

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

GOVERNMENT FORMS &amp; SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

Held \_\_\_\_\_

January 21, 2026

The Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Chair, Sherry Roberts at the Township Hall. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

The roll call showed the following members present: Chair, Sherry Roberts, Secretary, Joseph Fetzer, Member, Clyde Shetler, Member, Joseph Kruse, Alternate, Jim Switzer, Vice Chair, Greg Huffman and Alternate, Julie Cottingham were excused. Ms. Kathryn Dale, Zoning & Planning Administrator, and Dawn Connor, Zoning Assistant, were also present.

Visitors present included William Beckman, Maggie Beckman, William Beatty, John Feick, and Tim Walsh.

Ms. Dale advised that the Election of Officers would be moved to after the hearings of the evening had taken place.

Ms. Dale read the rules of order for the meeting proceedings.

The Chair asked Ms. Dale if all the documents relating to the cases had been received and were in proper order. She indicated that they were. The Chair swore in Ms. Dale.

The Chair introduced the first case of the evening.

### Adjudication Hearing

Case BZA #2026-001

198 Leddy Lane

William Beckman, Owner/Applicant

#### **Request for an Area Variance to Section 5.1.7 to allow for a front porch addition to encroach into the front-yard setback (20' required/ 13' 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. Mr. Fetzer moved, and Mr. Shetler seconded the motion to open the public hearing. All were in favor and the motion carried.

Ms. Dale stated the applicant is proposing to construct an 8' x 12' covered front porch addition to the east of an existing 8' x 12' covered porch, which will encroach into the front yard. The proposed porch addition overhang will be 13' from the east, front property line where 20' is required. The porch will result in being 16' x 12'. The property owner came before the BZA in Case# 2020-038 for a 2-story addition to encroach into the required north, side-yard setback (1' proposed/ 5' required) and exceed the 40% lot coverage (44% proposed). These variances were approved at that time, but also at that time, the owner only owned the lot that the house sits on (Lot 21). In 2022, the property owner acquired Lot 20 to the north with the detached garage and subsequently consolidated the lots. Once the lots were consolidated, the prior variances that were approved in 2020 were no longer necessary and essentially a moot issue. Ms. Dale concluded by reviewing the decision criteria the Board would be considering during their deliberations.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for Ms. Dale.

The Chair called upon the applicant to come forward and be sworn in.

**William Beckman, Owner, 198 Leddy Lane, Marblehead**, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Beckman reviewed the paperwork and stated it was as he had submitted. Mr. Beckman submitted a letter he had written to the Board for their consideration. It was marked as Applicant's Exhibit #3. Mr. Beckman then submitted a letter from his neighbor, Mark Scott of 199 N. Leddy Lane, in favor of granting the variance. It was marked as Applicant's Exhibit #4. Mr. Beckman said he bought the house in 2017 and three years later they added an addition to it that was in keeping with the cottage look. They did not change anything in the existing cottage at all. He asked the Board members to refer to the photos he had submitted with his application. He pointed out that the original porch is eight feet by twelve foot and eight foot deep. He said it was an entry walkway from the original cottage to get into the house. He showed in the picture that there was one chair and a small table there because there is not enough depth to put anything else. He said the door can only be opened so far because it hits the ceiling fan because of the height of the ceiling. He stated it was pretty much just a cover for the entry at the front of the house. He said when they added the two story addition, he extended the walkway to the driveway because the driveway was adjacent to the older cottage and it is also uncovered. From the driveway to the walkway into the house it only gives them two feet on either side of the door to put a chair or table to sit under the covered area. He said they are asking for the variance so they can come out eight feet from the overhang and extend only the front entrance or the cover for the front part. He said their street is wider than most and allows two cars to pass simultaneously from the north and south. Their porch would not impede any emergency vehicles or utilities to do any work if they get the variance. He said to sum it up, their porch area right now just does not have any room and is basically a walkway. He said he would be happy to answer any questions the Board may have for him.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for the applicant. There were none.

