



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

December 5, 2019

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call - the following members were present: Mikel Coulter; D.J. Falcoski; Brian Seitz, and Cynthia Crane. Also present was Lynda Bitar, Planning Coordinator; and Laney Nofer, Planning & Building Assistant. Board member Leah Reibel was absent.
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of the minutes of November 7, 2019

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes as corrected, seconded by Mr. Seitz. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the minutes were approved.

4. Affirmation/swearing in of witnesses

**B. Items of Public Hearing**

1. **Variance** – Side Yard Setback – Porte Cochere – **197 Winter Dr.** (Dan & Erin Arrasmith) **BZA 51-19**

Mrs. Nofer reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District with the dwelling being built in 1952. The lot is approximately 9,225 square feet in area, 124.9 feet in length and 63.5 feet in width. The surrounding properties are also zoned R-10 and host single family dwellings. Winter Drive has a higher elevation as it draws closer to High Street. The grade for this particular property sits higher than the properties to the west.

The applicant is proposing to construct a porte cochere along the side of the existing dwelling and within the required western side yard. The structure is proposed to be 16 feet in width, and 45 feet in length and would be between 1.68 feet – 1.38 feet from the side yard property line. It was stated there is an existing 8' x 10' shed on the property as well, however staff did not receive an overall site plan with this application. The total square

footage for the existing and proposed addition bring the accessory area for the property to 800 square feet, making it below the maximum allowable area of 850 square feet.

The applicant is requesting this structure in order to have covered parking and an outdoor entertainment space. In addition, there would be a newly paved concrete driveway and a front porch installed as part of this project.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states dwellings and structures accessory to dwellings must be at least 8 feet from wither side yard property line with sum of the side yards being 20 feet.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting a porte cochere to be approximately 1.38 feet from the side yard property line at its closest point, and 1.68 at its furthest. A variance of 6.62-6.32 feet is required for the side yard. A variance of approximately 9 feet is required from the sum of side yards.

**Conclusions:**

Staff does not typically support a structure located this close to side yard property line. There is the potential for challenges in maintaining the strip of land between properties. The contractor stated there is a retaining wall on the side of the property between the proposed structure and property line. The structure will also be open to the side allowing for access to the strip of land between properties. These facts could mitigate the nature of variance request. Staff would still recommend there be a minimum of 3 feet from the western side yard property line to allow easier maintenance and space between the two lots and the neighboring house & structures.

The property does not currently have a garage or parking structure on site. In addition, the property is smaller in both lot area and width than typically seen in the district, limiting the location where this structure can be located.

The essential character of the neighborhood will not be substantially altered with the construction of the porte cochere as there are other surrounding properties with similar parking structures.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Crane asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Dan Arrasmith, 197 Winter Dr., Worthington, Ohio, and Mr. Jeff Rankey, the contractor for the project. Mr. Rankey said after looking at the setbacks, the dwelling to the west sits on the property line, thus limiting their space to build the porte cochere. He said if they moved the structure three feet back

to the east to appease the request per staff, then the space would no longer be functional. Addressing the maintenance concerns presented by staff; to help prevent weeds, they would install a 20-year weed mat with Mexican pebbles or river rock. In addition, the retaining wall would most likely need to be replaced. Ms. Crane asked if staff had spoken to him about other options for the proposed structures and Mr. Rankey responded they have talked with consultants about possible other location, but due to the back yard dropping off eight to ten feet from the house in the back, there really is no other feasible location. Mr. Coulter asked if the two trees would be affected by the project and Mr. Rankey said the two trees would need to be cut down. The trees are a main reason as to why the retaining wall is failing. The trees are on the property line and Mr. Arrasmith stated the neighbor had no concerns about the need to cut down the trees. Ms. Crane asked the applicant to confirm that the abutting property to the proposed structure was within their side yard setback. Mr. Rankey replied they did not have a survey to confirm, but they believed the structure was within the setback if not directly on the property line. Mr. Falcowski asked if the abutting property also had a porte cochere and Mr. Rankey replied, yes. Mr. Crane stated she had an issue with the structure being that close to the property line and elevated as she felt it would be looming over the house next door. Ms. Crane asked if they could make the structure narrower. Mr. Rankey replied that moving the structure away from the property line would make it harder to park under the structure. If they were to place the proposed structure in the rear yard, then a lot of site work and tree removal would need to occur. Ms. Bitar asked if Mr. Rankey had considered any other architectural features to lessen the width. Mr. Rankey said they had, but they wanted the porte cochere to have similar features and materials to that of the house; changing the columns to be less wide would not be consistent with the house. Mr. Seitz addressed the letter from the abutting neighbor regarding the trees and the neighbors question about what is to be done about it. Mr. Rankey stated the homeowner had spoken to the neighbor about the trees coming down and the neighbors said they were fine with it under the condition the homeowners at 197 Winter Drive pay for the removal. Mr. Seitz asked what the impact would be on the abutting property owner; i.e. what would they be looking at. Mr. Rankey replied that the neighbors would likely not be able to see above the privacy screening that would be put in place. Mr. Coulter asked about the roof materials of the structure, to which the applicant replied they would be asphalt shingles. Mr. Coulter also asked about the drainage from the proposed structure. Mr. Rankey replied it would be downspouted and taken to the road. Mr. Coulter asked if the siding would match that of the house, and the applicant replied yes.

