

PERKINS TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING

Held By: Perkins Township Board of Zoning Appeals

Place: Perkins Township Service Facility, Meeting Room, 2610 Columbus Avenue

Date: January 16, 2024

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Mr. Kastor
Mr. Pitts
Mr. Bixler

Board Members Absent & Excused: Mr. Bertsch, Mr. Gast & Mr. Spence.

Staff in Attendance: Mr. Adam Panas, Planner
Mrs. Jessica Gladwell, Administrative Assistant

I. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Kastor called the meeting to order and lead the Board and staff in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Roll Call

Mr. Kastor asked for roll call to be taken.
Mr. Pitts, here; Mr. Bixler, here; Mr. Spence, here.

III. Chairperson's Welcome and Explanation of Public Hearing & Public Meeting

Mr. Kastor welcomed everyone to the meeting. He said it will be held in two (2) parts. First will be the Public Hearing, where the Board will hear from the applicant. Then they will switch to the Public Meeting, where the Board will decide the fate of the application.

Mrs. Gladwell Swore in everyone that signed in.

IV. Reading of the Request

APPLICATION #BZA2024-01- A variance application submitted by Roundabout Grill & Bar for the property at 5012 Campbell Street, Perkins Township, OH 44870 (PPN 32-04877.000). The variance request is to extend the existing non-conforming use of structures and land by installing a shipping container in the rear yard of the property, whereas Article 6, Section 1 prohibits the extension of a nonconforming use of a structure and land.

Johnny (owner) stated he needs a shed outback, the one we currently have is in declining condition, and over the last two years it's declining even more. We had to take stuff out of the shed and put it inside, and of course we pretty much ran out of space to store stuff on the inside. Instead of replacing it with another shed, we decided to go with a shipping container because we may do something different with the property later and with the shipping container, we can pick it up and move it on the property. I know your reasoning for denial is that you would like us to remodel the inside of the business in order to cooperate with some of this stuff, but some stuff can't be stored inside like lawn mowers and gas cans.

V. Staff Review

Mr. Panas stated that as Jessica stated KB Investments LLC at 10800 Humm Rd Berlin Heights, OH 44814, applied for a variance for 5012 Campbell Street Perkins Township, OH 44870 PPN 32-04877.000. The current Zoning is "R-11" / Single Family Serviced Residential, the comprehensive plan shows low density residential. The proposed development is for utilization of a shipping container permanently for storage in connection with a commercial business. The variance request is to extend the existing non-conforming use of structures and land by installing a shipping container in the rear yard of the property, whereas Article 6, Section 1 prohibits the extension of a nonconforming use of a structure and land. The parcel in question is located at 5012 Campbell St, which is approximately 0.66-acres in area. The property has been operating as a bar and restaurant since approximately the 1950s. The current owners have owned it since 2022.

Surrounding Land Uses:

North: Vacant Home, Existing Residence, Both Zoned "C-1" / Local Commercial

East: Agricultural, Zoned "R-1" / Single Family Serviced Residential

South: Residential, Zoned "R-1" / Single Family Serviced Residential

West: Residential, Zoned "R-1" / Single Family Serviced Residential

Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use Map Designation:

The Perkins Township Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates this parcel as low density residential.

Purpose of Variance:

Place a shipping container on the property permanently.

Note: This site plan was provided by the applicant.

Purpose of Variance:

Place a shipping container on the property permanently.

Note: This site plan was created by me to show potential impacts on parking.

DEPARTMENTAL FEEDBACK:

Public Works Department: No comment.

Building Department: No comment.

Police Department: No comment.

Fire Department: No comment.

PUBLIC / ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER FEEDBACK:

At the time of writing this report, the staff had not received any feedback from the public or adjacent property owners.

