

April 18, 2016

Mr. Jim Eichmann – Chairman
Mr. Ted Leugers – Vice-Chairman
Mr. Tom Scheve – Member
Mr. Jim LaBarbara – Secretary
Mr. Jeff Heidel – Member
Mr. Steve Scholtz - Alternate

Item 1. – Meeting called to Order

Chairman Eichmann called the meeting of the Board of Zoning Appeals to order at 7:00 P.M. on Monday, April 18, 2016.

Item 2. – Roll Call of the Board

Mr. LaBarbara called the roll.

Members Present: Mr. Scheve, Mr. Leugers, Mr. Eichmann, Mr. Heidel, Mr. LaBarbara and Mr. Scholtz

Also Present: Harry Holbert and Beth Gunderson

Item 3. – Opening Ceremony

Mr. Eichmann led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Item 4. – Swearing in of Those Providing Testimony

Mr. Eichmann swore in all those providing testimony.

Item 5. – Approval of Minutes

Mr. Eichmann stated the next order of business was to approve March 21, 2016 meeting minutes.

Mr. Eichmann asked for any corrections to the March 21, 2016 meeting minutes. No response.

Mr. Scheve made a motion to approve the March 21, 2016 meeting minutes.

Mr. Leugers seconded.

Mr. LaBarbara called roll to approve the minutes.

Mr. Scheve – AYE
Mr. Leugers – AYE
Mr. Eichmann - AYE
Mr. Heidel – AYE
Mr. LaBarbara – AYE

Item 6. – Old Business

SYCB160004
Mr. and Mrs. Ray Bauman
4371 Kalama Court
Variance

Mr. Holbert presented the resolution approving the variance request for Case SYCB160004.

Mr. LaBarbara called roll.

Mr. Scheve – AYE
Mr. Leugers – AYE
Mr. Eichmann - AYE
Mr. Heidel – AYE
Mr. LaBarbara – AYE

Mr. Eichmann explained what a variance is and the process by which the Board of Zoning Appeals makes decisions on those requests.

SYCB160005
Site Enhancement Services
8240 Montgomery Road
Variance

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Holbert noted the property is zoned "O" - Office and showed existing and proposed conditions on the property. He stated the allowable signage for the office district is one half square foot of building sign surface area per lineal foot of frontage. He noted the property is permitted directional signage not to exceed six square feet. Mr. Holbert said the proposal includes a 47 square feet "Outback" sign and a 10.6 square foot "Steakhouse" sign on the front elevation; a 10.69 square feet "Take-away" sign, which would be considered directional and could be permitted as of right if it were reduced to six square feet; and a 40 square feet sign on the side elevation. Mr. Holbert noted request is 235% above the amount of signage permitted on the building as of right. He pointed out that the "Outback" and "Steakhouse" signs proposed on the front are separated and considered two separate signs. He also said that if the property was zoned retail instead of office it would be permitted two building signs totaling a maximum of 81 square feet.

The Board members asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the "Takeaway" sign was in the total amount of square footage Mr. Holbert had noted.

Mr. Holbert answered yes.

Mr. Eichmann asked what the square footage would be without the "Takeaway" sign and what affect it would have to combine the "Outback" and "Steakhouse" signs proposed on the front elevation into one sign.

Mr. Holbert answered and said if the two signs on the front elevation were to be combined, the proposal would still exceed the square footage allowed but it would reduce the number of signs to two.

Mr. Eichmann asked what the remaining area of signage on the front elevation would be if the "Outback Steakhouse" sign on the side elevation were removed from the proposal.

Mr. Holbert said there would be about 57 square feet of signage on the front elevation if the "Outback" and "Steakhouse" signs proposed on the front elevation were to be combined and the building sign on the side elevation removed.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the signs were backlit.

Mr. Holbert answered yes.

There was discussion about sign lighting.

Mr. Scholtz asked for clarification on the office zoning and its effect on the Board's decision.

Mr. Holbert reminded the Board the property is also located in the SPI overlay.

Mr. Scholtz asked why a restaurant exists in an office district.

Mr. Scheve said was it approved years ago.

Mr. LaBarbara noted the building is pretty far off Montgomery Road.

