



MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
VIRTUAL MEETING

Jun 3, 2021

**A. Call to Order – 7:00 p.m.**

1. Roll Call - the following members were present: D.J. Falcoski, Vice-Chair; Brian Seitz, Secretary; Garrett Guillozet, member; and Michael Coulter, Representative from the MPC. Also present were Lee Brown, Director of Planning & Building; and Lynda Bitar, Development Coordinator. Cynthia Crane, Chair, was absent.
2. Approval of Minutes of the May 6, 2021 meeting

Mr. Coulter moved to approve the minutes, and Mr. Guillozet seconded the motion. Mr. Falcoski, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Seitz; and Mr. Guillozet, aye. The minutes were approved.

**B. Items of Public Hearing**

1. **Variance** – Rear Yard Setback – Pool – **6686 Evening St.** (Jeffrey Richeson & Kimberly Danner) **VAR 23-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This 1960's ranch is on a 70' wide x 125' deep lot. The 8750 square foot property is in the R-10 Zoning District where the minimum required lot area is 10,400 square feet.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

1173.05 Portable and Nonportable Swimming Pools.

(c) Nonportable swimming pools may be allowed as an accessory use only in "R" and "AR" Districts provided that they comply with the following conditions and requirements:

- (1) The pool is intended and used solely for the enjoyment of the occupants of the principal use of the property on which it is located.
- (2) The pool may not be located, including any walks or paved areas or accessory structures adjacent thereto, closer than ten feet to any property line of the property on which it is located.
- (3) The swimming pool or the property as hereinafter defined on which it is located,

shall have a barrier as required by Chapter [1305](#) to prevent uncontrolled access by children or other persons from the street or other adjacent properties.

**Request:**

This request is to install a swimming pool at the rear of the property closer than 10' from adjacent properties. The pool is shown 8'6" from the rear property line with the concrete pool deck being 5'6" from the rear property line. A variance to extend 4'6" into the required yard is requested.

**Project Details:**

1. The owners would like to locate the 16' x 36' pool far enough to the rear to maximize sun exposure and allow for a larger concrete patio space between the house and pool.
2. A 6' high cedar fence with lattice at the top is proposed at the property lines to enclose the rear yard.

**Conclusions:**

The extent to which the rear yard would be a solid surface is not typical for Worthington. Reducing the size of the pool and/or patio may be necessary on this small lot. The proximity of the pool deck to the adjacent properties should also be considered.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar mentioned emails that were received asking about the location of the property line and where the pool or equipment would be in relation to that rear line. She pointed out decking would be the closest part at 5.5' from the rear, and the equipment would be by the house. Another email asked about water runoff and compaction. Mrs. Bitar said her understanding was construction equipment would have access on the south side.

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Mr. Jeffrey David Richeson, 6686 Evening St., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Richeson they had to bury their existing overhead power line due to Code requirements and AEP relocated a power pole to the southwest side of their neighbor's property and then along the house. Mr. Richeson said if they need to relocate the pool closer to the house he is concerned because the pool would be very close to the buried power line. He has spoken with the neighbors on both sides, and he will be replacing both side fences and then will put a fence along his back property line which is 2' from the rear chain link fences. Mr. Coulter said he was comfortable with the plans for the project. Mrs. Bitar said there was someone waiting to speak.

Mr. Rick Triple said he lived east of the 6686 Evening St. He asked what impact shortening the setbacks would have on his or the other neighboring properties, and if the pool had to be drained where the water would go. Mr. Richeson said after talking with the manufacturer and installer of the pool, the pool would not need to be drained. All of the

existing operational lines would run between the house and the pool and not to the backside of the pool in any way. Mr. Triple said the drainage between the properties has been pretty poor lately and the yards area flat. Mr. Richeson said the pool decking and the pool surface is intended to be level with his existing patio. A French drain will be installed near his patio which will also run to the downspout. There were no other speakers.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JEFFREY D. RICHESON AND KIMBERLY J. DANNER FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO INSTALL A SWIMMING POOL IN THE REQUIRED REAR YARD AT 6686 EVENING ST. AS PER CASE NO. VAR 23-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 23-2021, DATED APRIL 9, 2021, BE APPROVED BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Coulter seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, nay; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Coulter; aye; and Mr. Falcoski, aye. The motion was approved.