Ms. Crane asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward. Mr. Rankey asked the Board members if the setback was the only concern with this proposal. Ms. Crane confirmed that yes, the setback was her concern as they typically do not approve structures closer than 3 feet. Mr. Seitz said he also had concerns about going under three feet for the setback. Ms. Crane discussed the options of moving forward with the discussion and said she preferred the applicant coming back to the Board in February after redesigning the space to be smaller and providing a survey.

Mr. Coulter said he would like to see a letter from the neighbor stating they were okay with the removal of the trees and how the drainage was going to work and that the retaining wall would be re-built. Mr. Rankey asked if he were to move the structure 3 feet from the property line, would the board be more likely to consider an approval. Ms. Crane replied that the primary concern was still regarding the setback, and seeing the structure moved at least 3 feet from the property line on a survey could alleviate some concerns. Mr. Coulter moved to table the application and Mr. Seitz seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the application was tabled.

2. **Variance – Alley Setback – Fence/Gate – 75 W. Stanton Ave. (Adam Lynch) BZA 52-19**

Mrs. Nofer reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This 6,875 square foot property is an existing lot of record in the R-10 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District. The property abuts an unimproved alley that runs between Stanton Avenue and Cemetery Drive. The alley is being used by homeowners as a gravel driveway and point of entry to the lot.

The applicant has installed a 6-foot-high fence and gate between the alley right-of-way and required building line, and across the unimproved alley. It connects with the side of the house and meets with an existing fence along the side property line of the adjacent property. The fence is approximately 8 feet 8 inches in length on private property and 18 feet in length across the alley. There is an existing chain link fence enclosing the remainder of the yard. The purpose of the fence is to allow children to safely play in the rear yard.

There is an existing storm drain within the alley that will need to be accessible at any time by the Service and Engineering Department. The Director of Service and Engineering has stated he will permit the fence and gate to remain within the public (alley) right-of-way if the variance is approved. The applicant states the gate will not have a lock and entry will be allowed to the entities who need it. The City is not responsible for any damage to the fence or driveway.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states any dwelling or structure accessory to a dwelling must be at least 30 feet from the public right-of-way.

Section 1149.08(a) states “At corner lots, no accessory uses, or accessory structures shall be located in any required front yard. Side yards fronting adjacent streets can be reduced to two-thirds of the required front yard setback from the right-of-way of the adjacent street.” Making the side yard setback for this case 20 feet.

Section 1180.02(a) states “In any ‘R’ District, no fence or wall shall be erected in the area between the right-of-way line and the building setback line”.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting to retain the fence within the required front yard along the side of the dwelling and across the public (alley) right-of-way. A variance of 11 feet 4 inches is required.

**Conclusions:**

Although the fence and gate are within a public right-of-way, the alley is unimproved and not used for through traffic. The entities who need access would have that ability if needed. These factors can mitigate the substantial nature of this variance request.

