

**Brunswick Hills Township Board of Zoning Appeals
Public Hearing Meeting Minutes
Township Hall & Zoom
June 2, 2021**

Call Meeting to Order

Chair Kersten called the Brunswick Hills Township Board of Zoning Appeals Public Hearing Meeting for June 2, 2021 to order at 7:00 p.m. A roll call of the board was executed.

- **Board Members in Attendance:** Cliff Kersten (Chair), Chris Schigel (Vice Chair/Virtual), Ron Wetterman, Ann Barron
- **Alternate Board Members in Attendance:** Daryl Lucien (Virtual)
- **Board Members Not in Attendance:** Todd Spiker (Resigned)
- **Others in Attendance:** Trustee Christina Kusnerak, Evelyn Czyz, Zoning Inspector, Mary Jean Milanko, Secretary

Chair Kersten stated we have a full board quorum present with two board members virtually and three members here. The Board of Zoning Appeals acts within the regulations of Sec. 519 of the Ohio Revised Code. Chair Kersten explained the vote will be a simple majority with a quorum present is in favor of the applicant.

APPROVE MINUTES AND DECISION LETTER FOR 329 N. Carpenter Road Southwest Baptist Church

1. Approval of the May 5, 2021 Public Hearing Meeting Minutes- Motion: Mr. Wetterman made a motion to accept the minutes as submitted by the Secretary. Mr. Lucien seconds. **Roll Call:** Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes.

2. Decision Letter for Southwest Baptist Church, 329 N. Carpenter Road, Brunswick Hills, OH.

Motion: Mr. Kersten made a motion to accept the decision letter as written. Mr. Wetterman seconds the motion. **Roll Call:** Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes.

Chair Kersten swore in Evelyn Czyz, Zoning Inspector.

****REQUEST FOR A HEARING CONTINUANCE FOR 1595 SUBSTATION ROAD TO JULY 7, 2021**

Chair Kersten stated we received a letter from Anthony Vacanti, Esq., requesting a continuance of their hearing (application #5,6,7 below) to July 7, 2021 @ 7 p.m. **Motion** Mr. Kersten made a motion to continue the hearing for applications #5,6,7 for 1595 Substation Road to July 7, 2021. Mr. Wetterman seconds. **Roll Call:** Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Ms. Barron-yes, Mr. Kersten-yes. Mr. Anthony Vacanti (virtual) thanked the board for the continuance.

New Business: Public Hearing

(Case #1) Gregory Cancilla, 5047 Woodcliff Circle, Brunswick Hills OH 44212, Variance for in-ground swimming pool, PP#001-02A-27-222, Zoning R-1. Gregory Cancilla was sworn in. Mr. Cancilla stated he submitted an application for a variance for an in-ground swimming pool. He said by the definition it needs to be 10 feet from the rear property line and we are asking to be 5 feet from the rear property line. Mr. Kersten said in checking your property in the back where the pool will be there is either a field or common ground and asked what that area is. Mr. Cancilla said there are three acres of common area behind us so the pool will not affect any of our neighbors adjacent to us. Mr. Kersten said I wanted to get it in the record that it is a common area back there and can't be built upon. Mr. Cancilla said it absolutely cannot be built upon. Mr. Schigel said on the pool diagrams you have the pool on the right side of your yard and asked if there is a reason why you

are not building it on the left side of your yard? Mr. Cancilla said there are two reasons: 1. There is a storm easement there that runs down between the two properties and 2. Based on the lay of the land, just putting a pool down there would need large retaining walls to shed the water from the pool area and the pitch of the land. He said the main reason was because of the sewer easement.

Mr. Wetterman said you have a shrubbery area on the side between you and the common area and asked if that will be eliminated? Mr. Cancilla said no, it will be maintained. Mr. Wetterman asked if that is the reason why he has to keep his pool further away? Mr. Cancilla said correct. That shrubbery runs down the property line and in order to do the pool, there is not enough space in there without that 5-foot offset. The shrubbery line will be maintained. Mr. Wetterman asked how far away from the boundary property line is the shrubbery? Mr. Cancilla said the shrubbery are right on the property line and those were actually existing trees when we moved in and some of those are actually on the other property. Mr. Wetterman said the photo is a little deceptive. Mr. Cancilla said one or two might be on the common area property line, but most of them are on our property. Mr. Wetterman said it looks like on the north section you have a concrete patio back there and asked if that was going to stay. Mr. Cancilla said correct and it will all stay. Mr. Wetterman said so your pool area would be more than 10 feet away from the property line then but how far away from the patio? Mr. Cancilla said it would be more than 10 feet away from the property line on the side and on the rear property line it would be the 5 feet variance we are asking for. Mr. Wetterman asked how big the patio is. Mr. Cancilla said it is a concrete patio about 15 x 15 feet. Mr. Wetterman asked if the pool edge will be right up to the patio? Mr. Cancilla said it will be about 4-5 feet off of that. He said we would have to pour more concrete to be up to that. Mr. Wetterman asked if you move it another 10 feet away, how much room would that give you from the back property line? Mr. Cancilla said the patio is on the side of the property, not in the back. Mr. Wetterman said what if you move the pool south closer to the swing set? Mr. Cancilla said the issue is then it wouldn't be 15 feet from the house. He said it wouldn't be possible to do it 15 feet from the house and then 10 feet away from the property line, thus the reason for the variance. Mr. Wetterman said you could put it farther than 10 feet from the property line. Mr. Cancilla said you can't do it, there is not enough room based on where the structure is. He said if you have a building structure and you moved it down any further, we wouldn't be able to maintain the 15 feet from the house and the 10 feet from the property line. He said this is the only place we can put it because the house kicks back in. Mr. Wetterman asked Mr. Cancilla to approach the board and show where that is on the diagram.

