

City of Norton
BOARD OF ZONING & BUILDING APPEALS
January 15, 2019

The Board of Zoning & Building Appeals convened in Council Chambers at the Safety Administration Building; Chairman Mullins called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. This was followed by the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silent prayer.

I. ATTENDANCE:

PRESENT:

X Donald Welch X Bill Helmick X Sandy Chrisant
X Andrew Mullins X Nick Genis

EXCUSED:

Donald Welch Bill Helmick Sandy Chrisant
Andrew Mullins Nick Genis

ALSO PRESENT: Mayor Zita; Bill Braman, Zoning Inspector; Jack Gainer-Ward 1 Councilman;
Charlotte Whipkey, Council at Large

II. SWEARING IN:

Chairman Mullins reviewed the procedural requirements for the night's hearing. Chairman Mullins proceeded by stating that this was a quasi-judicial Board and advised that anyone wishing to speak needed to sign the attendance sheet before standing to be sworn in prior to speaking.

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Mullins called the hearing open on BZA Application A13-2018 and stated it was requesting two variances; one for maximum height and a second for off street parking. Mr. Mullins asked the applicant or agent to come forward, be sworn in, state his/her name and address for the record, and present pertinent information regarding the application. Robert Powell of Arkinetics was sworn in:

- A. BZA Application A13-2018
 Thomas Lehner – Owner
 Robert Powell AIA, Arkinetics Inc. - Agent
 3163, 3177, & 3191 S. Cleve-Mass Rd.
 PPN # 46-01492, 46-03809, 46-02415
 [A Variance for 1276.05 Maximum Height and 1276.06 off Street Parking.]

Mr. Powell- Asked if everyone on the Board had seen the application and plan, which they had. I've also brought a proposed rendering of the building and he then provided copies to the Board. We are asking for two variances; one is for the number of off street parking spaces and the other on the building height. We have done several of these projects in the region and the number of parking is a reasonable amount for the type of building based on other cities that we work in. What is required in the current zoning would create a very large parking lot and a retail facility with what appears to be an empty parking lot is not inviting people to come in. There is a tight balance between having too much parking and not enough. The code creates a sea of asphalt with empty spaces and we really didn't want that for the facility.

The current zoning height we are working under has a 25 foot maximum height and requests a pitched roof. That is basically impossible to do with our building when it's 14 feet for the first floor because it is retail sales and then another 10 feet for the upper floor. That puts you at 24 feet before you have a roof. I know this isn't

an architectural review board, but I want to give you an understanding of what we are looking at and why we are asking for a 43 foot height. It's not proportional to the building; we would have to cut it off and put a flat roof on it and I don't think any of us really want that.

Mr. Genis-What's the use of the building?

Mr. Powell-The first floor's intended use is business retail, potentially restaurants, and the upper floor is all offices. That is the proposed intention; it all depends on the potential clients, but that is what we are trying to get.

Mr. Welch-Do you have any potential renters at this time?

Mr. Powell-At this time we have not talked to anyone directly as we don't have an approved plan yet and didn't want to start that until we had something more to work with. I am assuming we will go and start talking more directly to people tomorrow.

Ms. Chrisant-How high do you want to go?

Mr. Powell-The total height if the building is proposed 43 feet right now; the thing of it is, we will actually be cutting into the ground five feet as well due to the slope of the site. So the grade will actually be five lower than it is today when it's all done.

Ms. Chrisant- It will be 43 feet from the ground up?

Mr. Powell-It will be 43 feet from the ground up, but the ground is five feet lower than it is today.

Mr. Genis-The parking space, what is the setback from the road? Is that typically still there?

Mr. Powell-I don't know what it is right off the top of my head. This was drawn a month or so ago. It looks to be approximately 30 feet from the road curb itself.

Mr. Genis-So it's 25 or greater.

Mr. Genis-Also, on the space size, you have one space designated on the drawing as 9 feet. Nine feet would be the standard parking, 9 X 18 feet?

Mr. Powell-Yes, the standard stall would be 9 feet by between 18 to 20 feet long. Our van spaces we make a little bit wider and is why we specifically mentioned those.

Mr. Genis-So you didn't make the spaces smaller, you have the recommended size.

Mr. Powell-Exactly.