The homeowner was unaware of the unimproved alley abutting his property at the time of the fence and gate installation.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered as other neighboring properties also have fences that connect from the side of the house to the side yard.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected as long as access to any easement can be maintained.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Crane asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Adam Lynch, 75 W. Stanton Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said he has lived in the area since early 2000’s and there has always been a fence around the property. Mr. Lynch said the six-foot gate would never be locked, so if the Worthington Service & Engineering Department ever needed to have access, they would be able. Ms. Crane asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY ADAM LYNCH FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR A FENCE AND GATE TO BE LOCATED IN THE REQUIRED FRONT YARD AT 75 W. STANTON AVE., AS PER CASE NO. BZA 52-19, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 52-19 DATED OCTOBER 21<sup>ST</sup>, 2019, 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. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Falcoski; aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**3. Extension of Construction Completion Period – Alterations – 5759 Indianola Ave. (MaryAnn Ogle) BZA 53-19**

Mrs. Nofer reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

Building Permit #24192 was issued on March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018 to conduct interior alterations to the dwelling. The scope of work included Electrical, Plumbing, and HVAC work. A resubmittal for the work was submitted on April 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2018 and was approved. The permit expired on September 26, 2019.

The applicant states the contractor stopped coming to the job in August of 2018. He sporadically came back during Spring of 2019, but ceased work again in May. The applicant states they have another contractor who will finish the job; they plan to stop for the winter and finish the living room & kitchen this coming Spring.

The applicant states the remaining work to be done is to finish the kitchen, basement, bedroom closet, laundry room, and bathroom.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1305.06(b) The permit authorizing the work as shown on the approved construction documents is invalid if the work is not completed, inspected, and approved within eighteen months of the issuance of the permit.

Section 1305.06(c) Before any work authorized by a permit may continue for which the permit is invalid, the owner shall make application to the Board of Zoning Appeals for an extension of time as required under Chapter [1129](#) of the Planning and Zoning Code. Failure to complete work within said eighteen-month period or additional time granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals shall constitute a violation of this code.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting a 1-year extension from the Board of Zoning Appeals to complete the project and close the permit.

**Conclusions:**

It is reasonable for the Board to consider extending the completion period for a longer period due to the contractor's inactivity on the project. With a new contractor, the project should be completed in a timely manner.

The work is all interior, and likely won't be a nuisance to neighboring properties with the continued alterations. The appearance of the exterior is to remain the same.

There have not been any concerns expressed to staff about the status of the project.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Crane asked if the applicant was present. Ms. Maryann Ogle, 5759 Indianola Ave., Worthington, Ohio, said she would like an extension of time to complete her construction project. She said she has lived in her home since 1970. Ms. Ogle said she hired a contractor in March 2018 and they worked on the house until August 2018 and then suddenly stopped. The contractor told her he was having financial difficulty and was going through bankruptcy but said he could help her out in January of 2019. She said he would work every other two weeks and she was paying him a lot of money, but then the work stopped again. Ms. Ogle said the basement work has been completed and looked beautiful. The south part of the house upstairs has walls and the bathroom is almost done. She said her daughter's bedroom closet is almost finished, and they would like to put a washer and dryer on the first floor and a bathroom in her bedroom. Ms. Ogle felt the project should be completed by the first of the year. Ms. Crane asked if the house was habitable and Ms. Ogle said yes, they have a working bathroom and kitchen. Mrs. Nofer explained the City's Inspector has inspected the property a few times earlier in the year and never said the house was inhabitable, just noted progression on the work being done. Ms. Crane asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY MARYANN OGLE FOR AN EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION PERIOD FOR ONE YEAR AT 5759 INDIANOLA AVE., AS PER CASE NO. BZA 53-19, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 53-19 DATED OCTOBER 22<sup>ND</sup>, 2019, 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. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

4. **Temporary Use Permit** – Temporary Signs & Fence – **7007 N. High St.** (The Witness Group/He Hari, Inc.) **TUP 02-19**

Mrs. Nofer reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

The property was recently rezoned as a Planned Unit Development (PUD) to allow for a mixed-use development called “The Worthington Gateway”.

The applicant has installed two temporary signs on a temporary fence for the purpose of advertising the coming development and space available to lease. The signs have been in place for approximately a month. One sign is along W. Wilson Bridge Road, and the other along N. High Street. While having slightly different designs, both signs include the wording “Worthington Gateway” with an accompanied rendering of the building(s). There is also a number to call for leasing inquiries.