Mr. Wetterman asked what the size of the pool is. Mr. Cancilla said it is 16 x 38. Ms. Czyz asked what the distance between the back of the house and the corner of the pool? Mr. Cancilla said about 10 feet. Ms. Czyz said it has to be 15 feet. Mr. Cancilla said 15 feet directly off the house is what it needs to be based on the bylaw. Ms. Czyz said but it is the back of the house and our code says 15 feet from the structure. Mr. Cancilla said we asked that question even before we submitted for the variance. Ms. Czyz said I don't understand why if you have 10-foot storm sewer easement to this side, why this can't be moved over to this side. Mr. Cancilla said because we wouldn't be able to maintain it off the building, plus the land flows down so we would have to have a huge retaining wall there to keep the water out. He said that it would also affect the neighbors more. Mr. Wetterman asked how many different size pools are available and is there a certain reason why you picked that size? Mr. Cancilla said because it will fit well back there and despite what size pool you get, you still need a variance due to the current regulations. Mr. Kersten noted for the record that the Fire Department made an investigation and they have no concerns on this and would support BZA approval if we approve it.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

REVIEW OF THE DUNCAN FACTORS

A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance. Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes.

B. Whether the variance is substantial. All board members stated no.

C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance. Mr. Kersten-no; Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Wetterman-no; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-no.

D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services. All board members stated no.

E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction. Mr. Kersten stated we did not ask the property owner.

F. Whether the property owner’s predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance. All board members stated yes.

G. Whether the spirit and intent of this Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance. Mr. Wetterman-no; Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Schigel-yes; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes.

H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district. All board members stated no.

MOTION 5047 Woodcliff: Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve 5047 Woodcliff Circle variance for 5 feet from the back property line. Mr. Lucien seconds. **Roll Call:** Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Wetterman-no; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten yes. **Mr. Kersten stated the vote is 4-1 to approve your request for the variance.** He said in 30 days (July 7th) we will sign your decision letter at our next meeting to be mailed to you. Mr. Kersten said there is 30 days if someone wishes to appeal the decision through the Court of Common Pleas in Medina. Mr. Kersten said you can start your construction, but don’t. Ms. Czyz said he cannot start construction because he still has to apply for a pool permit.

(Case #2) Thomas Tesmer, 4632 Boston Road, Strongsville, Ohio 44149. Area Variance for an accessory building and attached porch built without a zoning permit. PPN#001-02A-03-008, current zoning R-1. Thomas Tesmer 4632 Boston Road, Strongsville, OH 44149 was sworn in. Mr. Tesmer said I built a shed about 22 years ago next to our garden and I didn’t realize I needed a variance for it at the time. He said my house sits 700 feet off the road and when I was here before you asked me why it was built so far back. He said the people I purchased the land from made a clearing back there and it seemed the best place to put a log cabin home. He said there is a creek that goes down the middle of the property about 400 feet off the road and then crosses our property. He said we needed the shed to accommodate our lawn mower, log splitter, pressure washer, bicycles because I believe garages are for cars. He said I did not know that you cannot have a shed in front of the home. The shed sits about 500 feet off the road and it’s surrounded by trees and woods and the only view is to the neighbor to the west who just put a big pole barn up. He said nobody can see it because it sits right in the middle of both property lines. He said when I built it, I realized there were restrictions for height and off the property lines, but never knew about building in front of a home.

QUESTIONS BY THE BOARD

Mr. Wetterman said you knew about the height restrictions, etc. but you never check about putting in front of the house? Mr. Tesmer said I was naïve and I heard things from the municipality in Parma that I worked at during that time about height and property restrictions, but to me it seemed like a garden shed and I just built it. Mr. Wetterman said, as I mentioned at our last meeting, you have been paying taxes on that building for the last 20 years so far be it for me to say it can’t stay there.

Mr. Schigel said is it my understanding that no building permit was pulled when building that shed? Mr. Tesmer said correct. I accumulated a bunch of things that needed storage and I built it at my leisure. Mr.

Tesmer said I think with the taxes they consider it a garage. Mr. Wetterman said that is what the tax department called it. Mr. Tesmer said it was a little garden shed and I built a little roof off the side for water collection to irrigate our garden. Mr. Wetterman said I suspect they saw a garage door and just assumed it was a garage.

Mr. Kersten said at one time there was a concern with the fire department on your driveway culvert and asked if he had communication with the fire department. Mr. Tesmer said yes, they came out for a preplan visit on the culvert when I applied for the other shed. Ms. Czyz said whether this is granted or not, you are aware that you still have to have pull offs for emergency vehicles every 200 feet according to our driveway regulations. Secretary Milanko stated the board received a letter dated May 10 from Fire Chief Anthony Strazzo. Secretary Milanko read the letter that referenced Sec. 303-9 Driveways and states the fire department would support approval of the variance with the contingency to fix the driveway. Mr. Tesmer was provided a copy of Chief Strazzo's letter and a copy of the township zoning regulations for driveways.

Mr. Kersten said that means if we approve your variance, we will put that you have to meet the contingency in the letter. Mr. Tesmer asked if this was effective when I built the house 20 some years ago? Mr. Kersten said I can't answer that question. Mr. Tesmer said the zoning regulations say effective August 10, 2007 so does that make me subject to it since it was effective 10 years after I built the house? Ms. Czyz said for the accessory buildings it would because at that time it was vacant land, now he's planning on putting accessory buildings on it so yes, he would have to adhere to the current zoning in place. Mr. Tesmer so if my driveway meets the width of 10 feet, but you also need another 10 feet next to it? Ms. Czyz said it has to be so a fire vehicle or a squad can pull off and allow the other vehicles to come through, so you have to have a pull off. Mr. Kersten asked if the driveway now is a two-way driveway or just one vehicle? Mr. Tesmer said no, it's 10 feet wide and 700 feet long and the shed sits at 500 feet. Ms. Czyz said every 200 feet you would have to have a pull off of 10 feet and height clearance of at least 16 feet. Mr. Lucien said I am missing something here; 700 feet off the road where exactly is the fire department going to get water? Ms. Czyz said they would probably have to truck that in. Mr. Tesmer said normally you would drop a line at the driveway as far as you could pull up and it would tie in with the street hydrant and pump it to the line in the drive. Ms. Czyz said if you have a water tanker in the driveway and a squad is pulling out, they have to pull off to the side to allow the other vehicle clearance. Mr. Lucien said it sounds to me like it would be easier to let the house burn down and build a new one compared to what we are putting them through; it's been sitting there for 26 years without a problem.