Mr. Scholtz said it is difficult to see it behind the Red Lobster.

Mr. Holbert said this location is a destination and is packed all the time. Mr. Holbert noted the sign proposed on the side elevation is more of a hazard if it causes traffic to stop suddenly on Galbraith in an attempt to make the turn into the Galbraith entrance. He also noted most people would not enter from Galbraith unless they already knew the restaurant was there.

Mr. Scheve asked if there was ever a study about which entrance is used more.

Mr. Holbert answered no.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

The applicant, Charley Schalliol, of Site Enhancement Services, representing Outback Steakhouse, addressed the Board. Mr. Schalliol pointed out this is a unique property in that the building setback is quite large so that it doesn't have the visibility that the adjacent Red Lobster has. He noted there will be modifications made to enhance the architecture and façade of the building. The applicant stated motorists traveling north to south have the view of the restaurant obstructed by vegetation. He said although staff noted it is a destination, people happening to drive by would see the sign and recognize Outback as a clean, affordable place to eat and may decide to stop in. He stated the property is unique because the restaurant is located in an office district which is more restrictive for signage than retail.

Mr. Scheve asked if the applicant had considered any modifications that would be more in line with the zoning resolution.

The applicant stated with the façade modifications that are coming, it would not be good to eliminate the sign from the side elevation. He would be willing to combine the "Outback" and "Steakhouse" signs on the front elevation as staff suggested. He said the signs have LED internal illumination and would not be harmful to the residential area nearby. He said the allowable 40 square feet of building signage for the office district is not enough for the restaurant use.

Mr. Scheve questioned the existence of a hardship noting every time he goes to an Outback Steakhouse he has to wait for a table.

Mr. Schalliol stated the hardship is the lack of visibility to the major roadways noting the free standing sign is only visible from one direction on Montgomery Road.

Mr. Scheve asked if the proposal is a rebranding.

The applicant answered yes pointing out that this restaurant is one of the first to undergo the updates.

Mr. Scheve agreed it does need to be updated. Mr. Scheve asked if revenue had gone down for that location.

The applicant said he is not privy to their financial information noting the project demonstrates the investment the company is putting in to this particular site.

Mr. Eichmann asked how long the Outback had been there.

The applicant and Mr. Holbert answered since 1993.

Mr. Eichmann agreed with Mr. Holbert that this is a destination restaurant. He said he has a hard time justifying the multiple signs, but he could see a compromise on the square footage. Mr. Eichmann suggested the "Takeaway" sign could be smaller and comply with code and the two signs on the front elevation could be combined into one.

Mr. Scheve said the sign on the Galbraith side would probably be the one to eliminate because it would not be very visible anyway.

Mr. Eichmann asked for clarification on the square footage of the proposed signs on the front elevation.

Mr. Holbert said there would be about 57 square feet of sign surface area on the front elevation if the two signs were to be combined.

The applicant said he could make concessions based on the Board's feedback but stated the sign on the front door is a necessity. He said it would be possible to reduce the "takeaway" sign to six square feet or less.

Mr. Scheve asked if the sign on the front elevation could be smaller.

Mr. Schalliol said reducing that sign would affect aesthetics and readability from Montgomery Road. He proposed keeping the front sign as submitted with the "Outback" and "Steakhouse" sections combined into one sign.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the façade proposed would remain the same without the sign on the side.

The applicant answered yes.

Mr. Scheve asked about the timeline for construction.

Mr. Schalliol said it would take about six months.

Mr. Holbert noted staff has been working with the architect on the façade renovation to bring the facade into compliance with the requirements of the SPI Overlay District.

Mr. Eichmann asked if there was anyone present from the public who wished to speak. No response.

Mr. Eichmann closed the floor to comments from the public and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Mr. Heidel said he is ok with a compromise to allow the one sign on the front at about 57 square feet.

Mr. Scheve agreed the building is unique in that it is so far back from the road. He noted the new façade design is an improvement.

Mr. Leugers agreed.

Mr. Eichmann entertained a motion.

Mr. Leugers made a motion to approve the variance request for Case SYCB160005 for one sign only on the front elevation facing Montgomery Road at a maximum of 57 square feet.

Mr. Scheve seconded.

Mr. LaBarbara called roll.