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

GOVERNMENT FORMS &amp; SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

Held

January 21, 2026

The Chair asked if there was anyone present with standing who wanted to testify. There was none.

**William Beatty, Owner, 201 Elizabeth, Marblehead**, came forward and was sworn in. He said that the applicant and he are back door neighbors, with the back of their houses being adjacent. He said he has done projects to his house including a garage and driveway. He said he and the applicant had worked on a number of projects together and he was just there to give support for granting the variance. He stated the variance would not have any effect on the other people on the street.

The Chair asked if there was anyone else who wanted to speak.

**Maggie Beatty, Owner, 198 Leddy, Marblehead**, came forward and was sworn in. She said she would really like to have the variance because when they have company or the neighbors come over, they could have an area to sit comfortably and converse.

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

Mr. Shetler motioned to recess into the executive session to deliberate the merits of the case. Mr. Fetzer seconded the motion, and the roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Kruse – yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes. The motion carried and the Board recessed at 6:21p.m.

Mr. Switzer moved, and Mr. Shetler seconded the motion to reconvene. The roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Kruse – yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes. The Board reconvened at 6:38p.m.

The Chair asked Ms. Dale to read the Findings of Fact for BZA Case #2026-001:

#### BZA MOTION & FINDINGS OF FACT

**With regard to BZA-2026-001 being a request for an Area Variance from Section 5.1.7 to allow for a porch addition to encroach into the east, front-yard setback (13' proposed/ 20' required) for the property located at 198 Leddy Lane.**

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 single-family residence.
2. The request **is** substantial because there are no other covered porches on this side of the street that encroach into the front-yard 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 the applicant owns the vacant lot to the south and there are decks and patios that encroach into the front setback, although they are not covered.
4. There is **no** indication the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage, etc.) because utilities exist, and any utility extensions or upgrades will require approval from the appropriate County agencies.
5. The applicant stated in their narrative statement that they were 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 the existing home and covered porch is right at the 20' setback requirement and any further extension would automatically require a variance for encroachment.
7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement **would** observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because there are no known negative impacts to surrounding properties.

Mr. Fetzer 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) (6) (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: Mr. Shetler. Roll Call Vote was as follows: Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Kruse – yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes. Vote 5-0 the motion carried.

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

GOVERNMENT FORMS &amp; SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

Held \_\_\_\_\_

January 21, 2026

The Chair stated that the application has been Approved, and the applicant can pick up permits following the Board's next meeting, which is February 18, 2026.

The Chair introduced the second case of the evening.

### Adjudication

Case BZA #2026-003

398 N. Erie Beach.

**Cypress Row Hospitality Group, LLC,**

**James Beardsley Owner/Applicant;**

**John Feick, Feick Design Group, Agent**

**Request for an Area Variance to Section 3.5 and Section 7.12.3.A. to allow for a vestibule addition to encroach into the south, front-yard setback (10' proposed/ 40' required).**

Ms. Roberts asked the Zoning Administrator to give an overview of the request.

Ms. Dale stated the property is part of the Wright's II Subdivision which was platted in 1903. The property was rezoned from "R-2" Suburban Residential to "C-2" General Commercial in November 2025 (ZC-2025-161). The applicant is proposing to remove the existing 6' x 8' canvas vestibule and replace it with a more permanently constructed 8' x 8' enclosed vestibule. The proposed vestibule will be 10' from the overhang to the south, front property line where 40' is required.

The existing grocery store structure was nonconforming under the former "R-2" Suburban Residential Zoning District because the use as a grocery store was not permitted and the building did not meet the front-yard setbacks. The building use as a grocery store became conforming as a result of the rezoning, however, the building structure remained nonconforming because it does not meet the front-yard setbacks of 40' for the "C-2" General Commercial Zoning District.