Mr. Wetterman asked the Zoning Inspector if he will also need a permit with the variance because the building is already standing? Ms. Czyz said yes and one for the fence and he will be doubled. She said if you look in your packet, I copied a drawing from the Auditors Office for the year 2000 and there was nothing there in 2000 in the aerial view, so it was built after 2000. Mr. Kersten said the way it stands right now, if we were to approve your variance, we will put the contingency on it and you have to do it. Ms. Czyz said and for that you need to contact the Medina County Highway Engineer's Office and Storm Water Management. Ms. Czyz said Mr. Tesmer can contact her for those phone numbers. Mr. Tesmer said this all started out in October when I wanted to build a pole barn and I still don't have the pole barn because of these contingencies, so it is disheartening. The price of the pole barn has gone up considerably with lumber, etc. Mr. Tesmer asked if he can move forward with the pole barn while he tries to take care of the other things.

PUBLIC COMMENT: None

REVIEW OF THE DUNCAN FACTORS

- A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.** All board members said yes.
- B. Whether the variance is substantial.** Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Wetterman-no; Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes.

- C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.** Mr. Wetterman-no; Ms. Schigel-no; Mr. Lucien-no; Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Kersten-no.
- D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.** Mr. Kersten-yes unless he conforms to the contingency; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Wetterman- if it is just on the variance for the building no but if it includes fixing the driveway then yes; Ms. Barron-yes.
- E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.** All board members said no.
- F. Whether the property owner’s predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.** Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Kersten-no; Mr. Wetterman-abstain; Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Lucien-no.
- G. Whether the spirit and intent of this Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.** Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Wetterman-under the conditions yes; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten-no.
- H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.** Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Wetterman-no; Mr. Kersten-no; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-no.

MOTION 4632 Boston Road: Mr. Wetterman made a motion that Mr. Tesmer’s request for a variance and permit be granted on the conditions of the correction of the driveway and driveway culvert as required by the fire department. Mr. Kersten seconds. **Roll Call:** Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Kersten-no. Secretary Milanko stated the vote is 3 no votes and 2 yes votes. **Mr. Kersten stated the application request is denied by a 3 -2 vote.**

Discussion on the Motion: Ms. Czyz stated the applicant does understand that he will have to remove the accessory building and the fence. Mr. Tesmer said if I remove the fence the chickens will get out. Mr. Kersten stated you have the right to file within 30 days with the Medina County Court of Common Pleas if you feel you have been adversely affected by the decision of the board. Mr. Kersten stated you do not have variances to have those buildings, so the buildings must come down. Ms. Czyz said one building has to come down. Mr. Kersten stated a decision letter will be sent by Certified Mail in 30 days. Mr. Tesmer asked if he still has to worry about the driveway. Ms. Czyz stated yes because you were granted a variance for your other pole barn.

(Case #3) Brent Collier, 575 Substation Road, Brunswick Hills, OH 44212, Area variance for an accessory building to exceed the height limit of 15 feet in a R-1 district. PP#001-02A-15-108. Brent Michael Collier, 575 Substation Road was sworn in. Mr. Kersten asked if he is the owner of the property. Mr. Collier said yes and I would like to build a 40x44 pole building in my back yard. He said I am asking for a height variance for 14-foot overhead doors so that anything that would drive on the road without a permit would fit into the building. He said that puts the height of the peak over the allowance with no variance. Mr. Kersten said it’s been noted that there is Buckeye State Roofing at that address and that is a residential area. Mr. Collier said yes that is my company but never in my 12 years in business have I had anyone to my house for any reason at all. He said this is a personal residence that I run a business out of.

Questions by the Board

Mr. Wetterman asked if he has a residential business permit for his home. Mr. Collier said I was unaware there is such a thing. Mr. Wetterman said you admit that the accessory building is going to be used for work related items storing trucks and equipment for your businesses, is that correct? Mr. Collier said just storage in

general, but yes that would be part of it to get my personal vehicles out of the elements. Mr. Wetterman said to my understanding the way the codes are written in an R-1 District, what you are describing is going to actually be a commercial use building because you are using your work-related vehicles there and storing other items there. Mr. Wetterman said in an R-1 District, that isn't even a variance related item and you actually should not be able to do that. Mr. Collier said the storage building is for personal things and I want to move the stuff that is in my two-car garage out so I can fit two cars in there again. I want move the lawn mower, weed whacker, personal tools, etc. so I can park vehicles in there. He said there are no materials and there will never be any materials and no one will frequent the place. Mr. Wetterman said it sounds like you are contradicting from what you put in your application. Ms. Czyz said Mr. Collier can apply for a "use" variance to use his residence as commercial; then he would have to come back before the board.

Ms. Czyz asked how high the building will be from the ground to the peak. Mr. Collier said 23 feet. Mr. Schigel asked if there was a prior variance on this property. Mr. Collier said yes, in 2019 I came before the board to get a pole building built in my backyard. He said the Amish man I had lined up to build it hand drew the plans and allegedly did the math wrong for the variance that we asked for and it was 11 inches difference in height. He said we were approved for the variance, but then the plans we had didn't match the variance so we spun our wheels and are back here now. Mr. Schigel said you were talking about doing all personal storage in the building and asked why a 10-foot door would not work; why do you need a 14-foot door? Mr. Collier said an RV or a boat I am planning for may clear 13.6 feet so that is why it's 14 feet. Mr. Lucien said I'm not sure how the 11 inches messed up the deal, but what was the height you were originally granted? Mr. Collier said I really don't remember but I think that building was to have 12-foot side walls and then a 10-foot garage door and a four-pitch roof still put us past the 15 feet limit with no variance. Mr. Lucien asked what the 11 inches was for. Mr. Collier said the 11 inches was the amount the math was off when the builder drew the plans. Mr. Lucien asked if it was 15 feet and 11 inches high? Mr. Collier said I think it was the difference between 19 feet and 19.11 feet, or 20 feet and 20.11 feet. Secretary Milanko stated in 2019 the BZA approved a variance for the height not to exceed 18 feet.