The sign along W. Wilson Bridge is 5.5 feet tall and 50 feet long for a total of 275 square feet. The sign along N. High Street is 5.5 feet tall and 25 feet long for a total of 137.5 square feet. The total temporary sign area on the property is 412.5 square feet. Both signs are made with a 70/30% mesh material that are secured with zip ties.

The temporary fence runs along the perimeter of the parcel and has been in place for approximately a year. The fence is in place for privacy and safety reasons to avoid trespassing on the site, which is under construction.

Temporary signs and temporary fences are prohibited except with the issuance of a Temporary Use Permit and can be granted for up to a period of 6 months.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1170.02 (n) states. “A ‘Temporary Sign’ means a sign associated with a temporary activity, not permanently attached to a building or permanently embedded on a site. Temporary Signs shall be prohibited except for the issuance of a Temporary Use Permit as per Section 1129.05(b)(5).”

Section 1129.05 (b)(5) states, “A temporary use permit may be granted where the temporary use of a structure or premises in any district where such temporary use shall be for a period of more than ninety days is proposed.” It goes on to say, “A temporary use permit for such use shall be granted in the form of a temporary and revocable permit, for not more than a six-month period, subject to six months’ renewal”.



**Request:**

The applicant requests two temporary signs and a temporary fence to be retained at the proposed Worthington Gateway site (formerly Holiday Inn: 7007 N. High St.) for a period of 6 months from the approval date. If the applicant is interested in a longer duration than what is granted, they will have to re-apply to the Board of Zoning Appeals in 6 months.

**Conclusions:**

Staff has the ability to grant and issue a 90-day Temporary Use Permit. These are typically a single banner, generally conforming with signage requirements, and for a reasonable amount of time. In this particular case, the applicant is requesting a longer duration to allow for ample advertising of the property; therefore, a Temporary Use Permit issued by the Board of Zoning Appeals is necessary.

The retention of the temporary fence could enhance safety on the site by preventing people from entering the construction area.

The retention of the temporary signs promote the future of the project and economic development endeavors on the site.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Crane asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jack Reynolds, an attorney with the Smith & Hale Law Firm, 37 W. Broad St., Suite 460, Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Reynolds said he was representing his client, The Witness Group. He said they needed to secure the site so the hotel could be torn down, and that is why the fencing was put up. When the hotel came down there was a desire to promote the site, so the marketing agent for the development put up the two signs and after which, they were told by the City that they needed Permits to hang the signs. Mr. Reynolds continued to say that is why he was at the meeting to ask permission for a six-month period with the understanding if the signs are up longer than six months then Mr. Reynolds would come back and ask for an extension so they can continue to market the site. Ms. Crane asked if putting the telephone number up on the sign would generate much interest, and Mr. Reynolds said yes, they are still getting a lot of interest in the sight. Ms. Crane asked how it had been since the Holiday Inn was torn down and Mr. Reynolds said a little over a year ago. There were some fire and hazardous concerns with the vacant building the way it was, so it made more sense for safety reasons to tear the building down. Mr. Reynolds explained they have already submitted applications for building Permits for the first three buildings along West Wilson Bridge Road and they are currently being reviewed by the City's Planning & Building

Department and the Service and Engineering Department. In addition, Mr. Reynolds stated they will be before the Architectural Review Board next week to review the plans for the building changes along North High Street. Ms. Crane asked if there was anyone present to speak for or against this application.

**Motion:**

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THE WITNESS GROUP ON BEHALF OF HE HARI, INC. FOR A TEMPORARY USE PERMIT TO ALLOW FOR TWO TEMPORARY SIGNS TO BE RETAINED AT THE WORTHINGTON GATEWAY FOR A PERIOD OF SIX MONTHS, AS PER CASE NO. TUP 02-19, DRAWINGS NO. TUP 01-19 DATED OCTOBER 29<sup>TH</sup>, 2019, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Seitz seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Falcoski; aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**5. Variance – Sign Area – 6580 Huntley Rd. (Super Games) BZA 54-19**

Mrs. Nofer reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is in the I-2 (General Industrial) Zoning District. The property was formerly Tropical Nut and Fruit and is now transitioning into the new space for Super Games.