2. **Variance** – Front Yard Setback – Covered Porch – **101 Howard Ave.** (Theodore Thompson Jr.) **VAR 24-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is in the R-10 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District as are the surrounding properties. The house is located 25.2’ from the Howard Ave. right-of-way, so the existing house extends 4.8’ into the required front yard.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states the required front yard is 30’.

**Request:**

The applicant is seeking approval to construct a covered front porch that is 10’ x 34’ and would be 15.2’ from the right-of-way line. A variance of 14.8’ is requested.

**Project Details:**

1. The right-of-way is approximately 14’ from the edge of pavement for Howard Ave. The proposed porch would be about 29’ from the road.
2. A front setback of 25’ is typical for houses in this neighborhood

3. The porch is proposed across the full width of the house with a concrete floor poured on a block foundation.
4. The hipped roof would be supported by 4 columns and have asphalt shingles to match the house roof.

**Conclusions:**

The character of the neighborhood might be altered as this structure would be closer to the road than others in this block. The porch, however, is complementary to the house. Also, there has generally been support by the BZA for front porches as they can facilitate good neighbor relations.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Mr. Theodore Thompson, Jr., 101 Howard Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Mr. Thompson said he has spoken with his neighbors and none were concerned with the porch addition. Board members did not have any questions or comments. There were no other emails or callers.

**Motion:**

Mr. Guillozet moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY THEODORE W. THOMPSON JR. FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR INSTALLATION OF A PORCH IN THE REQUIRED FRONT YARD AT 101 HOWARD AVE., AS PER CASE NO. VAR 24-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 24-2021 DATED, MAY 3, 2021, 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. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Guillozet, aye; and Mr. Falcoski, aye. The motion was approved.

3. **Variance** – Front Yard Setback – Covered Porch & Vestibule Addition – **240 Hardy Way** (Rebekah Kilzer) **VAR 25-2021**

Mrs. Bitar reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This property is in the R-10 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District as are the surrounding properties. The house is located about 27' from the right-of-way, so the existing house extends ~2' into the required front yard. The property is located on a cul-de-sac.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states the required front yard is 30’.

**Request:**

The applicant is seeking approval to construct a covered front entry that is 9’ wide and 8.5’ deep and would be about 20’ from the right-of-way line. A variance of about 10’ is requested.

**Project Details:**

1. The right-of-way is approximately 13’ from the edge of pavement for Hardy Way. The proposed porch would be about 33’ from the road.
2. The porch is proposed centered on the entry door with a gabled roof supported by two columns. Materials would match the house.

**Conclusions:**

The character of the neighborhood should not be altered as there is not a regular pattern of houses on the north side of Hardy Way and the proposed entry fits with the house.

**Discussion:**

Mrs. Bitar swore in the applicant Ms. Rebekah Kilzer, 240 Hardy Way, Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or comments. Ms. Kilzer said she spoke with her neighbors about her project, and they did not have any concerns. Mr. Falcoski asked if there were any emails or callers and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY REBEKAH KILZERS FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW INSTALLATION OF A PORCH IN THE REQUIRED FRONT YARD AT 240 HARDY WAY, AS PER CASE NO. VAR 25-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 25-2021 DATED, MAY 4, 2021, 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. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Mr. Falcoski, aye. The motion was approved.

4. **Variance – Front & Side Yard Setback – Porch & Egress Window Wells – 46 Howard Ave. (Colin DePew) VAR 26-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

## **Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

### **Background:**

This property is located just outside of Old Worthington in the R-10 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District. The surrounding properties are all located in the R-10 District. The house is located 35.6-feet from the Howard Ave. public right-of-way. The applicant would like to install a new covered porch across the front of the house and install three new egress window wells as part of an overall remodel of the existing home.

### **Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states the required side yard is 8-feet, and the required front yard is 30-feet.

Section 1149.06(a) regulates that architectural projections, cornices, eaves, sills, canopies or similar projections may extend or project into required side yards not more than two inches for each one foot of width of such side yard and may extend or project into a required front or rear yard not more than thirty inches. Bay windows and chimneys may project into a required front, side or rear yard not more than eighteen inches provided the side yard is not reduced to less than six feet.

