

**MINUTES OF THE  
CITY OF PATASKALA BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**

**Tuesday, April 11, 2017**

The City of Pataskala Board of Zoning Appeals convened in Council Chambers, City Hall, 621 West Broad Street, Pataskala, Ohio on Tuesday, April 11, 2017.

Present were:

Bruce Ashcraft  
Catherine Baird  
Kathleen Hasson  
Robert Platte

City of Pataskala Planning and Zoning Department staff:

Scott Fulton, Planning Director  
Zack Cowan, City Planner  
Lisa Paxton, Zoning Clerk

Chairwoman Baird opened the hearing at 6:30 p.m., followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

Roll call was made. Present were: Bruce Ashcraft, Catherine Baird, Robert Platte and Kathleen Hasson. Not present: T.J. Rhodeback.

***First on the Agenda, Variance Application VA-17-008, 063-148-254-00.000 Merritt Road***

Mr. Cowan reviewed the Staff Report, noting the Applicant is requesting to construct a 624 square foot home on the property; however, the code requires a minimum dwelling area of 1,450 square feet, and the Applicants are working with the Licking County Health Department regarding health department compliance. Mr. Cowan also noted an approved variance application from June 2016, and reviewed comments from the Licking County Health Department, noting a variance through the Board of Health would be required, as the property does not meet the minimum soil requirements; supplementary conditions have been placed to address the Health Department's concerns.

Carolyn Moreland, 100 Orchard Hill Court, Gahanna, was placed under oath.

Mr. Platte stated if the Board of Zoning Appeals grants a variance, based on the code noting a practical difficulty, what is the difficulty in reducing the square footage.

Ms. Moreland noted wanting to downsize to a smaller house.

Ms. Baird inquired as to a crawl space, slab or basement.

Ms. Moreland noted they are still looking into it.

Ms. Baird asked if there were any issues with the lot to build a bigger house.

Mr. Platte noted the Applicant requesting a reduction in dwelling size, and noted the zoning district requires 1400 square feet.

Ms. Moreland stated wanting to live in the country and to downsize their house.

Lauren Torgeson, 205 North State Street, Westerville, was placed under oath.

Ms. Torgeson noted the Applicants wanting to downsize, stated being a perfect fit for the lot. Ms. Torgeson stated the soil results make the Morelands perfect candidates for the lot. The water table is shallow and funding a more expensive septic system and a smaller house would be a better fit; a bigger house would be heavier and more of a burden on the soil.

Mr. Platte noted the code sets a minimum square footage per zoning district. Mr. Platte stated the Board's authority is to grant a variance on practical difficulty and trying to find the difficulty.

Ms. Torgeson noted the deck, a future garage and when completed would be close to the required square footage. Ms. Torgeson inquired as to the reasoning for square footage requirement.

Ms. Baird noted following the code, the 20% reduction, and looking at other factors to see if there's something else that the Board should review.

A discussion was had regarding square footage.

Ms. Moreland noted the homes in the area are all different.

Mr. Platte noted the changes due to the Lima Township merger to Pataskala.

James Johnson, 14707 Graham Road, was placed under oath.

Mr. Johnson noted field tile located in the back of the subject property, underneath Merritt Road.

Mr. Platte inquired as to the location.

Mr. Johnson approached the Board, indicating the location of water issues on Merritt Road.

Ms. Baird asked Mr. Johnson if he had any issues with a smaller house.

Mr. Johnson stated having no issues with a smaller house.

A further discussion was had regarding water issues.

A discussion was had regarding Findings of Fact.

Mr. Platte made a motion to disapprove the variance request for Variance Application VA-17-008. Second by Mr. Ashcraft. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. Ms. Hasson voted no. The motion was approved.

Next on the Agenda. Condition Use Application CU-17-003, 280 South High Street.

