

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

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

February 18, 2026

Held \_\_\_\_\_

The Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals Meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair, Greg Huffman at the Township Hall. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

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 #2026-013  
8666 Northshore Blvd.**

**Daniel & Genevieve Donich, Owners/Applicants**

**Request for an Area Variance from Section 5.2.1.A.i.b to allow for more cumulative accessory building space than permitted (1,200s.f. allowed/ 2,000s.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. 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 attach the existing detached garage to the existing house via an 8' x 10' breezeway, lessening the amount of detached accessory building space on the property. The applicant is then proposing to construct a 40' x 40' (1,600s.f.) detached pole barn to the south of the existing garage which will also have a 10' extended roof overhang or porch placed on the front (400s.f.). The total cumulative accessory building square footage will result in 2,000s.f. where 1,200s.f. is the maximum allowed. All other zoning requirements related to lot coverage, setbacks and building height for the structure are satisfied. 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. Mr. Shetler asked if the variance was required because of the percentage based on the house and existing buildings. Ms. Dale said it was not. She said this zoning district is R-1 and that zoning district requires a maximum of 1,200 square feet of accessory building space. She stated, by the applicant taking the existing detached garage and attaching it to the house via the breezeway, that all now becomes part of the house. Right now, it is an accessory building because it stands alone. He eliminates the square footage of that garage as an accessory building space because of the breezeway connection. The only accessory building space he will have now will be this new building. Mr. Shetler then asked to confirm that the limit would be 1,200 square feet. Ms. Dale confirmed that it was.

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

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

**Daniel Donich, Owner, 8666 Northshore, Marblehead**, came forward and was sworn in. Mr. Donich reviewed the paperwork and stated it was as he had submitted.

Mr. Donich said he was not sure where to go with this because it was all new to him. He said he is just trying to clean up his end of the neighborhood and secure things that belong to him. He said he has a good relationship with all of his neighbors, and they do not seem to have a problem with what he is planning. He said he is not trying to make money off of this building or anything, it is for his own personal items. He said he has been a member of the community for a long time and had served on the Danbury Fire Department. He stated he has always tried to be a member in good standing here. He said he did not really know what else to say. He said he was just trying to be honest and have the ability to store his goods and keep his wife happy especially since he bought his wife a Mustang GT for Christmas and it has to sit outside.

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

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

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

Ms. Cottingham motioned to recess into the executive session to deliberate the merits of the case. Mr. Switzer seconded the motion, and the roll call vote was as follows: Ms. Cottingham – yes; Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Shetler– yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Mr. Huffman - yes. The motion carried and the Board recessed at 6:16 p.m.

## RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

## Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

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

Held

February 18, 2026

Ms. Cottingham moved, and Mr. Switzer seconded the motion to reconvene. The roll call vote was as follows: Ms. Cottingham – yes; Mr. Switzer –yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer – yes; Mr. Huffman– yes. The Board reconvened at 6:30 p.m.

The Chair asked Ms. Dale to read the Findings of Fact for BZA Case #2026-013:

**BZA MOTION & FINDINGS OF FACT**

**With regard to BZA-2026-013 being a request for an Area Variance from Section 5.2.1.A.i.b to allow for more cumulative accessory building space than permitted (1,200s.f. allowed/ 2,000s.f. proposed) for the property located at 8666 Northshore Blvd.:**

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 and is permitted to have an accessory structure on the property.
2. The request **is not** substantial because the owner is taking the steps necessary to reduce the need for additional variances by removing an encroachment into the setbacks on the existing garage and attaching the smaller 2-car garage to the house via a breezeway.
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 other detached accessory buildings in the surrounding area as well as commercial storage buildings that are much larger. This additional building will also allow for the property owner to properly store utility trailers, a camper and other items now being stored outside, inside this new building.
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 because the property has been in the family since 1990.
6. The property owner's predicament **can** feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance because this is new construction and could be built to meet the size requirement.
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. 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) ( 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: Mr. Shetler. Roll Call Vote was as follows: Ms. Cottingham– yes; Mr. Switzer – yes; Mr. Shetler – yes; Mr. Fetzer– yes; Mr. Huffman – yes. Vote 5-0 the motion carried.

The Chair stated that the application has been Approved. Mr. Fetzer requested that the Board be allowed to sign the decision sheet tonight. Ms. Dale said they could and it would be done when the decision sheets from last month's meeting were signed. Ms. Dale advised the applicant that the Zoning office would be in touch with him the next day.

**Approval of Board of Zoning Appeals  
January 21, 2026, Regular Meeting Minutes**

Mr. Fetzer made a motion to approve the January 21, 2026, regular meeting minutes as presented. Mr. Switzer seconded the motion. All were in favor, motion carried.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Minutes of

Meeting

Danbury Township Board of Zoning Appeals

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

February 18, 2026

Held

Signing of Decision Sheets

Mr. Switzer motioned for approval of the decision sheet as presented. Ms. Cottingham seconded. All were in favor and the motion carried.

- a. **BZA-2026-001 198 Leddy Lane.** 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). **William Beckman, Owner.**
- b. **BZA-2026-003 398 N. Erie Beach.** 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). **Cypress Row Hospitality Group, LLC – James Beardsley Owner/Applicant; John Feick, Feick Design Group, Agent.**
- c. **BZA-2026-013 8666 Northshore Blvd.** Request for an Area Variance from Section 5.2.1.A.i.b to allow for more cumulative accessory building space than permitted (1,200s.f. allowed/ 2,000s.f. proposed). **Daniel & Genevieve Donich, Owner/Applicant.**

Unfinished Business

There was none.

New Business

There was none.

Other Business

There was none.

Reports and Communications from Members and Staff

There was none.

Adjournment

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

The meeting was adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

*Kathryn A Dale*  
RECORDING SECRETARY

*Greg Huffman*  
Greg Huffman

*Joseph R. Fetzer*  
Joseph Fetzer

*Clyde Shetler*  
Clyde Shetler

Jim Switzer  
*Julie Cottingham*  
Julie Cottingham  
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 \_\_\_\_\_

**February 18, 2026**

**[INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]**