Mr. Lucien said I'm looking an aerial view of your property and I see four work trucks and asked how many work trucks do you have? Mr. Collier said I have a 150, 250 and 350 so three trucks. Mr. Lucien said your next-door neighbor has what looks like a Ram truck with a 16-foot trailer and asked what is that pole barn being used for? Mr. Collier said in my neighbor's yard I don't know of anything business related in there. He said that is the neighbor's son's truck and trailer and he has everything you would ever need in a garage; snow mobile, dirt bike, power tools, air tools and miscellaneous garage things like that. Mr. Kersten said I am confused here on your application where it says "*the accessory building will have 14-foot doors in order to accommodate the boat I need to buy in the near future*" and in addition, *I will store my work trucks containing tools to get them out of weather elements.*" Mr. Kersten said the address is listed for Buckeye State Roofing and now you are saying you want to put work trucks in this building and this is a residential area. Mr. Kersten said a few minutes ago you said there would be no work stuff going in this accessory building, but you put in your application you are specifically saying your work trucks are going into this building. Mr. Collier said the vehicles at my property, yes, and said materials, no; stuff from my garage, yes; visitors from the outside, absolutely not. Mr. Collier said it is just for storage, I am not running a business out of there. Mr. Kersten said you said you are putting work trucks in there and then you say "that your personal vehicles will go in your front garage" so that's telling me these work trucks are from your business and you will be storing them in a residential area barn. Mr. Collier said no, right now in my two-car garage is my fiancé's vehicle....Mr. Kersten interjected and said I have no qualms about private vehicles but you are saying you are putting work vehicles in there. He said you have a business and I am assuming those are your work trucks. Mr. Collier said yes, they are pickup trucks.

Mr. Lucien said, let's say you have four work trucks and you can drive one of them; that means that three of them are on the property being driven by whom? Mr. Collier said I have three trucks, there are four in this picture and said the white one that was out front was sold. He said when I take off in one of the trucks, the other two stay there. Nobody comes over to pick up trucks, drive them or comes to my house for an office. He said I am the only one that comes and goes on my property. He said we meet at job sites so I don't have anyone coming to my house for business. Mr. Kersten asked how many feet it is from the street to the entrance

of the accessory building you are planning; and asked how much driveway feet you would need for that. Mr. Collier said I don't know from the street to that proposed building how many linear feet that is and I don't know how many linear feet the driveway is. Mr. Kersten asked if it is more than 200 feet? Mr. Collier said I think my house is 100 feet away but I really don't know. Mr. Kersten said if it is more than 200 feet, then you will have to build a driveway pull off. Mr. Kersten asked if he received the fire department letter. Mr. Collier said no. Mr. Kersten referenced Chief Strazzo's letter: *"there must be an area of 50 feet of unobstructed clear space off the driveway not further than 200 from the principal building to allow for an emergency vehicle to be turned around. Driveways that exceed 200 feet shall include a passing lane."* A copy of the fire department letter was given to Mr. Collier.

Mr. Kersten asked if he has an office at the house. Mr. Collier said no. Mr. Kersten asked where his office is. Mr. Collier said I don't have a physical office location. Mr. Kersten said if I want to purchase a new roof from your services, where would I go to meet you? Mr. Collier said I would come to your house. Mr. Kersten wanted to know if he ever had anyone come to the house for business. Mr. Collier said not once. He said if a customer has a check, they have to put it in the mail or I will come to pick it up. Mr. Collier said roofing companies that have a physical location go to the people's houses to look at the project and said I don't know that anyone would go to their office location unless they had a show room or something like that. Mr. Wetterman asked if the business phone number is his cell phone. Mr. Collier said correct. Mr. Wetterman asked if his phone is his mobile office. Mr. Collier said yes.

Ms. Barron said one of the things we will be considering is if the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction. She said you wanted an out building at some point and asked if he was aware of permits and restrictions. Mr. Collier said when I got the house, a pole barn wasn't something that was on my mind, but I did investigate what it would take to get that building built which was a permit and a variance. Ms. Barron said and you were probably aware that it was a residential area and there is no commercial. Mr. Collier said I was under the impression that in a township or village that you could have your business address as your mailing address for personal place for living and that it could double as a mailing address for your business. Mr. Wetterman said the thing that changes that is the storage of business materials and your trucks. Mr. Kersten said your application states you will store commercial vehicles and work tools. Mr. Collier said I don't know if it matters or not, but all of the vehicles are personally titled to me and yes, I use them for work.

Background Information on 575 Substation Road Variance: Ms. Czyz asked to give background information for board members that were not here in 2019 and said on April 30, 2019, the Colliers applied for a height variance of three feet from the 15 feet maximum. On October 19, 2019 they submitted an application and the height there was 21 feet, so it was three feet over what was allotted. Ms. Czyz said I returned their application and check and now they are applying for another variance for 23 feet as opposed to the 15 feet. Ms. Czyz said my concern is will the 23 feet end up being 25 feet?