Mr. Cowan gave an overview of the Staff Report, noting the property was approved for rezoning, from R-7 – Village Single Family Residential to DB – Downtown Business, to allow the property to be used as a bakery. Mr. Cowan noted a variance is required for the Applicant to continue using the second floor of the home as her residence.

Diana Christine LeFever, 280 South Main Street, was placed under oath.

A discussion was had regarding conditional uses.

Mr. Platte asked if the property has been used as a residence.

Mr. Cowan noted in the affirmative.

A discussion has regarding Findings of Fact.

Mr. Platte made a motion to approve Conditional Use Application CU-17-003. Seconded by Ms. Hasson. Mr. Ashcraft, Mr. Platte, Ms. Baird and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

Ms. Baird noted the 30-day appeal process.

***Next on the Agenda, Conditional Use Application CU-17-004, 11346 Refugee Road.***

Mr. Cowan reviewed the Staff Report, noting a proposed 310' wireless communications tower would be located in the south-east corner of the vacant property, roughly 270 feet from the south property line, and roughly 180 feet from the east property line. Wire anchors are proposed to be located in the three guy easements setback at least 100 feet from the property lines. A gravel driveway would extend off Refugee Drive along the east property line and turn into a gravel turnaround surrounding the base facility. The proposed use is a Conditionally Permitted Use under the PM – Planned Manufacturing zone district. According to the narrative, this site was chosen by Verizon Wireless to remedy a significant service capacity gap in the area and an additional facility is required to accommodate the increasing consumer base. Several other locations were evaluated but failed to meet their requirements. The proposed facility would be unmanned and would not create excessive noise, smoke, or traffic. A letter from the applicant's attorney addressing the requirements of the code has been included with the report.

Mr. Cowan also noted if the conditional use is approved, the Applicant must submit a Planned Manufacturing application through the Planning and Zoning Commission for site design approval. Mr. Cowan also noted comments from the Pataskala Public Service Director.

Nate Meyer, PBM Wireless Services, LLC, 6869 Windjammer Drive, Brownsburg, Indiana.

Mr. Meyer stated Verizon Wireless' need to improve service and coverage in the area. Mr. Meyer noted a list of answers to questions that may be addressed, and also a letter their attorney had provided regarding meeting the zoning requirements.

Ms. Baird inquired as to the lifespan of a tower.

Mr. Meyer noted five year leases renewing automatically for 20, 25 years. Mr. Meyer noted updates are done when necessary.

Ms. Baird asked who is responsible for removing the tower.

Mr. Meyer noted it being the tower owner.

Mr. Ashcraft inquired as to the police and fire services being able to utilize the tower.

Mr. Meyer stated it would be available for those services.

Mr. Ashcraft asked what the price would be for public safety use of the tower.

Mr. Meyer indicated not knowing the cost to those services.

Mr. Ashcraft asked if they are willing to work with those services.

Mr. Meyer indicated in the affirmative. Mr. Meyer also stated carriers that are licensed by the FCC are required to have GPS signals to ping from any carrier, giving emergency personnel more precise location.

David Phillips, 7900 Columbia Road, was placed under oath.

Mr. Phillips noted being the property owner and taxes are “blowing us” completely out. Mr. Phillips noted leasing the property will help financially. Mr. Phillips stated he has been a resident for 70+ years and not sure he could stay a resident without the supplemental income.

Jeff Wayne, 8351 North High Street, Columbus, representing Ryan Homes, and Jeff Lewis, Esq., 500 South 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Columbus, representing Cumberland Estates, LLC., were placed under oath.

Mr. Lewis reviewed and outlined a letter submitted to Mr. Nathan Meyer from Bricker and Eckler. Mr. Lewis further addressed legal merits of the letter, and cited Pataskala Zoning codes. Mr. Lewis noted the Conditional Use requirements sited in the NAICS Classification Matrix for 2012.

Mr. Fulton noted the NIACS Classification noted in the zoning code was adopted in 2008.

