



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

March 3, 2016

A. Call to Order – 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call - the following members were present: D. Falcoski, B. Seitz, and M. Coulter. Also present were D. Phillips, Chief Building Inspector, L. Brown, Director of Planning & Building, and P. Fox, Director of Law.
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of minutes of the January 7, 2016. Mr. Seitz moved to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Coulter. The minutes were approved.
4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses.

B. Items of Public Hearing

1. Variance – Front Yard Setback – Steps, Ramp & Handrails – **882 High St.** (Phil & Greg Giessler) **BZA 08-16**

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is in the C-3 district where the front yard requirement is 50 feet.
2. The existing building is 21 feet 1 inch from the High Street right-of-way.
3. The applicant is proposing to reconstruct the main entrance including steps, a ramp, and associated handrails, 11 feet 1 inch from the right-of-way. The requested variance is to allow the steps, ramp, and handrails entirely within the 50 foot setback
4. The property is subject to, and the alterations have been approved by, the Architectural Review Board.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. The location of the existing building prevents alterations without variances and places a practical difficulty upon the owner. In this particular case, the steps, ramp, and handrails are not substantial structures and mitigates the substantial nature of the variance request.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be altered.
3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

Greg Giessler, 387 Highgate Avenue, advised he had nothing to add.

Mr. Coulter said that this matter has already been through the Architectural Review Board process and he had no further questions.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY PHIL GIESSLER, GREG GIESSLER, AND CAROL & CO. LLC FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR FRONT YARD SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT STEPS, A RAMP, AND HANDRAILS AT 882 HIGH STREET, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 08-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 08-16 DATED JANUARY 7, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

2. Variance – Side Yard Setback – Garage – 52 W. North St. (James Ross/Musto) BZA 09-16

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 district where the minimum side yard requirement for detached accessory buildings greater than 120 square feet is 8 feet.
2. The lot width varies from 50 feet at the right-of-way to 50.34 feet at the north property line.. The property has an existing detached garage 3 feet 6 inches from the east property line.

3. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing detached garage and construct a 22 foot by 24 foot detached garage further to the north and 3 feet 6 inches from the east property line. The requested variance is 4 feet 6 inches.
4. The 2013 Residential Code of Ohio requires exterior walls and projections within 5 feet of a lot line be made of 1 hour, fire-resistance rated construction. Granting of this variance does not grant variances from the 2013 Residential Code of Ohio.
5. The property is subject to, and the garage has been approved by, the Architectural Review Board.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. This lot is smaller than typically found in the R-10 district, is narrow, and does not easily allow for a 2 car detached garage without sacrificing the already small rear yard. These factors mitigate the substantial nature of the variance request.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.
3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

James Ross, 6120 Crystal Valley Drive, Galena advised he had nothing to add.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMES ROSS AND LYNNE MUSTO FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR SIDE YARD SETBACK TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF A GARAGE AT 52 WEST NORTH STREET, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 09-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 09-16 DATED JANUARY 8, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

3. Variance – Parking Lot Screening Modifications – 6238 Linworth Rd. (Linworth Baptist Church) **BZA 10-16** (Amendment to BZA 10-15)

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 district where parking must be setback a minimum of 50 feet from the Linworth Road right-of-way for a semipublic use.
2. On May 7, 2015, the Board granted a 40 foot variance to allow parking within 10 feet of the right-of-way. At the time, the Linworth Road right-of-way was heavily screened including existing trees.
3. The applicant recently removed trees within the right-of-way without approval. To offset those removed trees, the applicant is proposing to plant a number of trees near and within the right-of-way.
4. The proposed screening modifications have been granted a Conditional Use Permit by the Municipal Planning Commission, with conditions. Those conditions do not affect the subject portion of the site.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. The existing utilities, specifically the electrical power lines, would eventually require severe trimming and pruning of the existing trees. Additionally, some of these trees were generally considered invasive. By replacing the removed trees with new trees, it appears to meet the intent of leaving the previously existing vegetation in the right-of-way.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered when compared to the existing semipublic use to the south.
3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

Donald Plank stated that he is the attorney for his client, Linworth Baptist Church, and said that nothing that they are doing will give them a variance from the screening requirements so this is in addition to the screening requirements for the parking lot. He said if you took a look at what was there before anyone could have made the same mistake. AEP had already chopped the tops of the trees off and the rest of the area was covered with honeysuckle. He said that what they are proposing now is actually better than what was originally agreed to. The only variance that this Board had granted prior was the ten foot setback off of Linworth Road.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there are plantings planned for the north side of the property and Mr. Plank replied yes, but that is not part the granting of this variance.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY LINWORTH BAPTIST CHURCH FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO AMEND ITS PREVIOUS APPROVAL FOR FRONT YARD SETBACK TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTED PARKING TO REMAIN AT 6238 LINWORTH ROAD, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 10-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 10-16 DATED JANUARY 8, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