Public Comment:

1. Cathy Ann Collier, (Brent Collier's Mother), 3088 Sleep Hollow Road, Brunswick Hills was sworn in. Mrs. Collier said my husband and I purchased the house that Brent lives in; it was a foreclosure, and when he moved there, he had a work truck that had ladders, compressor and tools that he would need to do a roofing job. She said two years ago when he wanted to build an accessory building, he got a hand drawing from an Amish gentleman and that drawing was done incorrectly. She said we had no idea and that drawing was submitted for the height variance when we were asking for the 18 feet and it was all approved by the board members two years ago. She said we took the next step and applied for a permit and submitted those drawings to Medina County Building Department. She said it got hung up there because they did not accept the drawing. She said so then we had to get an architect to draw the plans. Mrs. Collier said when the architect drew the plans, they noticed and notified us that height variance of 18 feet was no longer going to be sufficient and it was actually going to be 18 feet, 11 inches. She said once they realized what happened and Brent changed the height of the garage door, I did resubmit a permit to Evelyn because the house was still in my name at the time, and based on the architect's drawing that made the height variance now at 21 feet. Mrs. Collier said I realize

that was the wrong thing to do and I was not trying to pull anything over on anyone. She said the verbiage on the application where it says work-related trucks, yes, he probably has one truck too many and since he's getting married in a couple months there may be some things that change. His trucks do have ladders on them and he really does have a mobile office in his truck where he sets up appointments and gets calls. He is on the go continuously to homeowners giving them estimates, etc.

Mrs. Collier said we deeded the house over the Brent last year so he is now reapplying using correct drawings with the correct information drawn by an architect. She said now we know the height variance is 23 feet; it will not go over 23 feet and there is no reason to think that it would because we have official drawings now. She said by stepping forward as his mom, I am part of his dream process to have an accessory building. He has a riding mower and a plow to push snow for his yard only. She said the driveway is circular and read from the application letter that says *"from Substation Road to the front of my house is 181 feet."* Mrs. Collier said the accessory building will be built in the back of the garage 15 feet away and it will be out of the view from the street. She said this way, his trucks with ladders and a compressor won't be sitting out any longer in the weather and it will cut down on the thought of crime to the trucks. She said he would also like to put a garage door on the back of the accessory building so he can drive his lawn equipment out. Mr. Collier said that door is more for ventilation. Mrs. Collier said he is hoping to get an off-site location because he is looking to grow his business, so we have been looking for a commercial site for his trucks and to have an office.

Mr. Kersten said, so you are saying the trucks with the ladders and so forth will be in this accessory building. Mrs. Collier said yes, that is correct, to keep them out of the weather. She said he will be getting married and his bride will bring stuff and he also wants to buy a boat and that is the main reason for the height of the garage doors. Mr. Kersten said the boat is ok. Mr. Brent Collier said those trucks have been outside now for about 12 years, so if I have to keep them outside to get a vote, then it is what it is. He said I wanted the accessory for my personal stuff and yes, why wouldn't I want to put my trucks in there, but that was not the purpose of the building. He confirmed they have been looking for about a year for a commercial place to move the business, but it's hard to find the right fit because they are either too big or too small. Mrs. Cathy Collier noted again that he does have a turnaround driveway in the front of the house. Mr. Kersten said if the board would approve the variance, we would put in the contingency on the driveway for a pull off every 200 feet if that is required. Mrs. Collier said we want to do things the right way. In concluding board comment, Mr. Schigel said with regard to these vehicles being trucks or work vehicles, you can drive through any development these days and everyone has a work truck in the front of their house. Mr. Schigel said I understand with the trucks being service vehicles or work-use vehicles, but for him it's actually a silent salesman by having those trucks in front of his house. He said and parking them in the back actually takes the silent salesman away and helps protect his tools, etc. I look at it not as an interpretation of him utilizing that as a work place building back there. Mr. Kersten said I look at it the other way when you have four work trucks with ladders and all that and you are going to put them in an accessory building in a residential area, to me that is a no-no.

DUNCAN FACTORS

- A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.** All board members stated yes.
- B. Whether the variance is substantial.** All board members stated no.
- C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.** Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Wetterman-no; Mr. Kersten-no.
- D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.** Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-yes, if he doesn't address the driveway the way it is supposed to be. Discussion: Ms. Czyz said if he doesn't address his driveway, he doesn't get his permit either. The applicants asked what needs to be addressed with the driveway. Ms. Czyz said she will send the regulations to them tomorrow. Mr. Wetterman-no; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes.

- E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.** Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Kersten-yes.
- F. Whether the property owner’s predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.** All board members said yes.
- G. Whether the spirit and intent of this Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.** Mr. Wetterman-abstain; Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Kersten-no.
- H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.** All board members stated no.

Motion 575 Substation Road: Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve 575 Substation Road variance for the height maximum of 23 feet, which is an eight-foot variance. Mr. Kersten seconds. **Roll Call:** Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Wetterman-no; Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Lucien-yes; Mr. Kersten-no. Mr. Kersten said by a 4-1 vote the motion is to deny the variance. If the parties involved feel this is not fair, they have 30 days to appeal to file in Medina Common Pleas Court to try to overturn the decision.

Discussion: Mrs. Collier said I don’t understand why it’s being denied. Is it because he is not allowed to build a building there or is it because it’s 23 feet to accommodate a 14-foot garage door? She said is he not allowed to do that and asked if she is allowed to ask why you voted no. Mr. Kersten said I voted no because you have work trucks with ladders, tools, etc. and you want to build an accessory building and you want to house them in a residential area. Mr. Kersten said that is just not right and if I lived next door to that I wouldn’t want these trucks going in and out every day with ladders. That’s not what I bought a home for, so that’s why I voted no. Mr. Kersten said if anyone else on the board wants to comment they may, but they don’t have to. Mr. Wetterman said I think it is mostly because it is commercial use in residential district was the reason for my vote.

Mrs. Collier said the building will not house materials like shingles, nails and things like that. Mr. Wetterman said the application can be re-submitted a different way, but we have to go by what the application calls for. Mr. Collier asked if I do find a physical location that I am legitimately looking for and all of my work trucks and office are in a commercial district, will I encounter the same push-back? Mr. Kersten said you might not even have to bring it back before us, but you would have to go through zoning for the permits. Mr. Collier said we would need a height variance the same way because the 14-foot doors and the height have nothing to do with my vehicles. He said you can’t fit an RV or a tall boat with a trailer in a building with 10-foot doors. Mr. Kersten said I recommend you stop in the Zoning Office and go over it with them.