Mr. Lewis continued the bullet points for Conditional Use requirements. Mr. Lewis noted Mr. Wayne being present to address the affect of a 300 foot cell tower across from a planned \$400,000 houses and ability to sell the houses.

Mr. Wayne stated the owner of the property and golf course made a substantial investment to improve the public golf course for local residents. Mr. Wayne noted Ryan Homes will be constructing approximately 95 to 100 ranch homes, downsizers, empty-nesters, contributing to the community and the tax base, without burdening the school system. Mr. Wayne noted having a 300 foot cell tower immediately across the street from the entrance of the community and having to see a cell tower.

Ms. Baird asked what the distance will be between the cell tower and the first house to be built.

Mr. Wayne approached the Board, indicating the locations to the Board.

Mr. Wayne noted his opinion being not something people would want there; it would not be a draw but a detriment. Mr. Wayne stated it will reduce the property value, reduce their ability to sell the homes. Mr. Wayne stated the tower will reduce their ability to draw in the tax base his thinks it will bring.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Wayne if there's a chance if the tower is built, the deal will not go through.

Mr. Wayne indicated it could. Mr. Wayne stated if a cell tower goes in across the street, it puts into question if someone will invest that kind of money and spend the rest of their life in the home.

Ms. Baird noted Mr. Wayne talking about wanting to build homes on the property and why should he be able to build his \$300-, \$400,000 homes that might increase the public services, and Mr. Phillips wanting a cell tower. Ms. Baird asked why is his request more important than Mr. Phillips'.

Mr. Lewis stated having a greater, tangible, effect on the community, brining in residence who patronize local businesses, they add to the tax base, they add to the funding for local services without increasing the demand on local schools. Mr. Lewis stated there will be substantial benefit for a lot of people.

Ms. Baird asked Mr. Cowan if the property is currently zoned planned manufacturing, and anything that is in the code for Planned Manufacturing can be placed on the property.

Mr. Cowan noted permitted uses in Planned Manufacturing can go in without a conditional use; however, they would have to go through the Planning and Zoning Commission for a Planned Manufacturing application to approve the site design.

Mr. Lewis noted, per the zoning code, Planned Manufacturing would need to be adequately screened, which is difficult for a 300 foot cell tower.

Mr. Cowan noted the types of landscaping.

Mr. Platte asked the maximum structure height in the Planned Manufacturing District.

Mr. Fulton noted 50 feet.

Ms. Baird added with new additional residences, they will want to use cell devices and where would a cell tower go?

Mr. Lewis indicated on the map there being other places a cell tower may be placed that is not directly across the street from a country club and \$330-, \$400,000 homes. Mr. Lewis also noted different places the cell tower could be placed and not be detrimental to the surrounding area. Mr. Lewis stated his argument is the zoning code does not operate extraterritorially, but is regulated by extraterritorial uses, talking in terms of vicinities, not city or boundary lines.

Mr. Ashcraft asked if there is another area on the property that would be suitable for the tower.

Mr. Platte asked if they would still be opposed if it were moved to the northern edge of the property.

Mr. Wayne and Mr. Lewis stated it would be a lot better.

Mr. Lewis noted in the very northwest corner would be a much better solution.

Ms. Baird asked Mr. Meyer if it were possible to move the location of the tower.

Mr. Meyer noted not being in a position to address the question. Mr. Meyer indicated they meet the requirements for a cell Tower and stated the property could be used as an airport, businesses that create noise, traffic, and vibration; noting the tower does not do any of the three. Mr. Meyer also detailed how Verizon develops cell tower sites. Mr. Meyer also stated property values are a function of the market and not a function of what use is next to them, necessarily.

Ms. Baird asked if there were any other questions.

Mr. Lewis inquired into tabling to the next meeting.

Ms. Baird asked Mr. Meyer if there could be a discussion between the two if it were tabled to the next hearing.

Mr. Meyer noted he would like a ruling tonight.

