

**AVON BOARD OF ZONING & BUILDING APPEALS  
MARCH 6, 2024, 7:00 P.M.  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES**

**ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ladegaard at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers.

Present: Michael Bulger, Mark Ladegaard, Chauncey Miller, Kurt Schatschneider, Jill Clements, Zoning Enforcement Officer, Pam Fechter, Econ. Dev./Planning Coordinator, John Gasior, Law Director, Duane Streator, Safety Director, Susan Pintz, Planning Commission & ZBA Secretary

Absent: Bill Hricovec

**REVIEW & CORRECTION OF MINUTES**

Motion to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the regular meeting held on February 7, 2024, and to approve the minutes as published.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Schatschneider, to dispense with the reading of the minutes of the regular meeting held on February 7, 2024, and to approve the minutes as published. The vote was: “AYES” all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**REPORTS & CORRESPONDENCE**

None

**ADDITIONS & DELETIONS**

None

**APPEALS & REQUESTS**

**1. McDonalds USA LLC, 2295 Nagel Road; 2-24**

Proposal consists of a new McDonalds Restaurant with drive-thru.

The following variance is requested:

1. 23 parking space variance. Code requires 79; applicant proposes 56. Section C.O. 1292.04(11) Required Off-Street Parking Space.

Bob Bumbarger, Larson Architect, 12815 Detroit Avenue, Lakewood, Ohio 44107 was sworn in. Mr. Bumbarger states they are proposing a new McDonalds at 1891 Nagel Road. He indicated that the Drug Mart owners have allotted them a certain amount of space for a parking lot. He says the McDonalds Corporation are efficient in the way they prepare the site and the way the traffic will flow for safety. They have 56 stalls on the site. As most people are aware McDonalds is about 80% drive thru and the 56-stall parking lot is probably too much for what they need. They have 54 seats inside, essentially there could be more parking than seats inside. The newer McDonalds restaurants usually have about

40 parking spaces, the 79 spaces are excessive, and he doesn't think they can be on site with the code requirements including the landscaping.

Chair Ladegaard states since there will be 54 seats inside the restaurant that has a great deal to do with the variance and the amount requested.

There were no other comments.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Schatschneider, to approve McDonald's appeal to allow a 23-parking space variance. The vote was: "AYES" all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**2. Adam and Miranda Jatich, 3869 Swinton Circle; 3-24**

Proposal consists of a roof cover over the existing patio.

The following variance is requested:

1. 4.33 ft. rear yard setback variance. Code requires 40 ft.; applicant proposes 35.67 ft. Section C.O. 1262.04(d)(4) Lot and Yard Requirements, Rear Yard.

John Nash, Nash Project Management, 2425 Deerfield, Avon, Ohio 44011 was sworn in. Mr. Nash states he is building an outdoor living structure for Mr. and Mrs. Jatich and they are a few feet away from the building line. He states there is no foundation around the entire structure, and it will be at grade. The only foundation will be under the two posts and then there will be a foundation underneath the T.V. wall on the one side. The rest will be a slab. Mr. Nash showed a rendering of the structure on the screen.

Chair Ladegaard asked if this has been approved by the HOA.

Mr. Nash states the HOA has granted approval.

**Mr. Bulger moved, seconded by Mr. Schatschneider, to approve the Adam and Miranda Jatich appeal to allow a 4.33 ft. rear yard setback variance. The vote was: "AYES" all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**3. Michael Stark, 2453 Muirwood Road; 4-24**

Proposal consists of a roof cover over patio with fireplace.

The following variance is requested:

1. 5 ft. rear yard setback variance. Code requires 30 ft.; applicant proposes 25 ft. Section C.O. 1262.04(d)(1) Lot and yard Requirements, Rear Yard.

John Nash, Nash Project Management, 2425 Deerfield, Avon, Ohio 44011 was sworn in. Mr. Nash states this he is building an outdoor living structure for Mr. Stark. They are a few feet away from the building line. There is no foundation around the entire structure, it will be at grade. There will also be a fireplace on the side of the structure. The only foundation will be under the two posts and then there will be a foundation underneath the fireplace

wall. The rest will be a slab. Mr. Nash showed a rendering of the structure on the screen. This structure will have a deck.

Chair Ladegaard asked if this has been approved by the HOA.

Mr. Nash indicated that the HOA has granted approval.

Ms. Clements indicated that a copy of the HOA letter will need to be presented at the time the permit is picked up.

There were no further comments.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Schatschneider, to approve the Michael Stark appeal to allow a 5 ft. rear yard setback variance. The vote was: “AYES” all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**4. Jarret Ryan, 4265 St. Francis Ct; 6-24**

Proposal consists of a covered patio with gas fireplace.