Mr. Genis-I find this interesting because Norton has five parking spaces per 1,000 square feet, which gives you that big number. It is interesting it is one number, but for various businesses, it could be a different number. So from what I can see is I would think it would be as follows, although I am not an expert as to how many parking spaces you need for your business.

Mr. Powell-We typically find between 2½ to 3 per thousand.

Mr. Genis-I have state requirements and this is what I think fits. The state has: eating establishments that is 1 space per 75 square feet, so that takes a lot of parking places for a restaurant; under retail, greater than 100,000 would be 1 per 300; a shopping center is 1 per 300; a medical office is 1 per 300; other non-residential medical care is 1 per 300; with others being based on how busy they were being more or less spaces required. So you can see that it varies by the business. I think the 300 fits, which you wanted; I think that fits from what I can see by the State requirements for parking spaces for 300. That comes out to 3.33 if I divide that into 36,540, I get 121. So you must have used, although I do not know how you came up with the 121, but going by what I have here I can justify the 121 as a minimum. The maximum would be what Norton

has which is 1 per 200 square feet. So you are definitely in the ballpark.

Mr. Powell-Yes, it is based on what we have seen other places do. It is usually about 1 per 300 or 3.3 per 1,000 which is the same thing and that's what ours is based off of. We just do not want to create a sea of parking.

Mr. Genis -So the number you gave us is a number that I can substantiate by the State document. You are at what the State would call 'minimum spaces required' and the maximum would be the Norton number. So you are at the minimum. I don't see a problem with this.

Mr. Mullins-Asked what the back of the building would look like and would actually impact residents in back of you?

Mr. Powell-We put this rendering together to help substantiate our height request. We haven't actually designed all four sides of the building. We haven't really gotten to the point to submit to an architectural review board yet; this is kind of a preview to help you understand the height. It will have windows as it will have offices and don't want a blank wall.

Mr. Genis -I have a question on the number of handicap places. If you would have met Norton's number, would that have increased or changed since you are at 121?

Mr. Powell-I cannot tell you how many handicap spaces are required per standard space off the top of my head. We can add a few more as necessary. We don't leave an entire row if we don't have to do so.

Mr. Welch-I see four.

Mr. Powell-We have five actually; we have four at the front for the retail and one at the side for the office entry.

Mr. Helmick-So you could add those?

Mr. Powell-If we are not at the state minimum, we would definitely add more. If we want to calculate on the Norton number, we could do that also and it would probably only add one additional space.

Mr. Genis-What about the water run off area basis. Who did you have determine that?

Mr. Powell-We have civil engineers and they have not been totally been brought onto the project yet, but they helped lay out the size of the retention basin.

Mr. Genis-Has that been approved, that size?

Mr. Powell-It is designed for what is necessary. It hasn't been submitted for approval yet; this is the first step, but it will be submitted to the County.

Mr. Genis-The one thing he thinks of when someone comes here wanting less spaces than required if will meet the true requirements.

Mr. Powell-The last thing we want is to have too few. If you have a retail facility and the parking lot is full or close, the people are just going to leave. So as I said, it is a delicate balance based on having too many or too few; it is hard to un-pave pavement to make it smaller.

Mr. Helmick- This two story building then and the design requirement, the height requirement is your main concern right now before you even proceed unless you can get that increased.

Mr. Powell-That is correct, we cannot really proceed any further unless we get that.

Mr. Welch-You are talking by your picture here at potentially five retail spaces down below according to your drawing and umpteen offices upstairs. So where is all the refuse and trash going when you have one dumpster to handle the entire building? If you get a restaurant and other retails and all have their own

individual dumpsters, you have supplied no places for them so they will go in parking spaces. Or you will put them out in the back and the residential owners will be looking at your dumpster/s when out on their back porch.

Mr. Powell-Our dumpsters will depend on what we are actually putting in.

Mr. Welch-That is true, but it crosses his mind that we are going tight on parking spaces, which is fair enough, but now we have to look at the other stuff that has to go outside that building as well.

Mr. Powell-The little segment that depicts the dumpster is more than 20 feet wide and it is really drawn out of scale; you could probably get three dumpsters in there. It is more of a drafting to represent the dumpsters, but the actual dumpster would be significantly smaller than the one showing and you could get 3 in that same spot.

Mr. Helmick-So the only variance you are asking for is the height of the building.

Mr. Powell-Yes.