NOTE: This application considers two sets of standards. First, are the **general variance standards** contained in Article 7, Section 7.4.5. The results of that review are listed below:

ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE			
Standard	Answer	Preferred Answer	Meets Standard?
7.4.5.a - In Accordance with General Purpose & Intent?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.b - Establishment of New Use?	Yes	No	Yes
7.4.5.c - Special Circumstances Exist (e.g. wetlands, floodplain)?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.d - Proof of Hardship?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.e - Necessary for Reasonable Use? Minimum Variance Needed?	No, <u>No</u>	Yes, <u>Yes</u>	No, No
7.4.5.f - Injurious to the Public or Surrounding Area?	No	No	Yes
7.4.5.g - Confer any special privilege?	No	No	Yes

NOTE: Second, are the **Standards Relating to Nonconforming Structures** contained in Article 6, Section 6.7. The results of that review are listed below:

ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE			
Standard	Answer	Preferred Answer	Meets Standard?
6.7.1.a - Contrary to Public Interest?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.b - Proof of Hardship?	No	Yes	No
6.7.1.c - Special Circumstances Exist?	No	Yes	No
6.7.1.d - Lot Area Adequate for Off- Street Parking?	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.7.1.e - Will it Detriment the Surrounding Area?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.f - Will it Expand Beyond Property Lines?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.g - Is Removal/Demo of 60% or more?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.h - Replacement of mobile homes?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.i - Nonconforming Use Ever Stopped for >2 years?	No	No	Yes

GENERAL VARIANCE STANDARDS

ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE			
Standard	Answer	Preferred Answer	Meets Standard?
7.4.5.a - In Accordance with General Purpose & Intent?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.b - Establishment of New Use?	Yes	No	Yes
7.4.5.c - Special Circumstances Exist (e.g. wetlands, floodplain)?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.d - Proof of Hardship?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.e - Necessary for Reasonable Use? Minimum Variance Needed?	No, <u>No</u>	Yes, <u>Yes</u>	No, No
7.4.5.f - Injurious to the Public or Surrounding Area?	No	No	Yes
7.4.5.g - Confer any special privilege?	No	No	Yes

STANDARDS RELATING TO NONCONFORMING STRUCTURES

ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE			
Standard	Answer	Preferred Answer	Meets Standard?
6.7.1.a - Contrary to Public Interest?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.b - Proof of Hardship?	No	Yes	No
6.7.1.c - Special Circumstances Exist?	No	Yes	No
6.7.1.d - Lot Area Adequate for Off- Street Parking?	Yes	Yes	Yes
6.7.1.e - Will it Detriment the Surrounding Area?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.f - Will it Expand Beyond Property Lines?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.g - Is Removal/Demo of 60% or more?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.h - Replacement of mobile homes?	No	No	Yes
6.7.1.i - Nonconforming Use Ever Stopped for >2 years?	No	No	Yes

Based on the evaluation of both sets of standards, staff recommends **denial** of this application, primarily because, (1) no hardship has been demonstrated, (2) special circumstances do not exist, (3) it has not been demonstrated that storage could not be accomplished without the shipping container, as well as all of the other items from the summary tables above that do not meet the standards.

Mr. Kastor stated that this is a little more in-depth than just putting a temporary storage container up.

Mr. Kastor stated that it sounds like you have outdoor chairs, tables, and stuff you want to keep out of the elements. Tell me why you're thinking of a temporary storage container instead of a shed, you talked about the flexibility of being able to move it?

Johnny stated yeah being able to move it somewhere else on the property or completely get rid of it. With it being a bar and grill there is somewhat of an industrial feel that we are going for as we transition over. We feel a metal shipping container would have a little more cosmetic feel than a wooden one. The wooden one also has a lot more damage quicker where animals can get through the wood. The shipping container is airtight. We are not sure exactly what the future holds for the place so to put a shed out there now and it would be worse to have to move it and it would open a whole new set of worms. We hope to expand the kitchen and put a little more work in the kitchen and when we do that, we can possibly create a storage area within that construction and move it off site and not have to worry about it anymore. Not to mention the size we would need to store things; those get kind of expensive.

Mr. Kastor asked if they planned on buying or renting.

Johnny stated that they would purchase it.

Mr. Kastor said OKAY, would you be willing to paint it?

Johnny stated yes, we will paint it, depending on what the outcome was we looked into buying brand new or buying used. We would paint it black and white anyways. We're having the siding replaced on the bar this spring and it's going to be black and white compared to

the 3 different colors it is now, and we will have it painted to match the building, so it doesn't look like a normal shipping container back there.

Mr. Panas stated that when our discussion between it being as temporary or permanent I want to be very clear the only reason I referred to it as a permanent structure was because staff thought that was the most practical way to regulate it as we have accessory structure regulations, whatever the use or real life time of it being on the property while it's there it makes sense to treat it as permanent in terms of setbacks and stuff as an accessory structure.