(Case #4) Tammy Acevedo, Robru Investments, 2000 Baintree CT, Brunswick Hills, OH, 44212. Variance to construct a new home; PP#001-02D-13-101, Zoning R-1. **Tammy Acevedo and Gil Acevedo, 17579 Drake Road, Strongsville, OH 44136 were sworn in.** Mr. Acevedo said we totally relied on the advertisement for the lot we purchased on Baintree Court. It was advertised as a buildable lot and the advertisement said “bring your own builder.” We included that information in the application. Mr. Acevedo said on the day of closing, I emailed the county for the driveway application and they emailed it to us. He said that was part of our due diligence and it wasn’t until after closing and contacting the county and the township further that we found out that it wasn’t in fact a buildable lot. Mr. Acevedo said we want to assure all of the residents in the community that the home we intend to build is in keeping with the homes there. He said we feel it will maintain the values there if not raise the values. We are very cognoscente of homeowner value and maintaining that value. Therefore, we’ve chosen a design that we feel will enhance the community and build existing values with the attractive front elevation, blueprint plans, etc. Mr. Acevedo said we feel the variance will also be in keeping with this board’s recent variance granted to the Calton family across the street at 2001

Baintree Court. He said the area variance that was granted for that lot was just a little over 11,000 square feet and our lot is over 13,000 square feet. We intend to keep the setbacks in accordance with the township zoning laws as well as the side yards. He said if we were not granted the variance, it would hurt us financially. He said I'm 63 and this is our retirement home.

Questions by the Board

Mr. Lucien asked who is presenting these lots as buildable? Mr. Acevedo said that was Roger Nair with Keller Williams. Mr. Kersten asked did you have any legal recourse against them? Mr. Acevedo said we haven't examined that. Mr. Wetterman said, they definitely told you it was a buildable lot? Mr. & Mrs. Acevedo said it is right on the advertisement. Mr. Acevedo said when we moved to this area from Westlake, we lived in Brunswick and we loved it but we just outgrew the space. He said we built in Strongsville and the taxes are very high, so we've been looking for a lot within our budget in Brunswick, Brunswick Hills and Valley City. Mr. & Mrs. Acevedo said we found this lot and we thought it was perfect and there are horses next door. Mr. Wetterman said in your application you had a post land search and it described it as .3 acres residential land, it does not say a buildable lot. Mrs. Acevedo said the ad that we have says it is buildable and referred the board to the application. Mr. Schigel said on the bottom on the land search page it does say bring your own builder. Mr. & Mrs. Acevedo said we wouldn't buy a lot that is not buildable. Mr. Wetterman said unfortunately there are people out there who would sell anything if someone will buy it. Mr. Wetterman said it works the same way, you can turn around and sell it yourself. Ms. Barron said no one would want to buy it. Mr. Wetterman said it is a residential lot, it's just not a buildable lot. It was confirmed that the ad says bring your own builder; build your dream home.

Mr. Lucien asked what Roger Nair's response was when you presented to him there was a problem? Mr. Acevedo said I haven't approached him yet. He said my brother-in-law is an attorney and he said don't talk to them, try to do everything that you can to try to get it rectified. Mr. Lucien said the reason I brought it up is that we are being presented with someone's lie and it is up to us to make it not a lie, and that's why I am wondering why you didn't talk to the sales company. He said and specifically I would address whoever is on the original deed holder of the land parcel, because that is who did the survey. Mrs. Acevedo said it was our understanding that we need the variance to make it a buildable lot and that was granted before for 2001 Baintree Court and that was a larger variance. Mr. Acevedo said we are asking for a smaller variance. Mr. Wetterman said I understand that, but unfortunately, I was not on the board at that time. Mr. Acevedo said we are just trying to build our home. I know that Ryan Homes built in that subdivision and the home we intend to build is higher quality. Mr. Wetterman said I have no problem with the home; it's the problem with where it sits on the property is not sufficient. Mr. Acevedo said we are not going to violate the side yards. Mr. Wetterman said where the house sits, you need 90 feet of width and you only have 75 feet and that is the reason why we are hearing this.

Mr. Schigel said from the diagram it looks like the plane of the house is consistent with the plane of the next-door neighbor's house? Mr. Acevedo said correct. Ms. Barron asked what is Robru Investments? Ms. Barron asked, is this an investment property or is it not an investment property? Mr. Acevedo said Robru is where we keep all of our retirement, stocks and personal assets. Ms. Barron asked if they intend to occupy the home. Mr. & Mrs. Acevedo said 100% and we will testify to that. Ms. Czyz said when the Meadows of Southpointe subdivision was plotted out, this was plotted out as a buildable lot. She said it was in the subdivision, in the plans and it was a plotted parcel. However, the parcel across the street and the subject parcel were not included in their Homeowner's Association documents. For whatever reason, those two parcels were not included and if you remember, Mr. Kersten, with Mr. Calton (2001 Baintree Court) that was huge mess. She said the county has put that family through unbelievable hurdles. Mr. Acevedo said maybe you brought out something I didn't know and maybe that is why Keller Williams thought it was a buildable lot. Ms. Czyz said no, when I talked to them although it was plotted in all of the plans that were submitted it was a buildable lot, but because it has been vacant for so long you had to adhere to the current zoning. Ms. Czyz said I talked to them (Keller Williams) explicitly and said whoever purchases this, you need to tell them and second of all they will have to file for a variance because it doesn't meet the 15,000 square feet for the yard requirements. She said if it is vacant for two years and one minute, you have to resort to the current zoning and that is what has happened here. Mr. Wetterman said so Keller Williams did know. Ms. Czyz said Keller Williams did know because I

told them. Mr. Acevedo said Keller Williams said it was a buildable lot; we bought it direct from Keller Williams and there was no third-party realtor involved; they were the listing agent and the selling agent. Ms. Czyz said don't think you are automatically part of their Homeowner's Association because you are not. Ms. Czyz said you get all of the governmental services, but you don't have to adhere to their color schemes over there. Mr. Kersten said and they cannot make you join their Homeowner's Association. Mr. Wetterman said it is a public road and they can't give you any grief.