While the removal of the 6' x 8' vestibule and replacement with an 8' x 8' vestibule meets the permitted 20% addition onto a nonconforming structure, the last part of this language also states that the addition must meet the setback requirements. Had the applicant proposed to keep the vestibule as a 6' x 8' space and in the same location (11' distance from the south property line), they would have been allowed to remove and replace like for like with no variance necessary. However, since they are increasing the size of the vestibule, the additional 2' projection from the building and adding a 1' overhang, is why a variance needs to be received from the front-yard setback. The existing vestibule is 11' from the south, front property line and the new vestibule will be 1' closer to the south, front property line (due to the overhang) or 10' where 40' is required. Ms. Dale concluded by reviewing the decision criteria the Board would be considering during their deliberations.

The Chair asked if there were any questions for Ms. Dale. There were none.

The Chair called upon the applicant to come forward and be sworn in.

**John Feick, Agent, 224 E Water Street, Sandusky,** came forward and was sworn in.

Ms. Dale said that there needed to be a motion to open the hearing. Mr. Switzer made a motion, and it was seconded by Mr. Fetzer. All members were in favor.

Mr. Feick reviewed the paperwork and stated it was as he had submitted. Mr. Feick said they have an existing canvas shelter on the building that is not very substantial. It is open facing the West so when the wind blows, it is cold. When the interior door is open, it makes it cold inside. He said they are making big improvements to the interior of the store, and they have made big improvements to the appearance of the building. They would like to fix it so they can get rid of the big blast of cold air when the door opens by putting a permanent vestibule in. They are putting in an electronic door, so when you approach the exterior door, it opens and you step into the vestibule, and it closes behind you. They believe it will be a really big help for the interior, especially after they have all the other work done on the inside. He said that is the main reason for the variance request. They are hoping to have something that is permanent and will look like it has been part of the building as opposed to the little bit of canvas awning that has been there for all these years. He said the canvas does its job if it is raining, you can get to the door and open it up, but when you open it, you get a blast of cold air inside. He said the new permanent structure is the same size as the current structure with the addition of the roof edge being one foot further towards the road and one foot further towards the house. It will also come out into the parking lot two additional feet. He stated this is the main entrance and due to code requirements for making it ADA compliant, you have to have four feet past the leading edge of the door before you get to the next door. Mr. Feick said they are trying to keep it as small as possible, and it will not extend any further than the existing wall of the building. It will not be any closer to the road.

The Chair asked if there were any further questions for the applicant. There were none.

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

GOVERNMENT FORMS &amp; SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

Held

January 21, 2026

The Chair asked if there was anyone present with standing who wanted to testify. There was none.

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

Mr. Switzer motioned to recess into the executive session to deliberate the merits of the case. Mr. Fetzer seconded the motion, and the roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Kruse – yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes. The motion carried and the Board recessed at 6:51p.m.

Mr. Fetzer moved, and Mr. Kruse seconded the motion to reconvene. The roll call vote was as follows: Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Kruse – yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes. The Board reconvened at 7:07 p.m.

The Chair asked Ms. Dale to read the Findings of Fact for BZA Case #2026-003:

**BZA MOTION & FINDINGS OF FACT  
AREA VARIANCE**

**With regard to BZA-2026-003 being a request for an Area Variance from Section 3.5 and Section 7.12.3.A. to allow for a vestibule addition to encroach into the south, front-yard setback (10' proposed/ 40' required) for the property located at 398 Erie Beach.**

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 grocery store and any other use permitted in the C-2 General Commercial Zoning District.
2. The request **is not** substantial because the vestibule will be no closer to the south, front property line, with the exception of the new roof overhang than the existing vestibule. Additionally, the 2' extra in length (away from the building) will have no effect on their existing parking situation since the space is striped for handicap loading and not technically a parking space.
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 aforementioned in Decision Standard #2 above.
4. There is **no** indication the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage, etc.) because utilities exist, and any utility extensions or upgrades will require approval from the appropriate County agencies.
5. The applicant stated in their narrative statement that they were not aware of the zoning restrictions at the time they purchased the property in April 2025 because there was an existing vestibule. However, the property owner is aware that zoning exists in the Township as a result of their recent rezoning and other permits they have received for improvements to the property.
6. The property owner's predicament **cannot** feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance because this is the primary entrance into the store and the existing structure is nonconforming. Any outward improvements would likely result in variances being needed.
7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement **would** be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because there are no known negative impacts to the 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) (6) (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: Mr. Fetzer. Roll Call Vote was as follows: Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Kruse – yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Ms. Roberts – yes. Vote 5-0 the motion carried.

