

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

**Tuesday, June 13, 2017**

The City of Pataskala Board of Zoning Appeals convened in Council Chambers, City Hall, 621 West Broad Street, Pataskala, Ohio on Tuesday, June 13, 2017.

Present were:

Bruce Ashcraft

Catherine Baird

Kathleen Hasson

Robert Platte

City of Pataskala Planning and Zoning Department staff:

Scott Fulton, Planning Director

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-17-010, 120 Blacks Road.***

Mr. Fulton reviewed the Staff Report, noting the applicant is seeking a variance to replace an existing 8' x 12' shed with a 10' x 12' shed that would exceed the maximum permitted square. The property currently contains a 505 square foot pole barn and an 8' x 12' shed. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing shed with a 10' x 12' shed that would be located in the rear yard. Per the code, the applicant is permitted a maximum of 240 square feet for accessory buildings based on the lot size. As proposed, the applicant would have an accessory building area of 625 square feet, exceeding the maximum permitted by 385 square feet or 160 percent.

Danny Biggers, 120 Blacks Road was placed under oath.

Mr. Biggers described the need for a larger accessory building, noting the riding lawn mower is too wide for the existing building, and due to his physical disabilities, it is necessary from him to use a riding lawn mower.

Ms. Hasson inquired as to why he couldn't use the pole barn for the lawn mower.

Mr. Bigger stated his wife uses the pole barn for crafting.

Findings of Facts were reviewed.

Ms. Hasson made a motion to approve a variance from Section 1221.05(B)(1) of the Pataskala Code for Variance Application VA-17-010, with the following supplementary conditions:

1. The applicant shall construct the accessory building as submitted within one (1) year of the date of approval.
2. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the City of Pataskala prior to constructing the accessory building.

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

***Next on the Agenda, Variance Application VA-17-011, 303 Aberdeen Road.***

Mr. Fulton reviewed the application, noting the applicant is seeking a variance to construct a 38 foot x 34 foot addition to the existing 24 foot x 30 foot detached garage, exceeding the maximum permitted size by 692 square feet.

Bob Spencer, 1900 Harrison Road, Johnstown, Ohio was placed under oath, representing the applicant, Eddie Urdak, whom was unable to attend tonight's meeting.

Ms. Baird asked if Mr. Spencer is familiar with the project.

Mr. Spencer indicated in the affirmative.

Ms. Baird asked if Mr. Urdak intends to park his RV in the building.

Mr. Spencer indicated in the affirmative, indicating the picture that depicts the southern portion of the property.

Height of the building was discussed. Mr. Spencer indicated the addition would be a little higher.

Mr. Platte noted the District as R-87 and asked if he could confirm the addition will not be used for commercial use.

Mr. Spencer indicated in the affirmative.

Buffering was discussed.

Ms. Baird asked if Mr. Spencer is aware of any restrictions.

Mr. Spencer noted he is not familiar with any restrictions.

Mr. Platte inquired as to a homeowners association.

Mr. Spencer indicated not being aware, however, he stated there are regulations they try to adhere to.

Findings of Fact were reviewed.

Mr. Platte made a motion to approve a variance from Section 1221.05(B)(1) of the Pataskala Code for Variance Application VA-17-011, with the following supplementary conditions:

1. The applicant shall construct the accessory building as submitted within one (1) year of the date of approval.
2. The applicant shall obtain all necessary permits from the City of Pataskala and Licking County Building Department prior to constructing the accessory building.
3. The addition to the detached garage shall not create drainage issues.

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

***Next on the Agenda, Variance Application VA-17-012, Corylus Drive.***

Mr. Fulton reviewed the Staff Report, noting the applicant is seeking a variance to construct a road with a 220-foot radius in the Hazelwood Section 5 Part 1 subdivision that would fail to meet the 350 minimum radius requirement. The Final Development Plan for Hazelwood Section 5 Part 1 was originally approved in 2000 and consisted of 40 lots. The applicant is currently in the process of amending the Final Development Plan, which would reduce the number of lots to 34. From staff's understanding, the need to amend the Final Development is based on changes in storm water management requirements. The amended Final Development Plan will appear before the Planning and Zoning Commission for consideration on June 7, 2017. As part of the amended Final Development Plan, the applicant is proposing to reduce the minimum centerline radius of a collector street from 350 to 220 on Corylus Drive. Pursuant to Section 1123.05 of the Pataskala Code any variance request from the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations must be heard by the Board of Zoning Appeals. Mr. Fulton noted Staff does not see any issues with the proposal as both the Public Service Director and City Engineer do not believe it would be problematic.