The following variance is requested:

1. 14 ft. rear yard setback variance. Code requires 30 ft.; applicant proposes 16 ft. Section C.O. 1262.04(d)(1) Lot and Yard Requirements, Rear Yard.

John Nash, Nash Project Management, 2425 Deerfield, Avon, Ohio 44011 was sworn in. Mr. Nash states he is building an outdoor living structure for Mr. Ryan, and they are a few feet away from the building line. There is no foundation around the entire structure, it will be at grade. The only foundation will be under the two posts and then there will be a foundation underneath the T.V. wall on one side. The rest will be a slab. Mr. Nash showed a rendering of the structure on the screen. Mr. Nash states this project will be a challenge in that they are asking for a larger setback. The problem they have is that they are in a cul-de-sac lot and the way the cul-de-sac comes in and out, it then pushes the house way back. There is literally no space. If the lot was straight and the house was forward there would not be a problem but the way the curve around the house is situated, to meet the front set back they had to push the house back. He also has pictures showing that the backyard is all woods. He states it backs up to Nagel Road. He doesn't believe that anyone would have an issue with this project.

Chair Ladegaard states he believes that there is a small buffer that the HOA owns.

Mr. Nash states there is green space in that area.

Mr. Ryan states that the pine trees are part of the HOA. The trees in front are owned by Mr. Ryan.

Chair Ladegaard states that is a large variance request.

Mr. Nash agrees but without the variance they would not be able to build anything. It will be a beautiful structure and add value to the house and the neighborhood. It gives the

homeowner privacy. In the Red Tail Development, they have tight side yards, tight backyards, so having a nice T.V. wall on the side will give them some property. There is no privacy the way it is now. The back of the T.V. wall will also look nice; it will be something decorative. It will look good for the neighbors.

Mr. Bulger asked what is the size of the deck right now?

Mr. Nash states it is 16 feet. The deck was there when they built the house. Mr. Ryan purchased the house in 2019.

Chair Ladegaard asked about the HOA approval.

Mr. Nash states that he has given the HOA the information and they are working with the homeowner now, but it has not been officially approved. Although he doesn't anticipate any issue. He can provide documentation once this is approved.

Chair Ladegaard states anything that is approved will be contingent on the HOA approval.

Mr. Schatschneider asked if they could move the 20 feet to 15 feet.

Mr. Nash states no and says that he exclusively builds these structures. He says the "sweet spot" is 20 feet off the house. All the furniture that is sold these days is oversized furniture with big couches and chairs. The homeowners are investing a significant amount in this structure and a T.V. outside. Part of the allure of this structure is having an outdoor living space where it's almost maintenance free. The 15 feet is small. Structurally it can be done, but as an investment in this property for what they are putting into it, it would short the project.

Mr. Ryan states that he had neighbors sign off to the HOA that they have no objection.

There were no further comments.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Schatschneider, to approve the Jarret Ryan appeal to allow a 14 ft. rear yard setback variance. The vote was:**

**Mr. Bulger "yes", Mr. Miller "yes", Mr. Ladegaard "yes"**

**Mr. Schatschneider "no"**

**3, "AYES"**

**1, "NAY"**

**The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**5. Jesse Hanchosky, 3814 Williams Court; 5-24**

Proposal consists of no sidewalks for a new single-family home.

The following variance is requested:

1. Code requires sidewalks to be installed; applicant proposes not to install at this time but when future road work is completed, and sidewalks are required on Williams Court. Section C.O. 1246.05(3) Sidewalks, Walking Paths, Trails, and Bicycle Paths.

Jesse Hanchosky, 3814 Williams Court, Avon, Ohio 44011 was sworn in. Mr. Hanchosky states they are building a new home. He showed pictures on the screen. He refers to a ditch that would need to be crossed to get to the proposed sidewalk. He states the road is one way and is very narrow and there are no buffers on the road. He says the city will need to make the road wider at some point. Mr. Hanchosky says it doesn't make sense to install a sidewalk because no one can access it because the ditch is 12 feet wide at the southern end and it is about 4 feet deep. When it rains the ditch fills up to the top with water. He understands there is an ordinance with the city, and he has no problem installing a new sidewalk when the road improvements are completed.

There were no further comments.

**Mr. Schatschneider moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to approve the Jesse Hanchosky appeal to allow sidewalks to be installed when road work is completed. The vote was: "AYES" all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**6. Scott Lasker, 2466 Stonefield Drive; 7-24**

Proposal consists of accessory structure with overhang.