Mr. Braman-As he had spoken at the last meeting on the parking spaces and now the height of this building, with the new zoning we are trying to get through the Planning Commission and we had thought by now would have already been through. This would not be an issue. These are not issues that would be in that zoning code. If you look at the R1 residential code, you can go 35 feet per home; our B2 is 25 feet. I don't know how that really makes sense to do, but obviously if you put a pitched roof on it the math does not add up. Just keep in mind that these are issues that probably even been an issue if the new C1 zoning had been out of the Planning Commission. Whatever they put in this building is going to fit the B2 zoning district anyhow so don't get hung up on what they propose to put in there. It is just the height and the parking spaces to consider.

Chairman Mullins stated we have heard the testimony of the applicant and asked if there was anyone wishing to speak for or against the application? Please approach the podium, sign in, state your name and address, and be sworn in.

Mr. Don Cunningham. 3192 Rosebay Blvd, approached the podium and was sworn in.

Mr. Cunningham- I live directly behind the proposed building; my Father lives to the south of me at 3202 Rosebay and I have a neighboring property 3168 and a brother and sister-in-law that live right up the street. So these four homes will be directly behind this building. First of all, we have codes in all the municipalities where we live or work for reasons. This B2 district is fine and dandy; the requirements say buildings will be 25 feet and parking spaces are to be 5 per 1,000 or whatever. If you know our area very well, south of Wadsworth Road is kept up very well. North of Wadsworth Road is total trash no matter what business you look at. My concern and objection to this building highly is the closest building on height to this building may be the corner store, and he is estimating, it might be a maximum of 30 feet. If this building is 43, I am going to be looking at a brick wall from my deck. On top of that, it doesn't show the back as the gentleman said he doesn't have the drawings, but if you look at the rendering on the right hand side there is a band of windows on that side. It will probably be in the back and those windows will overlook all of our backyards; so privacy is out the window. Also from the rendering of the site plan, I am not sure of that 10 foot side yard setback park. Is that off of the property line? My reading of the ordinances is that a B2 has to be 25 feet off of a residential district. So my understanding is the building would be 25 feet off of the rear property line, if I am correct on that. I don't know exactly where the property line is and there is no measurement to the back of the building for that. The other thing is the height of this building is a 58% variance they are asking for and I don't know if people have put it visually together. On footprint it is about 2,000 square feet at 43 feet in height. Across the street is all residential and south there is Rick's Auto and Dean's Auto which are all single story. They are very low and this is going to look like the Taj Mahal in the middle of this field is and all the houses and businesses will be dwarfed. If it were one story, they could meet the 25 foot height and it was smaller footprint, they could meet the parking requirements. I look at Planning and Zoning variances as hardships. These are not hardships because this is just the size of structure they wish to put on a property. It just seems like problems and we have already been fighting to get the area cleaned up; to put this brand new building in here and he doesn't object to the building as it is a nice looking building, but the size is going to be out of

character for the area. Then we have the rest of the problems with the corner store and some of the other businesses not keeping up their properties. Another thing is lighting. I know there are six parking lot lights on this schedule that are 25 feet in height. I don't know if it has to be 25 feet or could it be lower. I would also be concerned that we have down lighting or shielded lighting for the glare. If there are mandos on the back of the building, which would be facing our properties, exterior lighting is required by code so those should be down or shielded lighting with time limits so as not be on all the time. Anyone is more than welcome to come to my house or these other residences to walk the backyards to see the area and distance the building would be for us. All of the residents he is referring to have long been in the City and I don't feel that it is the right thing to do to put a visual hardship on them.

Mr. Mullins-Can you address that thing with the lighting, how is that actually handled in our code?

Mr. Braman-Probably on a development standpoint in the plans and I am sure those can be addressed as we go through. They are all valid points. Whether we have it in the development code, it is there to protect us. This hearing is not the way to get to that. I think those are good quality concerns and will be duly noted whether it be through the City moving forward with the plans or them. They are hearing these and do not want to come into a place where there will be a hostile environment right from the get go. I think those concerns can be worked out and handled.

Mr. Helmick-Where will this go to next, once they hear what we have to say?

Mr. Braman-They will send it to Planning.

Mr. Helmick- Does it stop or go somewhere to come back to go to another plan. That plan with how the buildings are all laid out and stuff normally goes to the Planning Commission first, right? And to the City.