Joel West, 4900 Tuttle Crossing Boulevard, Dublin, Ohio representing Pulte Homes.

Mr. West noted being fine with the comments from the Public Service Director.

Mr. Platte asked if the Public Service Director and City Engineer were the only two comments that were submitted and having no issues.

Mr. Fulton indicated in the affirmative.

Findings of Facts were reviewed.

Ms. Hasson made a motion at approve a variance from Section 1117.10 of the Pataskala Code for Variance Application VA-17-012, with the following supplementary conditions:

1. The applicant shall receive approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission for an amended Final Development Plan.

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

***Next on the Agenda, Variance Application VA-17-013, 70 1<sup>st</sup> Street.***

Mr. Fulton reviewed the Staff Report, noting the applicant is seeking a variance to construct a 10 foot x 16 foot shed on a lot without a principle structure. Pursuant to Section 1203.03, an accessory building cannot be on a lot without a principle building. The proposed shed would meet all other zoning requirements. Staff has received a comment from the City Engineer stating that the property owner should consider a possible lot combination to eliminate the issue. Staff has not received input from neighboring residents.

Kathleen Ayres was placed under oath.

A discussion was had regarding two lots and one tax parcel number, platted lots, tracts and lot combination.

Mr. Fulton stated he will follow up with the City Attorney regarding parcels with two tracts.

Mr. Platte made a motion to table Variance Application VA-17-013 to the July 11, 2017 meeting.

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

***Next on the Agenda, Use Variance Application VA-17-014, 13142 East Broad Street.***

Mr. Fulton reviewed the Staff Report, noting the applicant is seeking a use-variance to use an existing facility as a daycare center located behind Word of Life church. Mr. Fulton further noted, per the Code, daycare facilities are not permitted nor conditionally-permitted uses in the M-1 – Light Manufacturing District, thus requiring the approval of a use-variance. Mr. Fulton stated the applicant has indicated the daycare is not associated with the church and would be a for-profit facility. The daycare is expected to house between 12 – 15 children and employ two part-time employees.

Ms. Baird asked if a traffic study would be required.

Mr. Fulton indicated it is not required.

A discussion was had regarding parking.

Mr. Platte noted the land use map shows office use.

Mr. Fulton indicated in the affirmative.

Vickie Westbrook, 206 Farm Creek Drive, Gahanna, was placed under oath.

Ms. Westbrook noted being aware of rezoning, but opted to request a condition use, as the fee was less. Ms. Westbrook indicated she is also an owner of the church.

A discussion was had regarding available parking for a daycare facility.

Ms. Westbrook indicated the daycare facility would consist of three- and four-year-olds.

Mr. Platte asked if daycare facilities were a conditionally permitted use.

Mr. Fulton indicated in the affirmative.

Mr. Platte stated he feels the use is appropriate; however, he noted his concerns regarding use variances, which are very rare and not granted lightly. Mr. Platte referenced 1211.07(b), and noted the intent is not circumvent the code. Mr. Platte also noted it would be more appropriate to rezone the property.

Ms. Baird asked when and why the property was zoned M1.

Mr. Fulton noted being unaware when or why the property was zoned M1, but believes it happened when the Township and the City merged.

A discussion was had regarding future land use map and current zoning classifications.

Mr. Platte again noted not being opposed to the daycare; however, doesn't believe a conditional use is the correct process.

A discussion was had regarding the church being in place prior to being zoned M1 and the use of the parcel.

Ms. Westbrook indicated hearing she could petition City Council to change the zoning.

Mr. Ashbrook asked if that should be the way to go, asking City Council to change the zoning.

Mr. Fulton indicated it could be, if the use is the recommended use on the Future Land Use Map.

Ms. Baird noted the applicant would need to acquire a conditional use if the property is rezoned.

Mr. Fulton noted in the affirmative.

A discussion was had regarding City Council and rezoning.

Ms. Baird asked what the timeframe would be to rezone the property.