Mr. Scheve – AYE

Mr. Leugers – AYE

Mr. Eichmann – AYE

Mr. Heidel – AYE

Mr. LaBarbara – AYE

Item 7. – New Business

SYCB160006

Bottom Line Land

12011 6th Avenue (600-0011-1508-00)

Variance

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. The applicant is requesting a variance to Table 4-6 of the Zoning Resolution in order to construct a single family home on a lot with two defined front yards because of the existence of a paper street. He noted this lot was created from a lot split. He also said the applicant had submitted two possible options for positioning the house, neither of which would meet the setback requirements for the "C" Residential District. Option One would have a 17 feet setback on the front yard adjacent to the paper street where a 30 feet front yard setback is required. Option Two proposed a 26 feet rear yard setback where a 30 feet setback is required.

The Board asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Leugers asked for clarification on the lot split.

Mr. Holbert clarified.

Mr. Scheve asked about the paper street.

Mr. Holbert said the Township could decide to put a street in there.

Mr. Eichmann asked if zoning requires a 30 feet setback from a paper street.

Mr. Holbert answered yes.

Mr. Eichmann asked for clarification on the site plan he had in his packet.

Mr. Holbert clarified stating that Cincinnati and 6th Avenue are the front yards.

Mr. Eichmann asked if there was a house behind the lot in question that would be affected by the 26 feet rear yard setback proposed in Option Two.

Mr. Holbert answered yes.

Mr. Eichmann asked where the property was located that was owned by the person who wrote to the Board against the variance request.

Mr. Holbert showed the property on CAGIS.

Mr. Eichmann asked if many of the houses in the area violate the setback requirements.

Mr. Holbert answered there are many lots in the area that have houses that do not meet the current setback requirements.

Mr. Eichmann asked why the applicant could not build a smaller house and meet the setbacks.

Mr. Holbert deferred to applicant for that question.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

The applicant, Mr. Rick Royce of Bottom Line Land, 16970 Bodman Road, Mt. Orab, OH 45154, addressed the Board. He said the lot split was done as it was to allow for two 6000 square foot lots. He noted there are other properties in the area whose lots have front yards less than 30 feet. He pointed out the next door neighbor has put a fence and trampoline on property that is the paper street.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the applicant could put a smaller prefab house on the lot.

Mr. Royce answered it would be more expensive to purchase a smaller house.

Mr. Scheve asked why it would be more expensive.

Mr. Royce answered the smaller house was from a different company.

Mr. Scheve asked for the square footage of the proposed house and why the proposed house is larger than the one installed on the adjacent lot.

The applicant said the house proposed would be 44 feet wide and said the house on the adjacent lot is from a different manufacturer and would be more expensive.

Mr. Leugers asked if the home would be put up for sale or used as a rental.

Mr. Royce answered it would probably be a rental.

Mr. Eichmann said he was having trouble finding a hardship when it is possible to install a smaller house that would meet the setback requirements.

Mr. Royce said he already put a deposit on the manufactured home that is 44 feet long and stated the cost is the hardship.

Mr. Eichmann said the Board cannot make a decision based on that hardship.

Mr. Royce said other properties are using the paper street without the proper front yard setback.

Mr. Eichmann asked if there was anyone present from the public who wished to speak.

Ms. Abby Perkins, of 12035 6th Avenue, Sycamore Township, OH 45249, said the trampoline and the fence the applicant mentioned are hers. Ms. Perkins said she is concerned about the proposed house being located so close to and facing her property. She noted the house the applicant installed on the adjacent lot is not properly maintained. She said there is a huge dirt pile and the grass is never mowed on the lot in question. Ms. Perkins said she is against building a house to rent because it will lower her property value. Ms. Perkins noted she cares for her property and she is trying to make the neighborhood better. She pointed out there is no benefit to squeezing in more houses.

Ms. Perkins showed the Board members photos she took of the property maintenance issues on the property in question noting she would email them to staff for the record.

Mr. Eichmann asked if staff had been aware of property maintenance issues on the property.

Mr. Holbert answered yes, noting the Township is required by state law to cut the paper street twice a year. Therefore, others sometimes feel they should only have to mow twice a year. He said the dumping of the dirt is not a zoning violation because the applicant is using it for fill. The Township has sent notices to the applicant because of tall grass and the Township has cut the grass on the property in the past.