4. Variance – Front Yard Setback – Fence – 307 W. Granville Rd. (Fence-N-Deck Doctors/Douglas) BZA 11-16

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is in the R-10 district where the building setback line is 50 feet along a regional thoroughfare. Fencing is not permitted between the right-of-way and the building setback line.
2. The property had an existing 2 rail, approximately 2 feet in height, open style fence within the 50 foot setback.
3. The applicant replaced the existing fence with a similar style fence in the same location. The requested variance is to allow the fence in the front setback to remain.
4. The property is subject to, and the fence has been approved by, the Architectural Review Board.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. This property is one of a few that abut a regional thoroughfare where the right-of-way is exceptionally wide to accommodate a service drive. A typical residential right-of-way is 50 feet and this portion of State Route 161 is 150 feet. The fencing is not very tall, is an open style, and partially encloses some landscaping and appears to be more of a landscaping feature than a typical fence. These factors mitigate the substantial nature of the variance request.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.

3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

Robert Douglas, 307 West Granville Road that he did not have anything further to say other than that the fence has been in the current location for fifty years. He can no longer keep up with the repairs to the fence so he decided to pay to have it done. He said that they have already received approval from the Architectural Review Board, and the Inspector has already been to the house to inspect the holes. He said that he did not realize that he had to come before the Board of Zoning Appeals also and apologized to the Board members. Mr. Coulter said that the fence is a great improvement and Mr. Seitz agreed.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY FENCE-N-DECK DOCTORS AND ROBERT DOUGLAS FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR FRONT YARD SETBACK TO ALLOW A FENCE TO REMAIN AT 307 WEST GRANVILLE ROAD, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 11-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 11-16 DATED JANUARY 15, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

5. Variance – Side Yard Setback – Window Well – 228 Pingree Dr. (Mark Henry Construction Inc./Copsey) **BZA 12-16**

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 district where the prevailing side yard requirement is to be maintained.
2. The existing dwelling is 7 feet from the east property line.
3. The applicant is proposing to install an approximately 48 inch by 48 inch window well in the east side yard, approximately 3 feet from the east property line. The requested variance is approximately 4 feet.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. The requested variance is not substantial.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.

3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

Mark Henry, 107 South Sunbury Road, Westerville, Ohio said he had no additional comments.

Mr. Seitz asked how the alignment of the proposed window well will be in regards to the neighboring property's window well and Mr. Henry replied they will be right across from each other. He said there is also an option in the back that he could use but it is currently a walk-in closet. They chose to put the window well on the side of the house to allow for more light. The room below the window well is a bedroom.

Mr. Falcoski asked Mr. Phillips if a fence was required to surround the window well and Mr. Phillips replied no, there is no building code or zoning code requirement.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY MARK HENRY AND LINDA COPSEY FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR SIDE YARD SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT A WINDOW WELL AT 228 PINGREE DRIVE, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 12-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 12-16 DATED FEBRUARY 1, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

6. Variance – Rear Yard Setback – 3-Season Room – 6838 Perry Dr. (Dennis J. Meacham Architect/Miles) BZA 13-16

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is in the R-10 district where the minimum required rear yard is 30 feet.
2. The applicant is proposing to construct a 17 foot 4 inch by 14 foot 3-season room at the rear of the dwelling, between 24 feet and 25 feet from the north property line. The requested variance is between 6 feet and 5 feet.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. The property is on a corner with additional setback requirements not typically required on other properties in the district. In this particular case, the larger than typical setback requirements mitigates the substantial nature of the variance request.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.
3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

Lonnie Miles, 6838 Perry Drive, and Dennis Meacham, 763 Glenview Drive, Howard, advised they had nothing to add.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY DENNIS J. MEACHAM AND LONNIE L. MILES FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR REAR YARD SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT A 3-SEASON ROOM AT 6838 PERRY DRIVE, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 13-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 13-16 DATED FEBRUARY 3, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

7. Variance – Front & Side Yard Setback – Fence – 584 Meadoway Pk. (James & Cassandra Dauphinee) BZA 14-16

Findings of fact:

1. This property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 district where the minimum required front yard is 30 feet. Corner lots are permitted to reduce the adjacent yard to 20 feet. Fencing is not permitted between the right-of-way line and the building setback line. Fencing and landscaping within 10 feet of the right-of-way cannot exceed a height of 2 feet 6 inches above the street grade.
2. The Indianola Avenue right-of-way is 80 feet, and the Meadoway Park right-of-way is 50 feet.