Johnny stated yeah when I first talked to him about it I didn't state a time frame it would be there, it could be there for a year, three years, or permanent. Just depends on how stuff turns out in the future.

Mr. Kastor asked if anyone else wanted to

Norb Matthews – property backs up not directly to his property, so I am concerned what it looks like, where it's going, I actually don't mind because the noise that's been coming from there has been getting nosier in the past year and a half and maybe that will stop some of it at night. The question is if it's a temporary structure but he's applying for a permanent structure, does that give him the rights to expand his property if this was approved if he removed that temporary storage?

Mr. Panas stated that he wasn't entirely clear with Mr. Matthews question, but he is more than happy to explain it to him. So, it sounds like you might think the placement of the structure temp in nature gives someone the right to replace it with a completely different structure in that same spot?

Norb stated that was correct. Because when he said it was a permanent structure and they are getting a variance for how far set back you can't to the property line.

Mr. Panas stated that was not what the variance was for it is because it is a bar and restaurant operating on an improperly zoned parcel. There's probably a million different reasons why it wasn't re-zoned mainly it really didn't matter until someone new took it over and wanted to give it some more love and these are just some things that we must iron out, and that is what the variance is for. I apologize if the way I explained was confusing, there are a lot of things that play here with the letter of the law so to speak. It's basically saying if these guys approve this it must be this far off the property line and so far from the building. That's all it is, if this structure in theory was allowed and then removed the property owners could absolutely put a new building there, they'd have to apply for the same permits as you or I would. So, just because the footprint might change the way a shipping container is attached to the ground by the commercial building code is not the same as a pole barn building, it goes through its own individual review process.

Mr. Pitts asked if the shed in the picture was the one, they were removing. The white structure here, is this a vacant house?

Johnny stated that the upstairs is vacant, but the downstairs has tenants.

Mr. Pitts stated this, they have another fence attached to it?

Johnny said yes.

Mr. Bixler asked what a shipping container typically costs.

Johnny stated anywhere from 2,500 – 3,000 a brand new one costs about 5,500.00.

Mr. Bixler stated that, so my question is about the financial hardship. So, you're saying you need this for flexibility reasons, it's not a hardship financially.

Johnny stated it's more on the flexibility side and financially it would put a burden on us later if we had to spend the money on something twice, if we had to build a garage to store this stuff in now, it might not be in our future plans. With this we're more worried about storage and opening the other half of our establishment to our customers and the whole back half is used for storage, a catch all of stuff we can't put everything else. St Patrick's day last year we went to the shed to get that stuff out and it was full of animal urine and stuff so we saved what we could and threw away the rest. We don't want to put anything else in it because we know it would be ruined. Right now, I'm moving the lawn mower and stuff every time we need to mow the grass and stuff. The grill is currently outside, id like to be able to

Mr. Bixler stated that you could spend the 5,500.00 on a garage right now but you're not prepared now for where it's going or where it's going to be.

Johnny stated that and the type we would need, it's just not a good time to consider something permanent.

Mr. Bixler stated that the other concern I have as a board member would be that if we do it for you, the next applicant applies and how do we tell them no?

Johnny stated that it would really matter in the case. I know people in high residential areas that have these in their back yards. They're made to store things.

Mr. Bixler stated that he is surprised the fire department didn't comment on that if he's going to be storing flammable things in an enclosed storage container not that far from the bar.

Mr. Panas stated right the police concern, about it. I am surprised they didn't comment, I can't comment why they didn't. As far as the police comment, in terms of policing side of it, what they worry about, unlike a shed prefabricated stick built, have some sort of windows. It's hard to have passage surveillance for your safety as the property owner or your customers. I've happened to work with you on a few projects, I know your good people but again the letter of the law again just like you don't want to accidentally encourage human trafficking, drugs, it's their job to think about those things.

Johnny stated the flammable items themselves aren't going to be stored in the container, well put the grill inside and the propane left outside. Our plan was to have a couple feet between the fence itself and barricade a spot off to put the bigger tables and the propane tanks that won't fit inside the container, that stuff would be stored outside.