Patty Butler, of 12010 6th Avenue, Sycamore Township, OH 45249, said she lives across 6th Avenue from the vacant lot in question. She said she backs up Ms. Perkins comments and said the previous owner of Perkin's lot purchased part of the paper street.

Mr. Holbert said the Township does not have a record of that stating typically the sale would be recorded.

Ms. Butler said she maintains the paper street near her lot always mowing the grass and maintaining the trees. She also said when the applicant rents the homes, instead of a single family residing in them, it appears that multiple families are living in the homes which could affect parking and traffic.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the paper street allows for parking.

Mr. Holbert said vehicles cannot be parked on grass.

Mr. Eichmann asked about the Township monitoring of the number of people residing in a home.

Mr. Holbert said it is difficult to prove who or how many people are living in a particular house, noting if it is an area that has crime, the Township can get the Sheriff's Office involved.

Mr. Royce said he has a regular grass cutting crew that takes care of his lots. He said the Township contractor cut the grass on the paper street as well as his lot and charged him

for both. Mr. Royce noted the Township lets the grass grow two feet tall on the paper street. He said other people park on the paper street.

Mr. Eichmann closed the floor to comments from the public and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Mr. Leugers said he has a problem with the owner splitting the lot and then asking for variance after the fact stating the hardship is self-created.

Mr. Scheve agreed the hardship is self-created, noting the applicant could put a smaller house on the lot and be in compliance with the zoning resolution.

Mr. Eichmann entertained a motion.

Mr. Scheve made a motion to deny the variance request for Case SYCB160006.

Mr. Heidel seconded.

Mr. LaBarbara called roll.

Mr. Scheve – AYE

Mr. Leugers – AYE

Mr. Eichmann – AYE

Mr. Heidel – AYE

Mr. LaBarbara – AYE

SYCB160007

Larry Randolph

11969 5th Avenue

Variance

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Holbert pointed out the property is on a corner lot, therefore, in order for a fence to be permitted, it would have to be setback 30 feet from the right of way.

The Board members asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the applicant could have an open style fence in that location.

Mr. Holbert answered no fence is permitted at all in a defined front yard.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

The applicant, Larry Randolph, of 11969 5th Avenue, Sycamore Township, OH 45249, addressed the Board. Mr. Randolph said he cut the bushes down that were in the location of the fence because they had grown over six feet tall and he could not maintain them. Mr. Randolph said the adjacent ditch would not drain and he had to have Township maintenance clean out the ditch a lot. Now that the bushes are gone, he can clean trash out of the ditch more easily and is able to see traffic. Mr. Randolph said the fence protects his grandchildren from getting in the ditch and his wife's garden from people coming through it. He pointed out he has an eyesore across the street and the fence blocks his view of that. He also noted the fence gives his neighbors behind him privacy because their bedroom faces his back yard.

Mr. Scheve asked if Mr. Randolph had thought about finishing the fence to the house.

Mrs. Darcy Randolph, also of 11969 5th Avenue, Sycamore Township, OH 45249, said she thought about putting up a picket fence with gate, but stopped work once they found out they would need a variance for the fence they had already installed. Mrs. Randolph said they would like to tile the ditch but, because their property sits lower than the road, it would flood. She stated she is also concerned about her grandchildren falling in the ditch and would like to keep people from using her yard as a cut through.

Mr. Scheve said he drove by the property and saw water in the ditch and what seemed to be a party at neighbor's house. Mr. Scheve said he is usually not a proponent of fences but he saw the problem the applicants have.

Mr. Eichmann noted the applicant should have asked for a variance before installing the fence.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the lot opposite the applicant's back yard is a nuisance property.

Mr. Holbert answered yes, noting the Township cleaned it earlier this year. He noted there have been issues on the property that the Sheriff has dealt with also.

Mr. Scheve noted there are many nice homes amidst other houses that are not being cared for in the area.

Mr. Randolph said he has lived there a long time and has a lot of family there so he chooses to stay in the neighborhood.