Public Comment:

1. Mark Mucha, 2010 Baintree CT. Mr. Mucha said I live next door to the property that we are speaking of and I want to express my sincere and honest concerns of the variance that is being considered tonight. He said we have lived next door to this property since 2003 and we purchased our property due to the fact that the property was unique and it is private. Mr. Mucha said there are horses next door and we have protected green space in the back and the farm to the north of the property. He said directly next to us was a strip of land that Ryan Homes communicated that was a double strip and Evelyn, you communicated how it was plotted out as a lot, but I want to share what was communicated to me as the homeowner who purchased this lot next door. Mr. Mucha said from our understanding, this lot was kept by the developer, Terry Properties, in hopes of expanding the neighborhood if and when the land owned by the farm was sold. He said this double strip would be an important piece of property for tying utilities and connecting to the new development. As time passed, Terry Properties defaulted on the property and it went to auction. I contacted the Medina County Engineer Office and they communicated that this piece of land was not buildable. He said with this information, I did not attend the auction, however it was purchased and then later sold. The property went back up for sale this past year and I called Medina County Engineers again to see if something had changed and they reassured me that this property was not buildable because it did not meet the requirements for a home to be built. Mr. Mucha said it was purchased and here we are tonight.

Mr. Mucha said I ask this board to be reasonable and to take time reviewing the variance request. He said by granting this request, the property would not be consistent with the other properties on the street. We are here tonight not for the benefit of one trying to correct the lack of information or truth that was communicated, but rather, for the benefit of the community. We should respect the current zoning ordinances adopted and supported by the County Engineers; they were put in place for a reason. Guidelines were used to ensure that the community and adjacent properties were taken care of and that items could not occur that were detrimental to the existing property. Mr. Mucha said I'm sure the new home that is being considered is beautiful as many new homes are, however, have all of the members on this board taken a tour and walked the property? He said by granting these variances it will definitely have a direct and substantial impact on our home, adjacent properties and Southpointe Meadows as a whole. This property cannot sufficiently support a home that is comparable considering the landscape of the land and how existing properties are situated. Mr. Mucha said he is a homeowner much impacted by these variances and it is going to cause additional economic impact to my family because we will have to endure costs of landscaping and fencing to get back some of that privacy we've had for 16 years. Mr. Mucha asked the board to take a long hard look at this request and keep in mind if you were a resident of Southpointe Meadows, would you support this? Not being part of the Association, putting a home that doesn't meet the requirements; what if you resided at 2010 Baintree Court? Mr. Mucha said you would have similar concerns as I do and said we pay taxes and support levies for the township and I would expect that you support the best interest of the community when making this decision. This property and Mr. Calton's, comes with a lot of red tape and problems that need to be rectified with regard to utilities, drainage and the roadway. He said this is not in the best interest of the community and the variances should not be granted.

Mr. Mucha said if Ryan Homes had this plotted out as a lot, they would have sold it and they would have built on it and they didn't for a reason. He said none of us can answer as to why it just sat there, but it was defaulted and eventually sold. He said the gentleman that bought it knocked on my door and said I could get it back for \$20,000 and I said you bought it for \$4,500. The gentleman said it's an investment but once he realized he couldn't build on it, that's when he sold it. Mr. Mucha told the board to just act in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Lucien asked Mr. Mucha, who did you get your information in writing from at the Engineer's Office? Mr. Mucha said there were two phone calls. Mr. Lucien said you don't have anything in writing, do you have names or anything? Mr. Mucha said I do not. Mr. Mucha said he was concerned when it went up for sale and there was a lot of traffic. He said he went out and talked to as many people as he could because he didn't want them to be stuck with the property. Mr. Lucien said that is very dangerous doing something like that.

Gil Acevedo returned to the podium to read an email from Vicky Zalewski, Medina County Engineer Office dated March 29th. He said we were closing on the property and getting ready for the permit process. I'm familiar with the building trades and so I knew the first thing we had to do was go through the Medina County Highway Engineers Office for the driveway permit. He said I want to read exactly what she (Vicky Zalewski) said in her email: "*Hi Gil. Per our telephone conversation attached are the copies of the driveway apron and stormwater management applications. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.*" Mr. Acevedo said the point is that this was part of our due diligence; we didn't just go into this blindly and unbeknownst to us it was supposed to be a buildable lot. He said so somewhere along the line when Mr. Mucha spoke to them and then when they spoke to me, there was some kind of miscommunication.

2. Tom Calton, 2001 Baintree Court stated he owns the property across the street and that is the same exact thing that happened to me. I feel bad for them and hope that you grant the variance so they are not out the money like I would have been. I am still going through the process for improvements and I have the construction drawings and I am preapproved through Medina County Highway Engineer and the water department so I am moving forward with the build. Mr. Calton said it is unfortunate what happened and my lot and theirs were in the preliminary plan and in the phase it was built it was drawn up as future development. Mr. Calton said future development means that eventually there was going to be a house put on there. That property was for sale just like mine was and anybody in that development had the opportunity to buy the property to keep it from never having a house put on there and they didn't. He said and it is just like with my property where all the neighbors used it but they didn't want to pay for it. I was the sucker that came along and bought the property and the same thing is that it was listed as a buildable lot and that's been five years already. Mr. Calton said I hope that this family does not have to go through what I did but everything is in place and approved for the water line as well as all of the other improvements. He said I've done the road extension that was approved and the temporary turnaround that was approved so everything is set to go. He said I hated to see this happen to my family and hate to see it to theirs because they bought this lot just like I did and it was sold as a buildable lot bring your own builder and I've been through five years of misery. Mr. Calton said I did get a lawyer and he told me there is no going back on the realtor or the person that sold it to you. I know he hasn't looked into that yet, but I'm telling you I did and all I could do at that time without the variance was to pay my taxes and let my neighbors use my property. Mr. Calton said it was misery but I'm moving forward and will put a house on my property. I hope they can put a house on their property as a buildable lot. Mr. Calton said I talked to all of the neighbors and said I understand; I would have been upset too if I lived there, but the fact is they bought the lot and nobody else did and they are getting screwed in it. My property was also for sale forever and no one purchased it; just like their property. If I lived next door, I would have bought that lot. Mr. Calton said I feel sorry for Mark (Mucha), but it would be an injustice to this family to pay taxes on the property to let someone else use it.