Mr. Panas stated that one thing the zoning resolution does allow and the board has allowed in the past is approve a variance with conditions, enforcing them is truly case by case with

the applicant and property owner. Depending on which way you're leaning like you mentioned about the fire stuff, if you wanted them to take a closer look at it and generate a report, do they need routine inspections or would it be treated like a commercial structure.

Johnny stated that future inspections wouldn't be an issue because I know they'll want to look at it. I know the health department would be doing it anyways because we deal with food, and certain things aren't allowed to be stored in it.

Mr. Panas stated that he has happened to work with other property owners already from other things that I've tried to guide them through with different applications that have timed up to be in front of this board yet, but obviously it's completely your decision. Me personally the guy enforcing conditions that in this case and future applications I'd feel better because it would have a paper trail showing the time or reason to allow one or the other.

Mr. Pitts stated that his issue is nonconforming business, neither of you had anything to do with that. But now we're at a non-conforming variance with a shed that is really a shipping container, my concern is that I agree with Mike, the whole idea of trying to take Perkins and clean up some of these things and put in some standards. So, I guess my contingencies can we, do a contingency to be reviewed in 3 years or is that?

Mr. Panas stated that well that I do see myself here in three years, to be honest I don't know about the best practice and how that is, might do annual review in front of the board. We also talked about you guys' re-zoning that property, please correct me if I'm misremembering but the main hangup with that is, they weren't so much worried about the immediate neighbors, he was willing to talk to the neighbors. But with it being zoned commercial that means that they could put up a few more buildings if they wanted and if it didn't affect parking, which they don't have a lot of anyway. At any rate you guys were interested in an adjacent property, and you wanted to potentially combine after buying that property and in some order have all of it re-zoned. If they combined the lot, it would be split zoning for a short period before going to zoning commission and that way it's a different application, it would just be a variance but a completely different lens. Johnny and I have talked about a lot of potential paths even ahead of this application.

Johnny stated that standards are something that we are big on ourselves, we've done a lot of work at that place and getting rid of that shed in the back is an improvement and itself. Getting rid of that thing that we may or may not use in the future is a benefit in the future, even if we don't like it or it's not a plan in the future, we can decide as we improve the building itself and we can accommodate what we need to use it for. We do respect the property and have nothing but good thoughts for it.

Mr. Kastor stated so that the neighbor now that you understand the plans and they're going to paint it. Also, the placement of that doesn't give them any privileges or rights to expand the building later. So, what we have is a non-conforming use, a bar in the middle of a residential area that has been there for 70 years and is grandfathered in. I think for them to make any significant changes that they're going to run into issues with zoning.

Mr. Panas stated that they're just trying to put out a shipping container on their property and were here talking for 40 minutes about it, it's already a roadblock.

Norb stated that if they're going to paint it I have no issues, I just didn't know what they were going to use it for.

VI. Staff Close Public Hearing/Open Public Meeting

Mr. Kastor asked for a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

Mr. Bixler motioned to close the public hearing. Mr. Pitts seconded.

Mr. Bixler, yes; Mr. Pitts, Yes; Mr. Kastor, Yes.

Mr. Kastor stated that Mr. Bixler and Mr. Pitts have voiced some of their concerns. Personally, I view your business and you've made improvements there, it's a unique situation if someone tries to put a shipping container in an R-1 or R-2 and its yellow were going to say no. But you're unique and you're trying to bring it in that industrial theme and if you paint it to kind of match anything, to me it makes it a lot more digestible and your track record of wanting to improve the property. You're trying to be a good neighbor, but I certainly honor Mr. Bixler that we must be concerned about precedence and the next guy is going to come in. Yours is unique, you're not just putting a shipping container in the back of a residential property.

Mr. Panas stated that you could if it would make the board feel better about whatever decision, you could make it a condition that it gets painted, in a manner that matches the building esthetically and Mr. Pitts you mentioned a yearly review, so lets say that you were to approve it and were here again and you ask for an update, in theory issue a variance and just not require a review that runs with the life of the land at default.

Johnny stated the only thing with that is could we wait until the weather to paint it, since this weather isn't great, and we can do it when the building gets re-sided.

VII. Discussion from Board

Mr. Kastor stated he would entertain a motion or approve or deny the request.