### **Request:**

The applicant is requesting to construct a covered front porch that will encroach into the front yard setback by 2'5", including the eaves it would be 2'10". A variance of 2'10" is required that would include the eaves.

The applicant is also requesting the installation of three new egress window wells that will encroach into the side yard setback. A variance 9-inches is required.

### **Project Details:**

1. Construct a 36' wide by 8' deep covered front porch.
  - a. Standing seam metal roof.
  - b. Open porch
  - c. *Confirmation needed on the architectural projection of the eaves on the front porch.*
2. Install three egress windows on the west side of the home to utilize the basement as living space that are approximately 3'8" out from the foundation of the structure.
  - a. The proposed side yard will be 7'3" to the western property line.

### **Conclusions:**

The variance request for the front yard setback does not appear to be substantial.

The variance request for the side yard setback would allow for additional living space to be utilized in the basement and would permit covered outdoor living space on the front of the existing home.

The essential character of the neighborhood would not be altered; however, the surrounding setbacks appear to be approximately 30-feet from the public right-of-way. Worthington is known for being a front porch community. Landscaping should help soften the overall appearance of the porch encroaching into the front yard setback.

Adjoining properties should not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance as there are other covered front porches in the neighborhood.

The egress windows should not be highly visible from the public right-of-way of Howard Ave. and is screened by vegetation.

Adding the egress windows along the western side of the house will give the applicant additional living space that they can safely utilize.

The surrounding zoning is R-10 (Low Density Residential).

The proposed covered porch is part of an overall remodel of the existing home and appears to be compatible with the neighboring homes.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant Mr. Colin DePew, 46 Howard Ave., Worthington, Ohio. Board members did not have any questions or comments. Mr. Falcoski asked if there were any emails or callers regarding this application and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY COLIN DEPEW FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A COVERED FRONT PORCH AND EGRESS WINDOWS AT 46 HOWARD AVE. AS PER CASE NO. VAR 26-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 26-2021 DATED MAY 7, 2021 BE APPROVED, BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF MEMO AND/OR PRESENTED AT THE MEETING.**

Mr. Guillozet seconded the motion. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Guillozet, aye; and Mr. Falcoski, aye. The motion was approved.

5. **Variance – Front Yard Setback – Porch – 393 Franklin Ct. (Joshua Sadvari) VAR 27-2021**

Mr. Brown 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 Worthington Park. The surrounding properties are all located in the R-10 District. The house is located 33-feet from the Franklin Ct. public right-of-way. The applicant would like to replace an existing brick stoop with a deck across a portion of the front of the house that would encroach into the front yard setback.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states the required front yard is 30-feet.

**Request:**

The applicant is seeking approval to construct a deck and stairs that would be constructed 7-feet into the required front yard setback along Franklin Ct. A variance of 7-feet is requested, where 30-feet is required.

**Project Details:**

1. Proposed deck is 7-feet by 23-feet with stairs encroaching an additional 3-feet.
2. Composite deck with steps and railings.
3. Located 23-feet from the front property line.

**Conclusions:**

The existing public right-of-way is approximately 12-feet from the property line; therefore, the deck will be located approximately 35-feet from the edge of pavement.

The essential character of the neighborhood might be altered. Decks are not typically found on the front of homes in Worthington. Covered front porches are typically found on the front of homes vs. an open-air deck. A covered front porch or an at grade patio encroaching into the front setback might be more appropriate to the character of the area. Landscaping may help soften the overall appearance.

The surrounding homes appear to be constructed at a front yard setback of 30-feet.

Adjoining properties should not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance, however it does change the character.



The current property owner has undertaken a large cleanup of overgrown vegetation on the site.

The delivery of government services should not be affected by the installation of the deck in the front setback.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicant Mr. Joshua Sadvari, 393 Franklin Ct., Worthington, Ohio. He said spoke with his neighbors and they did not have any concerns. Board members did not have any questions or comments. Mr. Falcoski asked if there were any emails or callers regarding this application and Mrs. Bitar said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Guillozet moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JOSHUA SADVARI FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR THE INSTALLATION OF A PORCH AT 393 FRANKLIN CT., AS PER CASE NO. VAR 27-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 27-2021 DATED, MAY 7, 2021, 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. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Guillozet, aye; and Mr. Falcoski, aye. The motion was approved.