The applicant is requesting to retain a 100 square foot wall sign on the property that exceeds the maximum sign area allowed per business. There is an existing freestanding sign on the property for the same business totaling 46.67 square feet that has been approved by staff. Tropical Nut and Fruit previously had both a wall sign and freestanding sign on the property as well.

The wall sign was previously used at the Lakeside Plaza location for Super Games. Now that the entity has relocated, the owner moved the sign to the new business location. This was preferred by the owner rather than having a new sign to be made and installed.

In 2009, the Municipal Planning Commission & City Council approved an Amendment to Development Plan for the sign location and size at the former Super Games site at 535 Lakeview Plaza Blvd. At the time, the sign included a “.org” section that exceeded the 100 square foot maximum. That part of the sign was later omitted, making the total sign area 100 square feet.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1170.05(a) states. “The area of all permanent signs for any single business shall be equivalent to one and one-half square feet of sign area for each lineal foot of width of the building or part of the building, but shall not exceed a maximum area of 100 square feet per business.”

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting to exceed the maximum sign area for a business in a commercial or industrial district. A variance of 46.67 square feet is required.

**Conclusions:**

The two signs would help provide wayfinding to patrons who may be travelling by the building from multiple angles.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered, as there was previously a wall sign in place in the same location.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Crane asked to clarify what color the sign would be and Mrs. Nofer explained the Super Games sign would be purple based on the rendering provided in the packet. Mr. Falcowski asked if the Tropical Nut and Fruit sign that was previous installed also exceeded the maximum square footage requirement and Ms. Bitar explained that no, it did not. Ms. Crane asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Jeff Angel said he was a Board member for the organization, 6580 Huntley Rd., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Angel explained it was much more cost effective to move the original sign from Lakeview Plaza Blvd to the new location. Ms. Crane asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY SUPER GAMES FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR A SIGN TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM**

**ALLOWABLE SQUARE FOOTAGE AT 6580 HUNTLEY ROAD., AS PER CASE NO. BZA 54-19, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 54-19 DATED NOVEMBER 1<sup>ST</sup>, 2019, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Falcoski seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Falcoski; aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**6. Variance – Front Yard Setback –276 E. South St. (Douglas and Christina Beech)  
BZA 55-19**

Mrs. Nofer reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is in the R-10 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District in Rush Creek Village; Rush Creek runs through the rear of this property. The dwelling was built in 1953.

The existing garage on the property has a cornered off section that makes it an irregular shape. The applicant is requesting to add 20 square feet of garage area to square out the room. In doing this, the garage will be within the required front yard.

The additional space would allow the existing 1-car garage to host 2 cars. The applicant states this would add value and usability to the property.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states any dwelling or structure accessory to a dwelling must be at least 30 feet from the public right-of-way.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting to construct a 20 square foot addition to the existing garage in the required front yard which would be 25.4 feet from front yard property line. A variance of 4.6 feet is required.

**Conclusions:**

The addition to the garage could help with storage of additional vehicles other equipment.

The variance request is not substantial.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered with the garage addition.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

**Discussion:**

Ms. Crane asked if the applicant was present. Mr. Doug Beech, 276 E. South St., Worthington, Ohio, and Brian Zingelman, 261 Garden Rd., Columbus, Ohio. Mr. Zingelman said the current garage slightly encroaches the 30-foot setback. The corner of the house is a bedroom wing which also slightly encroaches. Ms. Crane asked if there was anyone present who wanted to speak for or against this application, but no one came forward.

**Motion:**

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DOUGLAS AND CHRISTINA BEECH FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR A GARAGE ADDITION TO BE IN THE REQUIRED FRONT YARD AT 276 E. SOUTH ST., AS PER CASE NO. BZA 55-19, DRAWINGS NO. BZA 55-19 DATED NOVEMBER 5<sup>TH</sup>, 2019, BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Seitz seconded the motion. Mrs. Bitar called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Falcoski; aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Ms. Crane, aye. The motion was approved.

**C. Other**

Mrs. Nofer reminded the Board members there would be no meeting in January 2020, so the next meeting would take place on Thursday, February 6, 2020.

**D. Adjournment**

Mr. Seitz moved to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 8:11 p.m.