Mr. Braman-If that is what the process is, that is how it will go. I did not go through who gets it first.

Mr. Helmick-That is normally how it is unless something requires a variance and is why he asked that question specifically tonight about the height and the number of parking spaces. Because if they are doing this in a different way, it is going from us then back to redo their plans again and send it back to the City of Norton again. Then through the route of somebody in the Planning Commission, but there are some questions about other things and then it might come back to us. That's the way I see it.

Mr. Braman-I think this is how you handle potential problems; it is by hearing them and the right people to talk through them are here tonight. We probably cannot spend a whole lot of time to go through every little thing, but those are concerns and I am sure they want to hear them.

Mr. Cunningham-As Mr. Helmick mentioned, usually what I am used it goes to architectural to see about concerns, then it goes to Planning and Zoning to see if they approve exactly the parking lot, house, or whatever. If there are problems there, then it goes to the variance process. In my mind, we are completely turned backwards on how we are approaching this project. That is for you to work out. It would be nice if somehow there could be a model made up of the size of buildings around this area and then the building. If you look at these 4 lots, that entire section is taken up with building. It is going to be mammoth and so far out of character to the area that someone will get a lot of negative feedback once it starts going up. I do not understand why a variance would be granted when we have ordinances to protect the residents of Norton that have been on the books forever. This isn't a hardship and these are not small variances; you are asking for a 50% increase in height and 30% decrease for parking spaces. By making your building smaller it would fit the code; there are ways to do it and I think this is over the top.

Mr. Dan Newman, 3172 S. Cleveland Massillon Road, approached the podium and was sworn in.

Mr. Newman-I live directly across the road. I think this is beautiful and I am the one that will be the most impacted by this property. I think we say 43 feet and we think of a façade and this is not that. The peak of the roof may be at 43 feet. If you look at the area behind there on Rosebay, it is up the hill and the peaks of their roofs when compared to this property, may be at or about the same height. From my point of view from across the road, I don't see where there is a problem. He is going to have to run or connect to the sewer line, he would assume or is the City going to pay for that? If you are paying for it, it should have already been

there. There was a business up at the corner that moved out of town because they wouldn't allow him to pay for it; so good luck to you dealing with the people that chased that business out of town. I hope you stay there and see this thing through. I think it would be a great addition to Norton. I am sure when they put Rosebay and those allotments in everyone else was complaining about it going in. Everybody just wants to complain about what is going to be there every time something new happens. This adds to the neighborhood so what is going to go in next. Will it go downhill or uphill? I say uphill. I went to a business meeting in this town in 1983 and a many business people asked the same thing "Why isn't Cleveland Massillon Road. 261, and Greenwich all business all the way with sewer and water? That was forty years ago and here we are fighting this guy who wants to put a nice looking building on one of our main drags that might draw people to Norton. We don't develop near our highway intersections; we chase everyone out that we can and when someone wants to come here we draw up little penny ante roadblocks. If you want to put six dumpsters in, build a fence. There is a tree line out behind this property anyway and half the year you cannot even see it. If there are minor hurdles, based on this, you have to assume that they are going to handle that in an appropriate manner. Why would you go to this amount of expense to say we are going to throw dumpsters right out on Cleveland Massillon Road. They won't do that; it's preposterous. I am going to be the most impacted, being right across the road; you will probably want to buy my house and tear it down. Whatever you want to do, God Bless you.

Mr. Cunningham-I don't believe it was before this Board, I think it was Planning, but Rick's Auto came in five or so years ago into the old hardware store. He also made a lot of promises about what he would do for and on the property and he has never followed through. To this day there is a significant amount of trash, tires, steel, and stuff stacked behind that building; so he is not maintaining it as he said he would. He did not put the dumpsters in as he said he would and he did not pave as he said he would do; and there is no follow up through the City for that. I understand what Mr. Newman is saying, but this is a big impact upon the area so please take that into consideration. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Mullins asked again if there was anyone that wanted to speak.

Charlotte Whipkey, 4624 Albert Ave, approached the podium and was sworn in.

Mr. Mullins- Are you speaking as a representative of the City or as a private citizen.

Ms. Whipkey-I am going to use my seat right now as I have a question. Is it normal that they come in and get the variances before anything is put in as I do not recall that happening. When Mr. Helmick was questioning it, it seemed as though you thought that this should be done elsewhere as far as the planning and stuff.