Mr. Platte noted there being much information to review, a lot of unanswered questions, a big decision for the Board, and needing more information to make his decision. Mr. Platte supported recessing the application to the May 9<sup>th</sup> hearing. Mr. Platte asked if there were any other options the Applicant would be willing to consider, including moving it somewhere else on the property.

Mr. Meyer noted there are currently four federal lawsuits where local boards decided, when the ordinances were met regarding towers, and they were denied. Mr. Meyer noted Verizon standing by what they believe is their rights and moved forward with lawsuits. Mr. Meyer stated texting his client and his client would be willing to do it on this one as well. Mr. Meyer stated the client feels that the code has been met. Mr. Meyer further commented that cattle are currently on the parcel where the cell tower will be placed. Mr. Meyer stated the tower will approve communication and won't impact anything. Mr. Meyer commented that there are 180 foot transmission towers currently in that area. Mr. Meyer stated Verizon could go straight to Federal Court, because of their licensing with the FCC, and stated his client wanting him to share that information. Mr. Meyer further stated that more time isn't going to change anything.

Mr. Lewis noted the letter submitted with the application from Attorney Christopher Ernst.

Mr. Platte made a motion for a 10-minute recess at 8:02 p.m. Seconded by Ms. Hasson. Mr. Ashcraft, Mr. Platte, Ms. Baird and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved

Back on the record at 8:12 p.m.

Mr. Platte noted he would like to get more information.

Mr. Platte made a motion to table Conditional Use Application CU-17-004 to May 9, 2017. Ms. Hasson seconded the motion. Ms. Hasson, Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. The motion was approved.

***Next on the Agenda, Conditional Use Application CU-17-005, 330 Jefferson Park Drive.***

Mr. Cowan gave an overview of the Staff Report, noting the Applicant is seeking a conditional use to allow the property to be used for an automotive repair facility. The property currently was previously used as an automotive repair facility; however, there is no record of a conditional use being approved for the property from the previous user; therefore, an approval of a conditional use is required to use the property for automotive repair purposes. Mr. Cowan stated the Public Service Director has request that the applicant provide details of methods to be used to retain and properly dispose of pollutants. The West Licking Fire District has also requested that the use group of the building be changed through the Licking County Building Department.

Richard Marmol, 8565 Wildomar Avenue, Reynoldsburg, was placed under oath.

Ms. Baird asked if work would be done inside the building.

Mr. Marmol indicated in the affirmative, with closed doors, unless hot.

Ms. Hasson inquired as to the hours.

Mr. Marmol noted 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Parking was discussed.

Mr. Platte inquired as to storage.

Mr. Marmol stated indoor storage.

Findings of Facts were discussed.

Mr. Platte made a motion to approve Conditional Use Application CU-17-005 with the following modifications:

1. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the City of Pataskala and the Licking County Building Department prior to operating the facility.
2. Liquid pollutants shall not enter any storm or sanitary facilities.
3. The applicant shall submit details of method(s) to be used to retain and properly dispose of pollutants.
4. The use group of the building shall be changed from S-2/B to S-1/B through the Licking County Building Department prior to occupying the building.
5. All permitted installations shall be kept in a neat and orderly condition so as to prevent injury to any single property, any individual, or to the community in general.

Ms. Hasson seconded the motion. Mr. Platte, Ms. Baird, Mr. Ashcraft and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

***Next on the Agenda, Conditional Use Application CU-17-006, 77 Cypress Street.***

Mr. Cowan gave an overview of the Staff Report, noting the applicant is seeking a conditional use to allow the property to be used as a metal fabrication facility for the purpose of manufacturing, assembly, and distribution of metal products. According to the narrative, all operations will be contained within the premises and will limit all noise, smoke, fumes, etc. Mr. Cowan noted the property already sufficiently landscaped on the property lines bordering the residential zones and the parking requirements have been met. Mr. Cowan stated the Licking County Fire District has requested that the applicant change the building group use to accommodate the proposed use and to complete calculations of the sprinkler system for verification that it can provide the required demand of the new use by a licensed sprinkler designer.