Mr. Eichmann noted he does not want to start giving variances to people to block out nuisance properties. He also asked about an accessory structure on the property.

Mr. Scheve wondered if the ditch was a hardship because it could be dangerous to children in that it holds water.

Mr. LaBarbara asked if the grandchildren could still get out of the yard with the fence there.

Mrs. Randolph answered yes saying she would like to put a gate at the end.

Mr. Scheve asked if the applicant would have to come back through for a variance to finish the fence even if the Board chooses to approve tonight's request.

Mr. Holbert said the Board could make that part of their approval.

Mr. Scheve said there is a hardship because the property is on a corner lot and noted he feels for the owner with what he saw at the neighbor's house when he drove by the property.

Mr. Eichmann asked if there was anyone present from the public who wished to speak. No response.

Mr. Eichmann closed the floor to comments from the public and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Discussion ensued about how the owners could close in the fence.

Mr. Scheve said he is sensitive to Mr. Eichmann's concerns about setting a precedent.

Mr. LaBarbara asked if the presence of the ditch made it a unique circumstance.

Mr. Eichmann said he would not want others to put up fences to block illegal activities.

Mr. LaBarbara asked if the person who filed the complaint about the fence was from the area.

Mr. Holbert answered yes.

Mr. Heidel asked if the applicant could have a four feet tall fence.

Mr. Holbert answered no because fences are not permitted in a front yard. Mr. Holbert noted on the aerial view of the property where a fence would be allowed as of right.

Mr. Eichmann entertained a motion.

Mr. Scheve made a motion to approve the variance request for Case SYCB160007 noting it should not set a precedent because the lot has a unique physical condition with the ditch.

There was discussion regarding if the applicant would be allowed to finish the fence.

Mr. Scheve modified his motion to allow the applicant to finish the fence as permitted per staff review.

Mr. Heidel seconded.

Mr. LaBarbara called roll.

Mr. Scheve – AYE

Mr. Leugers – NEA

Mr. Eichmann – NEA

Mr. Heidel – AYE

Mr. LaBarbara – AYE

Mr. Eichmann suggested the Board take a short break.

SYCB160008

Chance Truemper

7167 E. Kemper Road

Variance

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Holbert showed the aerial view of the property and the approximate location of the sign in question. Mr. Holbert noted the property is permitted to have a free standing sign per the Zoning Resolution. He showed two signs that were permitted previously on the property and the sign in question which had already been installed.

The Board members asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the door signs were permitted.

Mr. Holbert said the code allows for tenants to have a sign for identification on the building.

Mr. Scheve asked if the sign would be permitted if it was on the building.

Holbert answered no.

Mr. Scheve noted the BioRx sign is the only sign back in that area.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the issue was the square footage or the number of signs.

Mr. Holbert said the two freestanding signs for the office park were approved when it was developed and said no more free standing signs are permitted as of right.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

The applicant, Chance Truemper, of Cincinnati United Contractors, 7143 E. Kemper Road, Sycamore Township, OH 45249, addressed the Board. Mr. Truemper passed out additional photos to the Board and staff for the record. He said BioRx is a pharmaceutical company and the largest tenant in the building. He noted there has always been a challenge with the property because there are two buildings on one parcel setback so far from Kemper Road making it difficult for people to find the businesses. Mr. Truemper said there are no signs on the buildings besides door decals for identification of tenants only. He said the two tier structure where the BioRx sign was installed was originally a water fountain. He noted BioRx has a lot of customers and clients that come in and BioRx needed a directional sign for those people to find them.

Mr. Scheve asked if BioRx was in the second building and if there were any trucks or shipping.

Mr. Truemper answered no, BioRx does not have tenant space in the other building and yes, there are some trucks and shipping from the location.

Mr. Scheve asked if there were any other signs on either building besides window decals.

Mr. Truemper answered no. He said the building is unique because it sits so far back and cannot be seen from the adjacent highway.

Mr. Scheve asked the applicant what the hardship is.

Mr. Truemper said the hardship is there are two buildings on one lot with multiple tenants making it difficult to locate their biggest tenant.

Mr. Scheve asked if this situation is different from other industrial parks.

Mr. Scholtz noted usually when there are multiple buildings on one lot they are designated by numbers or letters but this property does not have such identification.

