needs are. Ms. Kopanski agreed and stated the Commission needed to look at where the sprawl could occur and what the better option would be to make it more attractive to the community. Ms. Singer expressed her concern that there would still be mega-centers on the bigger plots of land and still get the sprawl in the smaller lot sizes. She continued that there could be a third scenario where both situations happen and the need to find a way to restrict them both. Ms. Kopanski agreed but continued that the restrictions had to be made in a way as to not create more problems when trying to solve the original problem.

Ms. Dress asked if there was any way to encourage storage developments to follow the layout of several others where there is a strip of office/retail buildings in the foreground with the storage units behind that. Ms. Dale answered that the Commission could not specify that it must be used for a retail center. She explained that the Commission could bump up the setback in this new Section 4.20 of the Zoning Resolution where it provides standards for the establishment of storage areas, marinas and developments for self-serving storage or personal property. They could, however, put in a purpose statement that the intent is to get storage buildings off the main thoroughfares into the back of the properties and encourage another permitted commercial development up front. The purpose statement would still require regulations to make that happen. Ms. Dress said maybe they could put a "sweetener" in that if plans included alternate commercial uses on the front of the property, that the restrictions or setbacks for the storage buildings could be decreased. The visual from the road is what we are concerned about, we would not care how close the storage building would be behind that. Discussion continued between Commission Members regarding a current building that is close to the roadway and serves as a showroom for boat sales. Ms. Kopanski questioned whether that would be considered retail or storage because it serves both functions. Ms. Dress and Ms. Singer both stated it would be considered retail because people driving by would realize it was an indoor place to shop for a boat and not just a building to store them. Ms. Dress again pointed out that a nice appearance from the road is what the Commission is ultimately looking for.

Ms. Dale had the Commission Members look at a current storage facility with retail on the front that is set off the main roadway and advised that the retail strip is set 240 feet from the road right of way. Ms. Singer pointed out that half of that 240 foot was buffer, which was nice, and the other half was the parking lot. Ms. Dale measured the distance between the road right of way and the first storage unit behind the retail center at about 400 ft back. She stated this is where property depth comes into play and no two properties are the same. Ms. Dale pointed out a similar property across the street, where the retail strip is only 82 feet off the road and the closest storage building is 205 feet back. She explained the difficulty regarding setbacks because no two properties were going to be exactly the same. Ms. Kopanski stated that lot depth was going to be an issue. Ms. Dale said that setbacks may need to be based on a percentage of lot depth.

Ms. Kopanski remarked that the Land Use Plan would be reviewed in 2025 and one of the criteria is whether a proposed project conforms to the Land Use Plan. She questioned that if the Commission's intent were to get storage off the main thoroughfares and that intent is included in the Land Use Plan, would it give them the leeway to look at each property and vary the restrictions based on how they are conforming to that intent. Ms. Kopanski emphasized that the Commission needed to make sure that storage intent is included in the Land Use Plan when it is revised.

Ms. Singer questioned whether it would be reasonable if they had a 100 ft. setback from the main thoroughfares, 50 ft. from private roads and then a 33% build to percentage of the property including driveways and everything. She stated her belief that if the setbacks were 100 ft., it did not matter if the buildings were at the back of the property or in the middle which would give more flexibility with strangely situated lots. She recognized that 100 ft. might not be the correct number, but wants the storage pushed back, preferably with a landscaping buffer between the businesses and the roadway. Ms. Dale pointed out another property where the storage building is 110 ft. from the roadway. She explained her concern that if the setbacks were placed at 100 feet, a property such as this would not be able to fit any commercial business in front of it; with parking around it and the storage building behind that.

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4⁰ 2024

Ms. Kopanski expressed her concern about making existing properties nonconforming and whether the Commission was okay with that. Ms. Singer recognized that they were going to have to deal with a percentage of nonconforming, no matter what the restrictions are, but it would aid in accomplishing the appearance from thoroughfares. Ms. Singer stated that if they set the minimum to three acres, it would give more people the possibility to continue to make a living with storage, but also would protect property values. With the expansion of residential projects, protecting the community and their residential values should be important to the Commission. Ms. Singer said that what the Commission is doing is protecting the Land Use Plan, but also focusing on already zoned "R-C" and "C-2" properties. Anything zoned agricultural already has some protection under the Land Use Plan.