Ray and Penny Evans, 3149 Carters Corner Road, Sunbury, were placed under oath.

Mr. Evans noted a precision metal fabrication shop and has been in business for 27 years.

Ms. Baird noted the residential homes and inquired as to the noise levels that may impact the neighbors.

Ms. Evans noted all the manufacturing is done within the building.

Mr. Ashcraft asked if there were stamping machines.

Mr. Evans noted they do not have a stamping machine as they do punch holes, CNC process, and also use laser processing. Mr. Evans noted the majority is laser processing.

Ms. Baird inquired as the hours of operation.

Mr. Evans noted, generally, 7:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Platte inquired as to outdoor materials.

Mr. Evans noted no raw materials stored outside; however, there are gases, tanks, which will be stored outside.

Mr. Platte inquired as to screening of the gas tanks.

Mr. Evans noted they will keep it legally contained.

Mr. Platte asked if, for esthetics, there will be a neat containment area.

Mr. Evans indicated in the affirmative. Mr. Evans noted the gases are nitrogen.

Mr. Ashcraft asked if there will be different hours.

Mr. Evans noted hours could be different.

Mr. Ashcraft asked if it is Monday through Friday.

Mr. Evans stated they don't work a lot of overtime.



William Albert, 302 Bristol Drive, was placed under oath.

Mr. Albert noted concerns regarding noise in the neighborhood, trucks, and a second shift. Mr. Albert stated he has been around presses, welders. Mr. Albert asked if parts are being stamped. Mr. Albert also noted his concern regarding pollution and his septic system.

Ms. Evans noted the vagueness of what they manufacture is they don't make an actual product, they supply parts to other companies. Ms. Evans noted making brackets, cabinets, signage frames. Ms. Evans noted not having a standard product.

A discussion on noise was had.

Mr. Evans noted most of his products are short-run products. Mr. Evans also noted most of the things they do is laser cut.

Mr. Platte asked if doors will be shut during the summer.

Mr. Evans noted the only reason to have an open door, for comfort, as far as the temperature.

Ms. Evans noted big fans are installed.

Mr. Platte further inquired as to hours.

Ms. Baird asked if the Applicant would be opposed to stipulating to certain times.

Mr. Evans explained he is interested in getting along with the neighborhood and understands the close proximity of the homes. Mr. Evans noted there are items they can do to make sure the noise happens during the day and not at night.

Mr. Albert again noted his concerns regarding noise, hours of operation, more employees and vagueness of a second shift.

Mr. Platte noted the Board's obligation and authority is spelled out of what can and cannot be considered. Mr. Platte replied that the Applicant is not obligated to tell them what the product is, whether or not they will have a second or third shift. Mr. Platte noted the Board has the authority to place conditions regarding hours of operation, etc., and that may be something that can be worked out.

Mr. Evans indicated it is a growing business, a big investment, and to consider putting limits would be detrimental to him to pursue the building.

Mr. Fulton reviewed the noise code and there are stipulations in place for recourse. Mr. Fulton noted if using a laser the majority of the time, which produces very little noise, doesn't know that it would be a problem.

Mr. Albert stated he has been around laser machines and it depends on what is being lasered.

Ms. Baird noted the 60 decibels at the property line for noise.

Findings of Fact were reviewed.

Ms. Hasson made a motion to approve Conditional Use Application CU-17-006 with the following conditions:

1. The use group of the building shall be changed from S-1/B to F-1/B through the Licking County Building Department prior to occupying the building.
2. Calculations shall be made of the sprinkler system for verification that it can provide the required demand of the new use by a licensed sprinkler designer.
3. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the City of Pataskala and the Licking County Building Department prior to operating the facility.
4. All permitted installations shall be kept in a neat and orderly condition so as to prevent injury to any single property, any individual, or to the community in general.
5. All operations to be conducted within the building.