Mr. Pitts motioned to approve #BZA2024-01 with the conditions and contingency of it being painted to esthetically approve the property, to match with what you're doing to the new building. Mr. Kastor asked if he could do a few amendments, I'd like the record to show that it is a non-conforming use, were not approved a shipping constrainer in a traditional R-1 property, it is going to be part of their theme and provides a buffer to the neighbors. Mr. Kastor Seconded.

Mr. Pitts yes; Mr. Kastor, yes; Mr. Bixler, No.

VIII. Reading of the Request

APPLICATION #BZA2024-02- A variance application submitted by Ohio Patient Access Real Estate LLC (Ascend Dispensary) for the property at 6019 Milan Road, Perkins Township, OH 44870 (PPN 32-03793.000). The variance request is to exceed the allowable square footage

for wall signage on the eastern and western walls of the building. Article 28, Section 12.4.c allows a maximum of three (3) square feet per one (1) lineal foot of building frontage for lots zoned "C-2" / General Commercial on U.S. Route 250.

Matt Mekenna – Representative from Ascend. You guys are right, we exceeded the recommended amount of allowed signage, it was an oversight to our marketing department. But I think a lot of is due to the strict cannabis regulations regarding advertising in the state. So, I appreciate you guys taking the time to be here today. After reviewing the staff report it looks like we were out of compliance in 3 areas, hardship, special circumstances and necessity to advertise. Like I said earlier these are mostly tied to Ohio's strict regulations regarding cannabis signage so basically within the state cannabis statutes were not allowed to have regular signage that any other business would have. The specific statute I want to state is no standalone signs, so that's 3796; 6-2-24H1 no billboards 3796; 6-2-24E2 and no handheld portable signs 3796;6-2-24E4. I apologize for the alphabet soup there. Basically, the state has a ton of regulations of what we can and can't do, so the marketing folks read the state regulations, not thinking it would be a violation in the local. I would argue that we do have somewhat of a hardship against us because they are unique to cannabis business exclusively. I would say that we have a necessity to advertise like any other business and that's the need to have them there.

IX. Staff Review

Mr. Panas stated that as Jessica stated OPA Real Estate LLC located at 7720 Campus Ln. Montgomery, OH 45242-7116 applied for a zoning variance located at 6019 Milan Road Perkins Township, OH 44870, PPN 32-03793.000. The current zoning is "C-2" / General Commercial with the comprehensive plan showing commercial. The proposed development is to allow murals that exceed the square footage allowances. The requested variance is for **1.** (Western Elevation): 423 s.f. vs. 198 s.f. sign area. **2.** (Eastern Elevation): 248 s.f. vs. 198 s.f. sign area. The parcel in question is located at 6019 Milan Rd, which is 0.72-acres in size. Before the property's current use as a medical marijuana dispensary, the property was host to a local bar since the 1940s. The current owners have owned it since 2022.

Surrounding Land Uses:

North: Best Western Hotel, zoned "C-2" / General Commercial; Best Budget Inn / UHAUL, Zoned "PUD" / Planned Unit Development

East: Hampton Inn and Tru Hotel, Zoned "C-2" / General Commercial

South: Manny's Bar & Grill, Danny Boys Plaza, Erie Street Rentals, all Zoned "C-2" / General Commercial

West: Residential, zoned "R-1" / Single Family Serviced Residential

Comprehensive Plan - Future Land Use Map Designation

The Perkins Township Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map designates this parcel as commercial.

DEPARTMENTAL FEEDBACK:

Public Works Department: No comment.

Building Department: No comment.

Police Department: No comment.

Fire Department: No comment.

PUBLIC / ADJACENT PROPERTY OWNER FEEDBACK:

At the time of writing this report, the staff had not received any feedback from the public or adjacent property owners.

Approving **Variance 1** would allow 423 square feet of wall signage on the western elevation of the building, whereas Article 28, Section 12.4.c only allows 198 square feet, thereby requesting signage that is approximately 213% of the standard.

Approving **Variance 2** would allow 248 square feet of wall signage on the eastern elevation of the building, whereas Article 28, Section 12.4.c only allows 198 square feet for the eastern elevation thereby requesting signage that is approximately 125% of the standard.