The Chair stated that the application has been Approved, and the applicant can pick up permits following the Board's next meeting, which is February 18, 2026.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

GOVERNMENT FORMS & SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

Held January 21, 2026

Approval of Board of Zoning Appeals
December 17, 2025, Regular Meeting Minutes

Mr. Fetzer made a motion to approve the December 17, 2025, regular meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Switzer seconded the motion. All were in favor, motion carried.

Signing of Decision Sheets

Mr. Shetler motioned for approval of the decision sheet as presented. Mr. Kruse seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.

- a. BZA-2025-270 1501 S. Danbury N. Request for a Conditional Use in accordance with Section 3.4 and Section 4.16 for a 100-campsite Recreational Camp/Campground. Also requesting Area Variances to Section 4.16.2.C to reduce the front (70' required/40' proposed) & side (45' required/ 20' proposed) yard setback; Section 4.16.2.D to reduce the access entries (50' required/30' proposed); Section 4.16.2.F to reduce the open space (2.72ac. required/ 1.84ac. proposed); Section 4.16.3.C to reduce the perimeter campsite setback to 2' & 5' (8' required). DB Development Group LLC./Owner; Keith Brown & James Davenport, Agents

Unfinished Business

Ms. Roberts stated she was elected to be Chair for 2026 at the last meeting. She stated she would like to step down and nominate Mr. Huffman as Chair and Mr. Fetzer as Vice-Chair. She asked Mr. Shetler and Mr. Kruse if either would like to be Secretary. Mr. Shetler nominated Mr. Kruse. Ms. Roberts asked for a second to the nominations. Mr. Shetler seconded it. All members were in favor and the nominations passed. The 2026 Board of Zoning Appeals will have Mr. Huffman, Chair, Mr. Fetzer, Vice-Chair and Mr. Kruse, Secretary.

New Business

There was none.

Other Business

There was none.

Reports and Communications from Members and Staff

Ms. Dale said she had given the Board Member two pages from the zoning code that need to be replaced in their books. One is the front cover and the second is the zoning map which was updated from some cases that finished in January and were recorded. She said if the Board Members wanted a copy of the Annual Report, they could come into the office for a copy of it or it was available online. She said they were down 39 permits since last year. Mr. Switzer said Lakeside had eighty applications and only twelve came before their board. Ms. Dale said there does seem to be a slow down in the market. Houses are sitting for sale longer. The stock market has been up and down and may have people on edge. People may be holding onto their money in case of an emergency or need. You can see it in the zoning permits that people are not doing the big projects. Ms. Dale said that it was okay because she was going to be working on the Land Use Plan.

Ms. Roberts asked if there were any updates on the Bilton Property. Ms. Dale said there were none. Ms. Roberts asked if there was a time limit on the removal. Ms. Dale said they would be working with counsel on that. Mr. Shetler asked about a different property on Saylor. Ms. Dale said there was nothing new on that either.

Adjournment

Mr. Fetzer moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Shetler seconded the motion. All in attendance were in favor and the motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

Kathryn A Dale
RECORDING SECRETARY

Sherry Roberts

Joseph Fetzer

Clyde Shetler

Joseph Kruse

James Switzer

Board of Zoning Appeals

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**

Minutes of

Meeting

**Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals**

GOVERNMENT FORMS & SUPPLIES 844-224-3338 FORM NO. 10148

Held \_\_\_\_\_

**January 21, 2026**

[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]