Mr. Fulton indicated four to five months.

Ms. Baird inquired as to when Mrs. Westbrook was hoping to open the daycare.

Ms. Westbrook indicated before the end of the year, and noted classes she would need to retake as they will expire.

Hardships were discussed.

Mr. Platte indicated the Board cannot consider a variance based on financial gain or loss.

Spot zoning and compliance was discussed.

Rezoning process and fees were discussed.

Further discussion was had regarding amending the application to a conditional use with conditions and meeting with the Law Director for clarification.

Mr. Platte indicated he would rather go before Council and ask them to waive the fee than to carry the fee from one application to another.

A discussion was had regarding tabling the application.

Mr. Platte stated he would stand before Council and request fees be waived and ask that process be concurrent, to save the applicant time.

A discussion was had regarding tabling the application, withdrawing, or proceeding with a decision.

Mrs. Westbrook stated to go forward with a decision.

Findings of Facts were discussed.

Mr. Platte made a motion to disapprove a variance from Section 1211.07(b) of the Pataskala Code for Variance Application VA-17-014. Mr. Ashcraft seconded the motion. Mr. Platte and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. Ms. Baird and Ms. Hasson voted no. The motion failed.

Mr. Fulton noted the motion was disapproved, so no action has been taken on the application.

A discussion was had regarding further options the applicant could pursue.

Mr. Platte reiterated his willingness to go to Council in support of the rezoning.

Ms. Hasson made a motion to approve a variance from Section 1211.07(b) of the Pataskala Code for Variance Application VA-17-014 with the supplementary conditions:

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. The applicant shall provide a signed statement from the church indicating that the daycare facility may use their parking lot.

Ms. Baird seconded the motion. Ms. Hasson voted yes. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte and Mr. Ashcraft voted no. The motion was disapproved.

Ms. Baird stated the Zoning Director will follow up with the applicant regarding the next step.

A break was requested at 8:20

Back on the record at 8:27 p.m..

***Next on the Agenda, Variance Application VA-17-015 and VA-15-016, 10500 McIntosh Road.***

Ms. Baird noted the Applicants not being present.

Mr. Fulton noted the Applicants have requested to table Variance Applications VA-17-015 and Variance Application VA-17-016.

Ms. Baird indicated a speaker request form has been submitted.

Perry Brandt, 10518 McIntosh Road, was placed under oath.

Mr. Brandt stated no issues regarding the building but being used as a business with trucks and semis.

Mr. Platte noted the question regarding a business will be asked at the July hearing. Mr. Platte also asked if the applicant is the owner of Dean Trucking.

Mr. Brandt indicated in the affirmative.

Ms. Hasson asked if Mr. Dean has applied for the building to be used as a business.

Mr. Fulton indicated no business has been submitted.

Ms. Hasson made a motion to table Variance Application VA-17-015 to the July 11, 2017 hearing. Seconded by

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

Ms. Hasson made a motion to table Variance Application VA-17-016 to the July 11, 2017 hearing. Seconded by Mr. Ashcraft. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

***Next on the Agenda, Conditional Use CU-17-008, 3700 Alward Road.***

Mr. Fulton reviewed the Staff Report, noting the applicant is seeking a conditional use to allow the existing house to be used as a Bed and Breakfast, consisting of two bedrooms for guests and not exceeding ten guests per night. The space would also be available for commercial meetings so long as the overnight occupancy limits were not exceeded. Mr. Fulton cited Section 1273.06, 1273.04, as being contradictory; however, according to the Law Directory, a conditional use is still required as the Code specifically has a chapter addressing regulations for bed and breakfast facilities and thereby the intent is to have a process to permit them.

Ms. Baird inquired as to occupancy requirements for weddings, meetings, etc.

Mr. Fulton noted nothing in the code how that is to be addressed.

Ms. Baird asked if the fire department would recommend building capacity.

Mr. Fulton indicated in the affirmative, regarding building permits and fire inspections.

Ms. Baird inquired as to the shared driveway and if there is an easement of record.

Mr. Fulton stated the applicant was unable to find a shared access agreement.

Mathew Buss and Stephanie Siegenthaler, 3700 Alward Road, were placed under oath.