**6. Variance – Accessory Structure Size – New Garage Addition – 430 Tucker Dr. (Dustin Mondrach/Dillhoff) VAR 28-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This home is located on 1.7-acres in the R-16 District (Very Low Density Residential) in Medick Estates. The 5,011 sq. ft. house was originally constructed in 1958. There is an existing 748 sq. ft. attached 2-car garage and an existing 219 sq. ft. shed to the east of the existing garage. The applicant would like to construct a new 3-car garage (956 sq. ft.) addition to the front elevation of the existing house for a total accessory structure square footage of 1,175 sq. ft.

The additional square footage is needed for storage.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.08(b) of the Worthington Codified Ordinances states, “In any “R” District, the total area for accessory buildings shall be limited to 850 square feet and must be compatible in materials and appearance to the other buildings in the area”.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting to construct a new 3-car garage that is 956 sq. ft. for a total square footage of 1,175 sq. ft. on the site. A variance of 325 sq. ft. is required.

**Project Details:**

1. Garage addition will be approximately 26.8-feet by 45.4-feet in size and 11.5-feet from the eastern property line.
2. The garage addition will be a sideloaded garage.
3. The garage addition will be located approximately 181-feet from the public right-of-way of Tucker Dr.

**Conclusions:**

The variance request is not substantial considering the size of the lot is 5 times the size required of properties in the R-16 zoning district.

The applicant will be going before the Municipal Planning Commission on Thursday, May 27, 2021 and ultimately City Council to amend the platted building line from 250-feet to 150-feet. Medick Estates was platted with building setbacks that exceed what is required by the Planning & Zoning Code. The existing home is currently located in the platted setback for Medick Estates by approximately 15-feet.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be altered as the houses and lots along Tucker Dr. are much larger in size compared to the lots found throughout the City.

Adjoining properties should not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.

Properties located in the R-16 District are required to have a front and rear yard setback of 30-feet and be a minimum of 16,000 sq. ft. in size. The minimum side yard requirement is 10-feet for a total of 25-feet.

The variance would allow for additional space for vehicles and storage of yard equipment.

The garage addition will be constructed 11.5-feet from the eastern property line. Code requires a minimum side yard of 10-feet. The proposal exceeds the minimum requirement.

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered as the lot is 5 times the size of the required lot size for the R-16 zoning district. The surrounding zoning is R-16 (Very Low Density Residential), however the parcels to the south are

approximately an acre in size and the parcels to the north are approximately 16,000 sq. ft. in size.

The 3-car garage addition will not be highly visible from the public right-of-way as the property has existing vegetation and slopes up from Tucker Dr. to the north.

The garage addition appears to be compatible in materials and design of the existing home.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicants Chris and Mary Dillhoff, 430 Tucker Dr., Worthington, Ohio. Mrs. Dillhoff said the addition will add to the value of the home and would not be visible from the street. She said she spoke with the neighbors that live in the area and no one had any objections. Board members did not have any questions or comments. Mr. Falcoski asked if there were any emails or callers regarding this application and Mr. Brown said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Seitz moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY DUSTIN MONDRACH ON BEHALF OF CHRISTOPHER AND MARY DILLHOFF FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW GARAGE ADDITION THAT WOULD CAUSE THE ACCESSORY STRUCTURE AREA TO EXCEED 850 SQ. FT. AS PER CASE NO. VAR 28-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 28-2021 DATED MAY 7, 2021 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. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; and Mr. Falcoski, aye. The motion was approved.