The following variance is requested:

1. 67 sq. ft. variance. Code allows 401 sq. ft.; applicant proposes 468 sq. ft. Section C.O. 1262.08(a)(2) Maximum Area and Number of Accessory Buildings.

Scott Lasker, 2466 Stonefield Drive, Avon, Ohio 44011 was sworn in. Mr. Lasker states they would like to install a pool in the spring, and he would also like to install a shed with an overhang. They need more space to store the outside furniture.

Chair Ladegaard states the current shed would need to be removed.

Mr. Lasker states they will be removing the current shed.

There were no further comments.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to approve the Scott Lasker appeal to allow a 67 sq. ft. variance. The vote was: "AYES" all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**7. Monnie Brawley, 2584 Deerfield Drive; 8-24**

Proposal consists of installation of a fence within an easement.

The following variance is requested:

1. Variance to allow a fence to be constructed within a drainage easement. Section C.O. 1248.19 Structures and Improvements within Utility Easement or Right of Way.

Monnie Brawley, 2584 Deerfield Drive, Avon, Ohio 44011 was sworn in. Mr. Brawley states they recently purchased the property, and they would like to build a fence for privacy

and for their dogs to utilize the yard. The easement is 60 feet, and they would like to go 30 feet into the easement, so there would still be a 30 feet easement in the back for the maintenance of the drainage system. He refers to the drawing on the screen of the overview of the house.

Chair Ladegaard states when these requests come before the Board of Zoning Appeals, we want to make the homeowner is aware if this is granted and at some point, in the future the city would need access to the easement that the homeowner is responsible for any costs related to accessing the easement including removing and replacing the fence.

Mr. Brawley states he understands.

There were no further comments.

**Mr. Schatschneider moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to approve the Monnie Brawley appeal to allow a fence to be constructed within a drainage easement. The vote was: “AYES” all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**8. Jonida Alicka, 36243 Wendell Drive; 9-24**

Proposal consists of a covered deck with roof structure.

The following variance is requested:

1. 16 ft. rear yard setback variance. Code requires 50 ft.; applicant proposes 34 ft. Section C.O. 1262.04(d)(1) Lot and Yard Requirements, Rear Yard.

Chrisitan Crock, Woodland Deck Company, 5260 Wooster Road, Norton, Ohio 44203 was sworn in. Mr. Crock is representing the homeowner. He states they are proposing construction of a deck with a roof attachment which makes this subject to a 50-foot rear setback. Due to the location and placement of the home basically anything that they build off the home with a roof attached would require a variance. The roof extends 16 feet with the deck.

Chair Ladegaard states he believes this requires HOA approval.

Mr. Crock states that he can check his paperwork and if that is needed, he will obtain approval.

Chair Ladegaard states that this will be contingent on HOA approval.

There were no further comments.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to approve the Jonida Alicka appeal to allow a 16 ft. rear yard setback variance. The vote was: “AYES” all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

9. **Michael and Megan McChrystal, 4326 St. Theresa Blvd.; 10-24**

Proposal consists of an in-ground pool and landscaping.

The following variance is requested:

1. 8 ft. 4 in. setback variance. Code requires 10 ft.; applicant proposes 1 ft. 8 in. Section C.O. 1478.03 Swimming Pool Location.

Ryan Delia, Green Impression, 842 Abbe Road North, Sheffield Village, Ohio 44054 was sworn in.

Michael McChrystal, 4326 St. Theresa Blvd, Avon, Ohio 44011 was sworn in.

Mr. Delia states they have a unique property and there are only a few properties in Red Tail that are permitted to have a pool. They are all on St. Theresa Blvd next to each other. This property is at the end of St. Theresa off the golf course. It does not have any property against the golf course. In the rear of the property there is a retention pond and then there is a 30–60-foot easement from where the pond begins and where the homeowner’s property line begins. He states it is a “dead zone” and Red Tail does not manage it or maintain it, the homeowner takes care of all the maintenance for the space. It has become part of their yard.

Mr. Delia also states when they began planning the pool project they wanted to follow as many guidelines as possible. They wanted to maintain the offsets on the north and south side as per code and against the house, as there needs to be a 15-foot setback, and they followed that. If they comply with the 10-foot setback off the back of the property line, that leaves about a 7-foot pool. Mr. Delia says that would not be the most desirable pool experience. He states when designing this project, there is a massive 10-foot setback. There is also the massive distance between the property line and the retention pond essentially property the homeowner maintains which nothing can be developed there.