Mr. Ashcraft seconded the motion. Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft, Ms. Baird and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

Next on the Agenda, Findings of Fact.

Mr. Platte made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact for Variance Application VA-17-008 based upon the following:

- a) Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or if there can be a beneficial use of the property;
- c) Whether the variance requested is substantial;

Mr. Ashcraft seconded the motion. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

Mr. Platte made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact for Conditional Use Application CU-17-003 based upon the following:

1. Is in fact a conditional use as established under the provisions of Title Three of the Planning and Zoning Code for the specific zoning district of the parcel(s) listed on the application.
2. Will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with any specific objective of the City comprehensive plan and/or this Code.
3. Will be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be harmonious in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area.
4. Will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses.
5. Will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools; or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such services.
6. Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.
7. Will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operations that will be detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare, including but limited to excessive

production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odor, potential for explosion, and air or water pollution.

8. Will have vehicular approaches to the property which shall be so designed as to not create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares.
9. Will not result in destruction, loss or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

Seconded by Ms. Hasson. Ms. Hasson, Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. The motion was approved.

Mr. Ashcraft made the motion to approve the Findings of Facts for Conditional Use Application CU-17-005 based upon the following:

1. Is in fact a conditional use as established under the provisions of Title Three of the Planning and Zoning Code for the specific zoning district of the parcel(s) listed on the application.
2. Will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with any specific objective of the City comprehensive plan and/or this Code.
3. Will be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be harmonious in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area.
4. Will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses.
5. Will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools; or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such services.
6. Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.
7. Will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operations that will be detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare, including but limited to excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odor, potential for explosion, and air or water pollution.
8. Will have vehicular approaches to the property which shall be so designed as to not create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares.
9. Will not result in destruction, loss or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

Seconded by Mr. Ashcraft. Mr. Platte, Ms. Hasson and Ms. Baird voted yes. The motion was approved.

Mr. Platte made the motion to approve the Findings of Facts for Conditional Use Application CU-17-006 based upon the following:

1. Is in fact a conditional use as established under the provisions of Title Three of the Planning and Zoning Code for the specific zoning district of the parcel(s) listed on the application.
2. Will be harmonious with and in accordance with the general objectives or with any specific objective of the City comprehensive plan and/or this Code.
3. Will be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained so as to be harmonious in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area.

4. Will not be hazardous or disturbing to existing or future neighboring uses.
5. Will be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewer, and schools; or that the persons or agencies responsible for the establishment of the proposed use shall be able to provide adequately any such services.
6. Will not create excessive additional requirements at public cost for public facilities and services and will not be detrimental to the economic welfare of the community.
7. Will not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, equipment and conditions of operations that will be detrimental to any persons, property, or the general welfare, including but limited to excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, glare, odor, potential for explosion, and air or water pollution.
8. Will have vehicular approaches to the property which shall be so designed as to not create an interference with traffic on surrounding public thoroughfares.
9. Will not result in destruction, loss or damage of a natural, scenic, or historic feature of major importance.

Seconded by Mr. Ashcraft. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

***Next on the Agenda, excuse of absence for Kathleen Hasson from the March 14, 2017 hearing.***

Mr. Ashcraft made a motion to approve the absence of Kathleen Hasson. Seconded by Mr. Platte. Ms. Hasson, Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. The motion was approved.

***Next on the Agenda, Approval of Minutes.***

Ms. Baird noted a correction to the minutes.

Mr. Ashcraft made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 14, 2017 hearing. Seconded by Mr. Platte. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

***Next on the Agenda, Other Business.***

Mr. Cowan noted the applications for the May 9, 2017 hearing.

Mr. Ashcraft made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Ms. Hasson. Ms. Hasson, Mr. Platte, Ms. Baird, and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Minutes of the April 11, 2017 meeting were approved on

\_\_\_\_\_, 2017.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson Baird