Mr. Helmick-I was just making sure that everyone from the City in this room understood this was not the final thing on this development. If they come in for a variance for the roof and parking on their plan, that is the only thing that this Board is ruling on.

Mr. Mullins-We will not rule or judge anything else as a part of this thing and Mr. Helmick agreed. We will work with what's been submitted to us and nothing else. If there is something else that is out of zone or whatever, we will not consider that at this moment. There is no way we can.

Ms. Whipkey-Once you make this decision, then it is a done deal.

Mr. Mullins-Just these two items.

Ms. Whipkey-Yes, I understand and that is what I am addressing; these two items.

Mr. Helmick-The Board of Zoning and Appeals could turn them down on those things when they get to them. That is their business, up unto now; that's them saying yes or no because they do not meet these code requirements. If they ask us to give them a variance at that point, they will have to come back to us.

Ms. Whipkey-Right, but once you pass these variances they will not be re-visited, it is done. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. Helmick- Yes.

Ms. Whipkey-I was kind of agreeing with Mr. Cunningham the fact that it seems rather backwards since what has been presented is not actually the finished product. That still has to be made.

Mr. Helmick-I am going to answer you in my experience. I have been a Councilman in wards 1, 2, 3 and at Large in the past. This is the first time in my experience that I have seen a variance come in ahead of a development within our City. For two things only and the rest of the things had already been in consideration for construction. This is the first time I have seen it.

Ms. Whipkey-That has been my experience for as long as I have been trotting up here too and is why I was sitting here and it just doesn't feel right. I want the business. I want the businesses bad to come in, but I also want my residents to be happy, although we all know that not everyone will be. I would not want that in my backyard or know that the office people are up there looking down at me. It just seems like this is an odd way of doing it. Did I understand correctly that it sounds like this is not even what they could be building period? He kept saying well it's not really done; they don't have the design. It almost sounds like this is a wish list.

Mr. Braman-If someone is going to build maybe an office space, it is hard to come to the City and say we want to build an office space to be maybe 43 feet tall with two floors or if we cannot do that then we have to redo it. It is not cost effective to submit two plans, so they have a rough idea of what they would like to do and even though it may not follow the plan as in the past that it has, I think economically this is the best thing for them and the best thing for us. That way if we need to tweak something down the road we can do it. It is hard to submit two plans and pretty costly to them and then to come here potentially for a possible no go. Rather than waste all the money, let's find out where we sit. That is why we are here today. Let's get a variance first and see where we sit. Keep in mind that we thought the other zoning would be in place by now.

Ms. Whipkey-I would really have to look at that again as I didn't think it was coming down that far so this would actually fall within the new zoning from what I remember; so I will check that out. I know you are telling me the C1 is coming there. The C1 is the new one we are bringing and I don't remember it coming down that far. In response to the sewer question, no, the developer is going to pay for it over time as I remember. We will probably be putting the money out, but they will be reimbursing us.

Mr. Welch-Generally in a development like this, you go through three stages; the feasibility stage, which I believe we are in right now. Then there is the preliminary stage which is a little bit further and that is the stage where you ask yourself one big question "Is there anything on this drawing that prevents me from doing this project as I have planned to do?" If you say yes there is, then you have to change things. Of course when you pass the preliminary stage, you go the final stage where everything is set in concrete. I look at this right now as feasibility; we have business people here that are asking if we can do something. They have given us a sketch which is nothing more than a feasibility study on what they want to do right now and it makes sense to me that they would want to do it this way. Why would they invest tens of thousands of dollars and go to a preliminary stage and ask for a variance. They have spent a lot of money and makes sense to do the feasibility, get the variances out of the way and then you can progress to the preliminary and then you can do the final. I think it is the proper step myself in my way of thinking about how it should be done.

Ms. Whipkey-I guess the issue I have is that I have been to many Planning Committee meetings and have heard the people come in and complain. Once it hits, and you have to follow the law, but once the law has been changed they do not have a leg to stand on because you are following the law. That is why I am concerned about this variance and I'm sure Mr. Braman is more familiar with the corridor. I do not want to see this rushed and then we have this room filled up for Planning and Council. I want the businesses in Norton; we need the businesses, but I also owe the residents to make sure we are not changing something that is really not for the benefit of all.