3. The property has an existing 5 foot tall chain-linked fence in the front yard setback and the Indianola Avenue right-of-way, approximately 46 feet long by 27 feet wide. The existing fence appears to be approximately 20 feet into the Indianola Avenue right-of-way. This fence was erected on March 6, 1975 and granted a front yard setback variance to allow it to remain on September 4, 1975. No record was found that Worthington City Council approved the portion of the fence within the right-of-way although Council was advised of the fence on May 12, 1975.
4. The applicant is proposing to replace the existing fence with a 4 foot tall wooden fence 40 feet long by 49 feet long. The proposed fence continues to be in the front yard setback, in the Indianola Avenue right-of-way, will now encroach into the 20 foot side yard setback, and appears it may encroach approximately 2 feet into the Meadoway Park right-of-way. The requested variances are 30 feet for front yard setback and 20 feet for side yard setback.
5. Staff prepared a sketch superimposed over an aerial photograph to clarify.
6. Assuming a 6 inch curb and a relatively flat yard, the maximum fence height of 2 feet 6 inches at street grade is approximately 2 feet above the ground. The requested variance for fence height is 2 feet.
7. Worthington City Council must approve any portion of the fence in the right-of-way. Any Board of Zoning Appeals approval does not grant any City Council approval.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. The property is on a corner with additional setback requirements not typically required on other properties in the district. In this particular case, the Indianola Avenue right-of-way is much wider than a typical residential street which may mitigate the encroachment of the fence into at least a portion the front yard setback, perhaps 15 feet. Although the existing fence is within the right-of-way and the proposed fence lessens this encroachment moving it approximately 6 feet to the west, a portion of the fence continues to encroach into the Indianola right-of-way. Similarly, the fence is proposed to encroach into the 20 foot side yard and appears to also encroach into the Meadoway Park right-of-way. All of these factors represent a substantial setback variance request.
2. The purpose of preserving intersection sight lines is to allow vehicle drivers to see vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, and other users of roads and sidewalks well before reaching an intersection. The proposed fence will impact the sight lines at the intersection for eastbound traffic on Meadoway Park, and greatly impact southbound traffic on Indianola Avenue. The zoning code recognizes these hazards and prohibits fencing exceeding 2 foot 6 inches above the road surface when located within 10 feet of the right of way. In this particular case, the fencing not only exceeds 2 feet 6 inches in height above the roadway, the fencing will be

within the right-of-way creating a greater hazard. These factors present a safety concern for this substantial variance request.

3. The essential character of the neighborhood will be altered since fencing is rarely approved in the front yard. The existing chain-link fence was approved in 1975 because the Building Inspector erroneously approved the fence permit creating a hardship upon the property owner especially when City Council would not agree to pay to move the fence. The open style of the chain-link allows visibility across this corner lot, which the Board took into account in 1975.
4. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

James Dauphinee, 584 Meadoway Park said that this project will greatly improve the look of their yard. When they moved in they spent a lot of time removing the overgrown vegetation off the fence. They decided to hold off on doing any landscaping until they got their fence approved. He continued to say they want to contain their two dogs in the yard, and make the yard look better. He stated the dashed line on the drawing represents where the new fence will be located.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there is process with the city that Mr. Dauphinee would have to go through from a safety standpoint or is this the body, the Board of Zoning Appeal can say yes or no for the fence because he noticed while visiting the property that the fence could cause some sight line problems. Mr. Phillips replied the Board only has authorization for that portion of the fence that is on private property and could grant a variance to the right-of-way line. The next step would be for this matter to go to the Worthington City Council where they can approve the portion of the fence that is in the right-of-way. At that time, staff members will discuss safety concerns with the members of Council.

Mr. Coulter asked if the Board could make a recommendation and Mr. Phillips replied yes, but the process is not the same as with the Municipal Planning Commission. The Board would be granting a variance for the fence on private property that would extend to the right-of-way.

Mr. Dauphinee asked if he brings the fence back twenty feet to where the requirement is for Indianola Avenue would that reduce the sight line encumbrance. Mr. Falcoski asked if the need for a variance would be eliminated if Mr. Dauphinee moves the fence back away from the right-of-way. Mr. Phillips replied the fence would still be in the front yard setback, so a variance would still be required. Mr. Falcoski stated that if Mr. Dauphinee pulls the fence away from both rights-of-way and follows the white line as depicted on the sketch, he would not need to go to City Council.