GENERAL VARIANCE STANDARDS

ANALYSIS SUMMARY TABLE			
Standard	Answer	Preferred Answer	Meets Standard?
7.4.5.a - In Accordance with General Purpose & Intent?	Yes	Yes	Yes
7.4.5.b - Establishment of Use Not Permitted in District?	No	No	Yes
7.4.5.c - Special Circumstances Exist (e.g., wetlands, floodplain)?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.d - Proof of Hardship?	No	Yes	No
7.4.5.e - Necessary for Reasonable Use? Minimum Variance Needed?	No, <u>No</u>	Yes, <u>Yes</u>	No
7.4.5.f - Injurious to the Public or Surrounding Area?	No	No	Yes
7.4.5.g - Confer any special privilege?	No	No	Yes

Based on the evaluation of the standards, the staff cannot recommend approval of either variance because a hardship has not been shown, there are no special circumstances, and the requested variances are not necessary to advertise.

Mr. Kastor stated that when the construction plans were submitted, did this graphics show on the plans?

Mr. Panas stated no.

Mr. Kastor stated that he remembered driving by as they were painting it and I'm like woah. So, on the back of the building that sign placement doesn't have any issues, seems out of place.

Discussion about the signage happened between Gene Diagu and staff. Mr. Diagu stated that he is satisfied with the building, he has no problems with it, and it's easily seen. So, if they're just asking us to ignore the fact, it's done. I have no objections.

Mr. Panas stated that if the board were to approve the variance it would allow me to close the zoning violation too.

Mr. Kastor stated that Sandusky Bay Pancake, I don't recall approving that mural.

Mr. Diagu asked if this was approved of, does this set a precedent for someone else to come in to put up a sign.

Mr. Panas stated no, why I wrote them up was because they didn't come in to begin with, and it wasn't until I received more paperwork that I discovered not only did that happen and it was too big for the regulations. Anything new that doesn't come through our building or zoning office gets written up and approached the same way.

Matt said it would also de-clutter because there is no off-building signage, it is a benefit for the ones driving down the main road without whipping their head trying to read what's on the sign. That is what is behind the bigger logo.

Mr. Pitts stated that the one on the back, who's going to see that? Unless you're riding a bike or something or someone coming up to the drive through. Do these have a flood light on them or are they lighted?

Matt said no I don't think so.

Mr. Pitts stated that he doesn't have much of an issue with the signage.

X. Staff Close Public Hearing/ Open Public Meeting

Mr. Kastor asked for a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

Mr. Bixler motioned to close the public hearing. Mr. Pitts seconded.
Mr. Bixler, yes; Mr. Pitts, Yes; Mr. Kastor, Yes.

Mr. Kastor stated overall that I think the applicant, it's a nice-looking structure its custom with some architectural, the signage is big scale wise but its not in your face too much. It's pretty settled. I mean you must be highly regulated because 90% of the people who drive there don't know what is there.

XI. Discussion from Board

Mr. Kastor stated he would entertain a motion or approve or deny the request.

Mr. Bixler motioned to approve #BZA2024-02. Mr. Pitts Seconded.

Mr. Bixler yes; Mr. Pitts, yes; Mr. Kastor, Yes.

XII. Old Business

Mr. Panas stated that there were updates on signage zoning violations – Tusing moved his trailer. I made it pretty clear in my letter no matter what you're using it for it's a vehicle sign, I had success with that.

Coastal swings moved that trailer. Few electronic message boards near Ascend had some dead pixels in them, so certain squares of the board were malfunctioning. I touched base with almost all of them.

XIII. New Business

Mr. Panas stated that Lentz property was not ready yet to present again. They're pursuing the February meeting. We certainly have one new application for Mr. Polous for Perkins Mini Storage. There may also be a variance for a side yard variance for a poll at 2708 Lynn Dr. I haven't gotten anything from that application. There was a guy with the last name Morrow on Kingsley Court, he applied for a variance application but failed to submit payment. I advised him that he needed to submit payment to be heard by this board. He was seeing if the trustees would pay for his payment.

XIV. Adjournment

Mr. Kastor asked for a motion for adjournment.

Mr. Bixler made the motion and Mr. Pitts seconded.

Roll Call: Mr. Bixler; Yes, Mr. Pitts, yes; Mr. Kastor, yes.