Mr. Eichmann asked if a Board approval would set a precedent for other tenants in the building to request a similar sign.

Mr. Truemper said he would make it known to the other tenants that this sign was approved through the variance process and that BioRx is unique as an anchor tenant.

Mr. Scheve asked for more information on the agreement the landlord had with BioRx and the uses of the space by BioRx.

Mr. Truemper explained.

Mr. Eichmann asked if there was anyone present from the public who wished to speak. No one was present in the audience to comment.

Mr. Eichmann closed the floor to comments from the public and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Mr. Eichmann entertained a motion.

Mr. Leugers stated there is a unique hardship because the property is a panhandle lot and the tenant needs more than just a directional sign at the entrance.

Mr. Scheve agreed noting no one will see the sign except those looking for the business.

Mr. Leugers made a motion to approve the variance request for Case SYCB160008.

Mr. Scheve seconded.

Mr. LaBarbara called roll.

Mr. Scheve – AYE

Mr. Leugers – AYE

Mr. Eichmann – AYE

Mr. Heidel – AYE

Mr. LaBarbara – AYE

SYCB160009

Chance Truemper

7225 E. Kemper Road

Variance

Mr. Holbert presented the case and case history in a Power Point presentation. Mr. Holbert showed the aerial views of the site and the location of the signage on the fabric awnings in three separate locations. He stated the tenant would be permitted two building signs with a total of 100 square feet sign surface area, however, the tenant installed three awning signs for a total of 72 square feet. He said the awnings would be permitted as of right with a permit but not the text on them.

The Board members asked questions of Mr. Holbert.

Mr. Scheve asked if these were replacements of existing signs.

Mr. Holbert answered yes, Queen City Awning removed awning signs and replaced them with new ones.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the applicant was present and wished to speak.

The applicant, Chance Truemper, of Cincinnati United Contractors, 7143 E. Kemper Road, Sycamore Township, OH 45249, addressed the Board. Mr. Truemper said he represents the owner of the building and that Queen City Awnings is the only tenant in a single tenant building. He said the tenant believed since they were replacing the existing awning signs that could be done without a permit. He said the original awnings were installed in 1988, replaced in 1998 and then again in 2015, which is the proposal before the Board tonight. Mr. Truemper said the property is on the corner of Kemper Road and a private drive and noted that, depending on which direction people are coming from, they would only see maybe two of the signs. He said somewhere along the line there was a precedent to have the three signs on the building. He noted the size of the lettering remained the same as it was on the previous awnings and that the square footage is less than permitted.

Mr. Eichmann asked if the work could be considered a face change.

Mr. Holbert said that would be stretching the definition of a sign face change because it is an awning not a removable panel.

Mr. Eichmann asked what material was used for the awnings.

Mr. Truemper answered a material called "Sunbrella" which is supposed to not fade.

Mr. Scheve clarified an approval would allow more signs but less total square footage than permitted by the Zoning Resolution.

Mr. Leugers noted that aesthetically, having the name on each awning provides balance.

Mr. Eichmann asked if there was anyone present from the public who wished to speak. No one was present to comment.

Mr. Eichmann closed the floor to comments from the public and the Board discussed the issues brought before them.

Mr. Eichmann entertained a motion.

Mr. Scheve made a motion to approve the variance request for Case SYCB160009.

Mr. Leugers seconded.

Mr. LaBarbara called roll.

Mr. Scheve – AYE

Mr. Leugers – AYE

Mr. Eichmann – AYE

Mr. Heidel – AYE

Mr. LaBarbara – AYE

Item 8. – Date of Next Meeting

Mr. Eichmann noted the date of the next meeting – Monday, May 16, 2016.

Item 9. – Communications and Miscellaneous Business

Mr. Holbert informed the Board the screens in the hearing room should be up and running in the next two weeks.

Mr. Eichmann asked Mr. Holbert about property maintenance and there was discussion regarding what bearing that should have on variance requests.

Item 10. – Adjournment

Mr. Eichmann entertained a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Scheve moved to adjourn.

Mr. Leugers seconded.

Vote: All Aye.

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 P.M.

Minutes recorded by: Beth Gunderson, Planning & Zoning Assistant