Ms. Dale concluded that she would research three-acre parcels, along with proposed setbacks and percentages for storage building coverage.

The Commission Members had discussion on the area needed to maneuver a boat into a storage building and what the minimum setback could be for that to be functional.

Mr. Kaminskas referred to the Land Use Plan and asked if what the Commission was trying to ultimately solve was a developer buying a large piece of agricultural land and having it converted to commercial to put storage buildings on it. He questioned the restrictions on future commercial property and the struggle to be fair to owners of existing commercial properties. He stated he sees this as a project for future agricultural land that may get converted into commercial property. Ms. Dale answered that if the property were rezoned, and new restrictive language was in place, they would have to follow those restrictions.

Ms. Dress requested that when the Land Use Plan was reviewed/revised that a caveat be added that as a community, we recognize that agriculture is disappearing, along with the ability to make a living on it, but we desire agricultural land to go to residential zoning instead of commercial. It would not prevent farmers from selling their land, but it would change the type of developer they would be selling to. If that developer asked to have that property changed to commercial, it can be denied based on the Land Use Plan and the Conditional Use provisions. Mr. Kaminskas stated that a potential developer would be aware of these tougher restrictions and may decide to purchase land somewhere else. He recognized the difficulty in how to manage existing commercial properties, so those owners don't get injured. Ms. Dale agreed that looking at the averages would help to resolve that. Ms. Kopanski pointed out that these properties being deemed "conditional use" would add more obstacles to a potential buyer, in their plans to develop that property.

Ms. Dale directed the Commission to look at a large piece of property that was recently sold. She stated that she did not see it staying agricultural, and strongly suggested that the Commission be more specific if they found it acceptable to be changed to residential. She pointed out another large parcel that was zoned as commercial in the Land Use Plan because the original intent was to have it be a recreational area. A potential buyer would see that "R-C" zoning and lean toward commercial instead of recreational. Ms. Dale emphasized the need to possibly change some of these large swaths of land, along with some prime pieces of waterfront property, from "R-C" to residential to prevent the building of commercial businesses on that land. The same might need to be done for other agricultural land that due to its proximity to existing neighborhoods, would need to be zoned for some type of residential use. Ms. Kopanski suggested the possibility of zoning it agricultural/residential if there was more than one use that could be appropriate for it. Ms. Singer agreed, stating if that land was not going to be used for farming, keeping some of it open, with houses that sit on larger lots, would be ideal to retain the open land feel. Ms. Kopanski put forth the possibility of granting more leeway than the 33% to a developer who agrees to leave a portion of the property undeveloped. It does not have to be landscaped, it could also just be habitat with natural vegetation and wildlife. Ms. Singer agreed that habitat containing wildlife is an important tourist attraction in this area.

Ms. Dale stated that these things needed to be considered when reviewing/revising the Land Use Plan. The Commission will need to reconsider rural development, with a potential focus on residential instead of neighborhood commercial as an appropriate use for that. Ms. Singer concurred and hoped that it would help with attracting more year-round residents to the area.

Reports and Communications from Members and Staff

Mr. Strauss announced his resignation from the Zoning Commission effective at the end of the month. Ms. Dale and the other Commission Members thanked him for his years of voluntary service to the community. Ms. Dress asked about alternates to fill his position and was advised that a recommendation would be given to the Trustees to elect one of them to fill the vacant position.

Public Comments Regarding Zoning Items Not on the Agenda.

There was none.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4, 20 2024

Adjournment

The Chair asked for a motion to adjourn. Ms. Kopanski moved to adjourn the meeting and Ms. Singer seconded the motion. All Ayes. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.

Kathryn A Dale
RECORDING SECRETARY

Susan Dress
Susan Dress

Jodi Kopanski
Jodi Kopanski

Vito Kaminskas
Vito Kaminskas

Robert Strauss
Barbara Singer
ZONING COMMISSION

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

Danbury Township Zoning Commission

DAYTON LEGAL BLANK, INC., FORM NO. 10148

Held

December 4th

2024

[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]