Ms. Siegenthaler stated there will be no non-resident employees. Ms. Siegenthaler stated having no issues of guests staying more than 30 consecutive nights or 45 nights in any calendar year, as they will only be opened Thursday through Monday. Ms. Siegenthaler also noted having no issues with complying with the guestbook registration.

Ms. Baird inquired as to a deed with a driveway agreement.

Mr. Buss stated being unaware of a driveway agreement.

Ms. Siegenthaler indicated the driveway being shared.

The location of the driveway was discussed.

Noise level was discussed.

Fencing, buffering and a ravine were discussed.

Ms. Hasson noted the narrowness of Alward Road.



Permitted occupancy was discussed.

Mr. Platte noted heavier traffic, safety, and Alward Road being narrow. Mr. Platte also inquired to the engineer's comments.

Ms. Siegenthaler noted they will work as parking attendants during events, if needed.

Ms. Baird inquired as to the responsibility of the maintenance of the driveway.

Mr. Buss indicated being unsure.

John and Kate Haidet, 3750 Alward Road, were placed under oath.

Mr. And Mrs. Haidet listed concerns regarding a business next to their property, including safety, noise, and liability.

Sepp and Lisa Rajaie, 3698 Alward Road, were placed under oath.

Mr. Rajaie noted his concerns regarding property value, safety and maintaining the driveway for the past 12 years.

A discussion was had regarding no deed or driveway agreement.

Ms. Rajaie noted her concern regarding no fencing, guest accessing their property, noise and traffic safety and sharing a driveway with a business.

Ms. Baird asked Mr. Rajaie if there was a driveway agreement with the previous owner.

Mr. Rajaie noted the previous owner did not live there, only used the house on the weekends.

Regulations regarding bed and breakfasts were discussed.

Deborah Hoy, 3945 Headleys Mill, was placed under oath.

Ms. Hoy listed her concerns, including noise, transiency and traffic.

Ms. Siegenthaler stated the house is their home, will not disrupt neighbors.

Further discussion was had regarding driveway agreement and maintenance of the driveway.

Mr. Buss stated possibly having a second driveway for access.

Mr. Platte noted the adjacent property owners being in opposition.

Mr. Buss stated they intend to respect the neighbors and will follow the code regarding bed and breakfasts. Mr. Buss also noted having children and no concerns regarding safety.

A further discussion was had regarding events, noise, traffic and safety control.

Findings of Facts were discussed.

Ms. Hasson made a motion to disapprove a conditional use pursuant to Section 1245.04(2) of the Pataskala Code for application CU-17-008. Seconded by Mr. Platte. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

Mr. Fulton reviewed the appeals process.

**Next on the Agenda, Findings of Fact.**

**Variance Application VA-17-010:**

- | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |  |
|------------|-----------|--|
| ✓          |           | a) <i>Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or if there can be a beneficial use of the property;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | b) <i>Whether there are unique physical circumstances or conditions that prohibit the property being developed in strict conformity with the zoning regulation such that a variance is necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;</i> |
| ✓          |           | c) <i>Whether the variance requested is substantial;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | d) <i>Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or the adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | e) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | f) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will be detrimental to the public welfare;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | g) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, would adversely affect the delivery of government services;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | h) <i>Whether the property owner purchased the subject property with knowledge of the zoning restriction;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | i) <i>Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some other method than variance;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | j) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and represent the least modification possible of the requirement at issue; and,</i>  |
| ✓          |           | k) <i>Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.</i>   |

Ms. Hasson made a motion to approved Findings of Fact for Variance Application VA-17-010. Seconded by Mr. Platte. Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte, Mr. Ashcraft and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

**Variance Application VA-17-011:**

- | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |  |
|------------|-----------|--|
| ✓          |           | a) <i>Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or if there can be a beneficial use of the property;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | b) <i>Whether there are unique physical circumstances or conditions that prohibit the property being developed in strict conformity with the zoning regulation such that a variance is necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;</i> |
| ✓          |           | c) <i>Whether the variance requested is substantial;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | d) <i>Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or the adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | e) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | f) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will be detrimental to the public welfare;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | g) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, would adversely affect the delivery of government services;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | h) <i>Whether the property owner purchased the subject property with knowledge of the zoning restriction;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | i) <i>Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some other method than variance;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | j) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and represent the least modification possible of the requirement at issue; and,</i>  |
| ✓          |           | k) <i>Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.</i>   |