Mr. Newman-I am thinking they have probably spent more than \$10,000 on this property and will probably be spending more than tens of thousands of dollars on the sewer line. I think they are going to spend more than hundreds of thousands of dollars on this property and when I look at it, I think the total package as being maybe two to two and half million and I say I want some assurances from Norton before I ever sink any money into it. This is what I think I want to build; let me know if you want my two and half million dollars. I think we should at least help these people out in that regard. This is a preliminary, do you want us. I would say, dear God come to us, if I were you. Their putting the money in that they already have, shows their good faith. Now, what do we say to them? I say we shouldn't nitpick at them all the way down the line.

Chairman Mullins asked again if there was anyone wishing to speak for or against the application? He asked for a third time and there was no one.

Chairman Mullins declared the fact finding portion of the hearing closed.

Mr. Genis offered the document showing the State's requirements to the rest of the Board and how it seemed to fit.

Mr. Mullins agreed with the resident's concern on the back and wished they had more of a drawing of the back. It was discussed that it was up to the Planning Commission to mitigate some of these concerns.

Mr. Welch stated if the Planning Commission theoretically has this on the dockets to change the zoning, it would have been nice to have that change before this came to be. The reality is we have to go under the existing policies until such time that the changes are accepted. Number two, even if we said the changes are coming the 35 foot limit would still be shorter than what is being called for here. We have to go back to we do not have these new requirements; we still have the old ones, unfortunately. The different requirements for homes, barns, accessory buildings, and business heights were discussed. Mr. Genis pointed out that this is adding one more floor.

The Mayor reminded the Board to speak into their microphones so all could hear and they acknowledged they would speak louder.

Chairman Mullins asked if there was a motion on BZA Application A13-2018.

Mr. Genis made a motion to approve BZA Application A13-2018 for Thomas Lehner, the owner, and Robert Powell, the agent for variances on the maximum height and the number of parking spaces for the following reasons: the parking spaces proposes are in agreement with State standards for the type of mixed properties, so that is approved and I also approve the height requirement as requested as being in compliance as to what you would expect for a two story building. Mr. Helmick seconded the motion.

Chairman Mullins called for a vote on the motion:

For:

X	Donald Welch	X	Bill Helmick	X	Sandy Chrisant
X	Andrew Mullins	X	Nick Genis		

Against:

	Donald Welch	Bill Helmick	Sandy Chrisant
	Andrew Mullins	Nick Genis	

Motion Passed 5-0 The variance application has been approved.

IV. OLD BUSINESS: None

V. NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Mullins stated we have to hold an organizational meeting at this time to elect a Chair and Vice Chair. Would anyone care to make nominations for the Chair?

Ms. Chrisant nominated Bill Helmick for Chair and Mr. Genis seconded.

The nomination passed unanimously. 4-0 with Mr. Helmick abstaining.

Mr. Mullins asked for nominations for Vice Chair.

Mr. Helmick nominated Sandy Chrisant and Mr. Mullins seconded.

The nomination passed unanimously. 4-0 with Ms. Chrisant abstaining.

Mr. Helmick stated he would like to close the meeting by saying we left these people out here tonight really not understanding these were only two items that we voted on tonight and the Planning Committee can do whatever they want when they get them back. If they don't like what we did, they can object to us in writing and it has to be in writing from them. They are allowed to do that when they bring all the rest of the stuff to the floor like the architectural planners, and we do have some in Norton, they need to decide on a plan that is submitted like the one we got with the yeas and the nays that they don't like about that. That can kill it right there; it can kill it deader than a dodo bird. The Planning Commission, when they get it, can say we are not even going to process it as it has too many problems within it if they don't say they are going to change these things to something they like. Those are the options they have out there right now when they get this back from us. The only thing we did was approve the height and number of parking spaces. Mr. Mullins stated there are a lot of things wrong that kills this project, but we have nothing to do with that.

Ms. Szittai stated that when they get off subject like that, you have to get them back and tell them this is what we are here for tonight and that's it.

Approval of Prior Minutes: none

Next BZA Meeting – Tuesday, February 20, 2019 Meeting adjourned at 7:05PM.


BZA Chair/Vice Chair


BZA Vice Chair/ Member

6/18/2019
Date

Minutes recorded by Shannon Szittai