Mr. Falcoski said that he appreciates Mr. Dauphinee making the adjustment to move the fence back and feels that the new fence will greatly improve the look of the property. Mr. Dauphinee said that he will build his fence along the white line as depicted in the photograph.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMES AND CASSONDRA DAUPHINEE FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR FRONT AND SIDE YARD SETBACK TO ERECT A FENCE AT 584 MEADOWAY PARK, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 14-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 14-16 DATED FEBRUARY 4, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

8. Variance – Side Yard Setback – Garage – 40 W. North St. (James Ross/Brooks) BZA 15-16

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 district where the minimum side yard requirement for detached accessory buildings greater than 120 square feet is 8 feet.
2. The lot width varies from 50 feet at the right-of-way to 50.34 feet at the north property line. The property has an existing detached garage 3 feet from the east property line.
3. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing detached garage and construct a 22 foot by 24 foot detached garage further to the north and 3 feet 2 inches from the east property line. The requested variance is 4 feet 10 inches.
4. The 2013 Residential Code of Ohio requires exterior walls and projections within 5 feet of a lot line be made of 1 hour, fire-resistance rated construction. Granting of this variance does not grant variances from the 2013 Residential Code of Ohio.
5. The property is subject to, and the garage has been approved by, the Architectural Review Board.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. This lot is smaller than typically found in the R-10 district, is narrow, and does not easily allow for a 2 car detached garage without sacrificing the already small rear yard. These factors mitigate the substantial nature of the variance request.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.

3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

Stephen Rodocker, 187 Selby Boulevard, had nothing to add.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMES ROSS, STEPHEN RODOCKER, AND CANDANCE BROOKS FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR SIDE YARD SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT A DETACHED GARAGE AT 40 WEST NORTH STREET, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 15-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 15-16 DATED FEBRUARY 5, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

9. Variance – Front Yard Setback – Porch – 6755 Masefield St. (James Ross/Hairston) BZA 16-16

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is in the R-10 district where the minimum front yard requirement is 30 feet.
2. The applicant is proposing to construct an 8 foot by 6 foot porch. A small corner of this porch appears will encroach into the front yard setback, perhaps as much as 1 foot. The requested variance is for 1 foot.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. The requested variance is not substantial.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.
3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

James Ross, 6120 Crystal Valley Drive, Galena, stated he had nothing to add.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY JAMES ROSS AND ALLEN AND ELAINE HAIRSTON FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR FRONT YARD SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT A PORCH ADDITION AT 6755 MASEFIELD STREET, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 16-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 16-16 DATED FEBRUARY 5, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

10. Variance – Side Yard Setback – Addition – 669 Farrington Dr. (Craig Stephan Moreo, Architect/Colleli) BZA 17-16

Mr. Phillips reviewed the following from the staff memo:

Findings of fact:

1. This property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 district where the minimum side yard requirement is 6 feet and the minimum sum of the 2 side yards is 12 feet.
2. The existing dwelling is 5.9 feet from the east property line and the existing attached garage is 6.9 feet from the west property line.
3. The applicant is proposing a 30 foot by 16 foot addition to the rear of the existing dwelling, 5.9 feet from the east property line. The requested variance is 0.1 feet.
4. The applicant is also proposing to demolish the existing attached and construct a 21.6 foot by 40 foot attached garage and storage, 4 feet from the west property line. The requested variance is 2 feet.
5. The 2013 Residential Code of Ohio requires exterior walls and projections within 5 feet of a lot line be made of 1 hour, fire-resistance rated construction. Granting of this variance does not grant variances from the 2013 Residential Code of Ohio.

The following conclusions are presented:

1. The eastern portion of the addition requested variance is not substantial. The western portion of the addition will make the garage more usable for parking of 2 cars and allow the addition across the back for additional storage.
2. The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.
3. The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

Discussion:

Craig Moreo, 399 Tradewind Court, Westerville, stated he had nothing further to add.

Mr. Falcoski asked if there was anyone present that wanted to speak either for or against this application.

Motion:

Mr. Seitz moved:

THAT THE REQUEST BY CRAIG MOREO AND JOHN AND MEGHAN COLLELI FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS FOR SIDE YARD SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION AT 669 FARRINGTON DRIVE, AS PER CASE NO. BZA 17-16, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 17-16 DATED FEBRUARY 5, 2016 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All members voted yes and the motion was approved.

C. Other

Staff reminded the Board starting in May this Board will be meeting at 7:00 p.m. instead of 7:30 p.m.

The Board needs to start using city email addresses because staff will no longer be sending emails to their personal email accounts.

D. Adjournment

Mr. Seitz moved to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Coulter. The meeting adjourned at 8:24 p.m.