Mr. Platte made a motion to approved Findings of Fact for Variance Application VA-17-011. Seconded by Mr. Ashcraft. Mr. Ashcraft, Mr. Platte, Ms. Baird and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

**Variance Application VA-17-012:**

- | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |  |
|------------|-----------|--|
| ✓          |           | a) <i>Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or if there can be a beneficial use of the property;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | b) <i>Whether there are unique physical circumstances or conditions that prohibit the property being developed in strict conformity with the zoning regulation such that a variance is necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;</i> |
| ✓          |           | c) <i>Whether the variance requested is substantial;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | d) <i>Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or the adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the</i>   |

- variance;
- ✓ e) *Whether the variance, if granted, will substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;*
  - ✓ f) *Whether the variance, if granted, will be detrimental to the public welfare;*
  - ✓ g) *Whether the variance, if granted, would adversely affect the delivery of government services;*
  - ✓ h) *Whether the property owner purchased the subject property with knowledge of the zoning restriction;*
  - ✓ i) *Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some other method than variance;*
  - ✓ j) *Whether the variance, if granted, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and represent the least modification possible of the requirement at issue; and,*
  - ✓ k) *Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.*

Mr. Platte made a motion to approved Findings of Fact for Variance Application VA-17-012. Seconded by Hasson. Ms. Hasson, Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. The motion was approved.

**Variance Application VA-17-014:**

- | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> |  |
|------------|-----------|--|
| ✓          |           | a) <i>Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or if there can be a beneficial use of the property;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | b) <i>Whether there are unique physical circumstances or conditions that prohibit the property being developed in strict conformity with the zoning regulation such that a variance is necessary to enable the reasonable use of the property;</i> |
| ✓          |           | c) <i>Whether the variance requested is substantial;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | d) <i>Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or the adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | e) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will substantially or permanently impair the appropriate use or development of adjacent property;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | f) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will be detrimental to the public welfare;</i>   |
| ✓          |           | g) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, would adversely affect the delivery of government services;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | h) <i>Whether the property owner purchased the subject property with knowledge of the zoning restriction;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | i) <i>Whether the property owner's predicament can be obviated through some other method than variance;</i>  |
| ✓          |           | j) <i>Whether the variance, if granted, will represent the minimum variance that will afford relief and represent the least modification possible of the requirement at issue; and,</i>  |
| ✓          |           | k) <i>Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and</i>  |

*substantial justice done by granting the variance.*

Mr. Platte made a motion to approved Findings of Fact for Variance Application VA-17-014. Seconded by Ms. Hasson. Ms. Hasson, Ms. Baird, Mr. Platte and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes. The motion was approved.

**Conditional Use CU-17-008:**

Yes   No

- ✓ 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.*

Mr. Platte made a motion to approved Findings of Fact for Conditional Use Application CU-17-008. 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 TJ Rhodeback from the April 11<sup>th</sup> hearing.***

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

***Next on the Agenda, excuse of absence for Bruce Ashcraft from the May 9th hearing.***

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

***Next on the Agenda, excuse of absence for TJ Rhodeback from the May 9th hearing.***

Mr. Platte made a motion to approve the absence of TJ Rhodeback. Seconded by Mr. Ashcraft. Mr. Platte, Ms.

Baird and Ms. Hasson voted yes. The motion was approved.

***Next on the Agenda, excuse of absence for Kathleen Hasson from the May 9<sup>th</sup> hearing.***

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

***Next on the Agenda, excuse of absence for Robert Platte from the May 9<sup>th</sup> hearing.***

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

***Next on the Agenda, Approval of the April 11, 2017 Minutes.***

Mr. Platte noted a correction on Page 2 of the April 11, 2017.

Mr. Ashcraft made a motion to approve the minutes as amended from the April 11, 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, Approval of the May 9, 2017 Minutes.***

Ms. Baird made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 9, 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.***

A discussion was had regarding upcoming applications.

***Next on the Agenda, adjournment to the July 11, 2017 meeting.***

Mr. Platte made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Mr. Ashcraft. Mr. Platte, Ms. Baird, Ms. Hasson and Mr. Ashcraft voted yes.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

Minutes of the June 13, 2017 meeting were approved on

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

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