Mark Mucha, 2010 Baintree Court said I will be respectful, but I did do my homework when it did go to auction and we all knew that these sites weren't buildable. He said I've spent the money and maintained that property since 2003 and I'm sure you think it looks nice, but unfortunately at some point this board has to think long and hard before we keep approving these mistakes that keep happening. He said I would have bought it but I would have been in a bidding war with the individual who bought it. He said I didn't buy it because I knew it wasn't a buildable lot.

3. Paul Wrentmore, 2009 Baintree Court said it's a bad situation all the way around, but when Tom (Calton) got his two variances, that was totally mismanaged. He said the plans did call for future development lot and I am assuming that the caveat would have been if it met all of the requirements for an R-1 lot like every other house in this development. He said you gave him two variances when there were already pre-requirements for an R-1 lot, so at what point do you guys throw your zoning regulations and rules out the window like I've seen

you guys go through all meeting long and just grant people whatever they want because they made a bad purchase. **Mr. Lucien** said Ohio Revised Code Sec. 711 governs platting in subdivisions, so how that lot was divided up under that law by whoever Ryan Homes had representing them, was done under that Ohio Law and it is not bound to our (township) zoning requirements if they meet Ohio Revised Code Law. Mr. Lucien said so it was buildable at the time it was made up. Mr. Wrentmore said there are only three requirements for an R-1 lot and you granted Tom (Calton) two variances out of three and that's a failing grade in my eyes. He said the initial developer that put in the development held on to that strip as a bartering chip if that farm next door ever sold and he defaulted. Those lots were never part of this subdivision or designed to put homes on them or Ryan Homes would have let them be built. End of public comment.

DUNCAN FACTORS

- A. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.** All board members said no

- B. Whether the variance is substantial.** Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Mr. Schigel-no; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Kersten-no

- C. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood will be substantially altered and whether adjoining properties will suffer interference with their proper future development and rights as a result of the variance.** Mr. Wetterman-yes; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Schigel-no; Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Kersten-no

- D. Whether the variance will adversely affect the delivery of governmental services.** All board members stated no.

- E. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction.** All board members stated no.

- F. Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some method other than a variance.** All board members stated no.

- G. Whether the spirit and intent of this Zoning Resolution will be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.** Mr. Wetterman-no; Mr. Schigel- yes; Mr. Lucien-yes; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes.

- H. Whether the property in question has unique or exceptional circumstances or conditions that do not generally apply to other properties in the vicinity and within the same district.** Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Lucien-no; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Ms. Barron-no; Mr. Kersten-yes.

Motion 2000 Baintree Court. Mr. Schigel made a motion to approve the 2000 Baintree Court house for the 13,000 square feet and the 70-foot frontage of the building line. Mr. Wetterman seconds. **Roll Call:** Mr. Lucien-yes, I approve; Mr. Schigel-yes; Mr. Wetterman-yes; Ms. Barron-yes; Mr. Kersten-yes. **Secretary Milanko stated the motion is to unanimously approve.** Mr. Kersten said on July 7th I will sign your decision letter and it will be mailed to you. He said within 30 days, if someone does not like the decision we approved, they can file against it in Medina Court of Common Pleas.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Trustee Kusnerak said it is my understanding that there is an issue in Medina County Planning Services with ORC. Sec. 711. Trustee Kusnerak thanked Mr. Lucien for providing the information on Sec. 711 and said she did send the information off and there is some discussion on that at the county and state level. Mr. Lucien said what is going on down at the county is that everyone is

racing to tie up loose ends. He said there is a document that exists that was actually written in the county by people in Medina. Ms. Czyz said it is being addressed at the county level and state level and the legislature is trying to put together verbiage for a House Bill. Mr. Lucien said I believe it's Sec. 23, but there are 40 laws under Sec. 711 and one of them specifically prevents townships, because they are unincorporated, from dividing properties on three lots per parcel. He said the fact remains that whoever platted out that subdivision, they own those lots free and clear legally and they were buildable lots.

Trustee Kusnerak said the Board of Trustees lifted the Covid restrictions effective June 14th and the contract for virtual meetings will be up on July 1st so we won't be holding virtual meetings and people have to come in person. She said it is still the discretion of people meeting in this room that the BZA and Zoning Commission can require that masks be worn after the June 14th deadline. Mr. Lucien stated given that criteria, I cannot attend public meetings due to my health situation and compromised immune system, so I have no choice but to publicly resign from the board. Trustee Kusnerak asked Mr. Lucien to hold off resigning to see if we can work something out because we need you on the board.

(Case #5), (#6), (#7) Turnberry Partners LTD & Anthony Vacanti, Esq. Conditional Zoning and two variance requests for 1595 Substation Road, PP# 001-02C-05-028 for proposed self-storage units.

(Continued to July 7, 2021 @ 7 p.m.)

Next Public Meeting: Wednesday, July 7, 2021 @ 7 p.m. [Mr. Schigel reminded the board he is on vacation that week)

Motion to Adjourn: Mr. Wetterman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Kersten seconds. **Roll Call:** All in favor to adjourn. Meeting officially adjourned at 9:42 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mary Jean Milanko, Secretary

Cliff Kersten, Chair

Date