7. **Variance** – Front, Side & Rear Yard Setback – New House – **576 Greenwich St.** (Joseph Moss/Haidet) **VAR 29-2021**

Mr. Brown reviewed the following from the staff memo:

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions**

**Background:**

This lot is currently an existing 10,454 sq. ft. vacant lot located in the R-10 District (Low Density Residential) in Rush Creek Village. There was previously a 1,158 sq. ft. home that was originally constructed in 1924 and eventually demolished in October 2019. The original house was constructed prior to the incorporation of Rush Creek Village Company; however, a deed restriction was eventually placed on this parcel that would legally bind the future construction of any structures be in accordance with plans approved by the Board of Trustees of Rush Creek Village Company. The City does not have the ability to enforce deed restrictions, our authority is strictly associated with regulations found in the Planning & Zoning Code.

The owners would like to construct a new home on the site that would be encroach into the front, side and rear yard setbacks.

**Worthington Codified Ordinances:**

Section 1149.01 states the required front and rear yard setback is to be 30' from the lot line and that the side yard should be a minimum of 8-feet for the sum of the side yards to be 20-feet.

Section 1149.06(a) regulates that architectural projections, cornices, eaves, sills, canopies or similar projections may extend or project into required side yards not more than two inches for each one foot of width of such side yard and may extend or project into a required front or rear yard not more than thirty inches. Bay windows and chimneys may project into a required front, side or rear yard not more than eighteen inches provided the side yard is not reduced to less than six feet.

**Request:**

The applicant is requesting the following:

- Front yard setback to be 20'8" from the required front yard of 30-feet.
  - A variance of 9'4" is needed.
- Front yard setback (eave) to be 19'6"
  - A variance of 10'6" is needed.
- Rear yard setback to be 26'1" from the required rear yard of 30-feet.
  - A variance of 3'11" is needed.
- Rear yard setback (eave) to be 20'6"
  - A variance of 7' is needed.
- Side yard setback (northern property line) to be 6'9" from the required 12-feet.
  - A variance of 5'3" is needed.
- Side yard setback (eave – northern property line) to be 5'7"
  - A variance of 6'5" is needed.

**Project Details:**

1. Construct a new home that will be approximately 2,490 sq. ft. of finished space for a total footprint of 2,744 sq. ft.
2. One-story and a split two-story home will be constructed.
3. House will be constructed at a 20-degree rotation from the southern property line.
  - a. Rush Creek homes are typically situated at 30–60-degree grid throughout the community.

**Conclusion:**

The essential character of the neighborhood should not be substantially altered with the proposed encroachments. The design has been approved by the Rush Creek Village Company. Please see letter in the applicant's materials.

Adjoining properties should not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance as the majority of the homes found in Rush Creek are similar in layout, style, materials. Surrounding lots are a little larger than the subject lot, however the proposal is not out of character for the area.

Many of the homes found in Rush Creek Village do not meet current setback requirements from property lines. This is not uncommon throughout the community.

The proposed home is an improvement over the condemned home that was eventually demolished after years of neglect by the previous owner.

The area of the proposed encroachments would not be highly visible from the public right-of-way of Greenwich St. There is a larger public right-of-way along this portion of Greenwich St. with existing vegetation and trees on a steep slope that slopes up to the east towards the location of the future home. The proposed house would be approximately 42-feet to 55-feet from the edge of Greenwich St.

No public utilities are in the area of encroachment.

The delivery of governmental services should not be affected.

**Discussion:**

Mr. Brown swore in the applicants John & Kate Haidet, 576 Greenwich St., Worthington, Ohio, and their Architect Mr. Joe Moss. Board members did not have any questions or comments. Mr. Falcoski asked if there were any emails or callers regarding this application and Mr. Brown said no.

**Motion:**

Mr. Coulter moved:

**THAT THE REQUEST BY JOSEPH MOSS ON BEHALF OF JOHN & KATE HAIDET FOR A VARIANCE FROM CODE REQUIREMENTS TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW HOME AT 576 GREENWICH ST., AS PER CASE NO. VAR 29-2021, DRAWINGS NO. VAR 29-2021 DATED MAY 10, 2021, 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. Mr. Brown called the roll. Mr. Guillozet, aye; Mr. Seitz, aye; Mr. Coulter, aye; and Mr. Falcoski, aye. The motion was approved.

#### **C. Other**

There was no other business to discuss.

#### **D. Adjournment**

Mr. Seitz moved to adjourn the meeting and Mr. Guillozet seconded the motion. All Board members voted, "Aye," and the meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.