Mr. Delia says he thought this was worth proposing the idea because it’s “dead zone” behind the homeowner’s property. If they did buildup 5 or 10 feet to the property line, it would have no impact on the lot behind it because there is no one there. He states he wanted to design the pool to maximize the living space which would be the smartest investment and to take advantage of the edge of the lot, and the sides of the lot. They wanted to maximize the living space around the pool. He states if someone is going to make the investment to install a pool and the surrounding living space it should be efficient and it needs to be worth it. He thinks this design achieves and checks all those boxes.

Chair Ladegaard states the unfortunate part is the homeowner does not own the property behind them.

Mr. Delia states that is correct

Chair Ladegaard states he realizes that Mr. McChrystal maintains the space, but he is not a legal owner. He asked if it has been considered to put the pool to the side of the house.

Mr. Delia states they did consider that. They went through several design considerations and the reason that it doesn’t work that well is it is not off the veranda, and not off the

living area. It wouldn't necessarily make sense with the future addition that they are also proposing which involves the pool house, bar, and grille area, changing room, and pool equipment. He states when you consider all those factors creating an outdoor living space with the architecture of the home to make fit well this seems to be the best layout.

Chair Ladegaard states that is an excessive variance, that is almost 100% variance.

Mr. Schatschneider states could Mr. McChrystal purchase 10 feet of the vacant property behind his house?

Mr. McChrystal responds, "buy the land"?

Mr. Delia says buying the land from the Red Tail Development has not been discussed but he doesn't think they would be thrilled with that mainly because that is the distance that each lot on St. Theresa has in the rear of their property. Each lot is the same depth. Mr. Delia states it is worth exploring but it would not change anything. He states from a topographic standpoint, ecological standpoint, and stormwater management standpoint it will not affect anything.

Mr. Delia says whether any water manages to fall either on the lawn or the concrete it is all going to the same place. He states the setback is important when the parcel is adjacent to other homes. However, there is no impact for this design, that is the critical issue. That is the whole reason for the setback is stormwater management. There is no other property to impact. That is why they are requesting this proposal.

Mr. Miller states that they might want to try to request the purchase of additional property.

Mr. Delia states if an additional 10 feet were purchased that would affect the property line. That would be a line on paper. However, it would not affect stormwater management.

Chair Ladegaard states several variances are requested at the Board of Zoning and Appeals. If we grant the variance that is right up to the property line, then we will need to grant that same variance for the next person who requests that. We don't grant this large of a variance.

Mr. Delia asked what variance has generally been granted in the past. Is it 48 inches, 32 inches, 5 feet?

Mr. Schatschneider states we will have to look in the record book.

Mr. Delia states if we request a 5 feet variance off the property line. Is it 5 feet to waters edge or is it 5 feet to hardscape? What is the most important variable. If they move the pool in, then we are affecting the offset against the house. We are moving to appease that zoning requirement and he thinks the hope is that if they build to the property line or close to it that at least they are taking as many things into consideration as possible.

Chair Ladegaard states he thinks if they move it 1-foot in on the pool that is better than being on the property line, it would be to the water's edge.

Mr. Delia states as far as the hardscape, they will need a retaining wall of some kind behind it, that would be a 6-foot variance for hardscape.

Ms. Clements clarifies it is 5 feet for concrete with hardscape around it.

Mr. Delia asked if that would be a 1-foot variance for hardscape?

Chair Ladegaard states that would be a 4-foot variance, because if it should be 5 feet and they wanted 1 foot off it would be a 4-foot variance.

Mr. Delia states that is correct, it depends on how you look at it, looking from the pool out or from the property line in. It is the same response.

Mr. Schatschneider asked about the wall, how close to the property line can you go with the wall.

Ms. Clements states 5 feet. She says the wall is the hardscape of the pool.

Chair Ladegaard says, could that be considered a fence being on the lot line.

Ms. Clements states there will be some type of footer or something underneath.

Mr. Delia agrees and states that is what they are proposing. The wall would be 4 foot tall and that would serve as the fence itself.

Ms. Clements states with it being part of the pool it would have to stay off the 5 feet.

Chair Ladegaard states it would need to be 1 foot off the property line.

Mr. Delia states if it is off the water's edge, they could figure something out and it is a matter of what will be eliminated to get that.

Mr. Schatschneider states it will still be 50%.

Chair Ladegaard states the wall would be an 80% variance. It would be 1 foot off the property line.

Mr. Delia states no, that would be if the current design were to pass then it would be about 12 inches. The 12 inches off the property line is the wall and 20 inches off the property line is water's edge, that is the current design.

Chair Ladegaard says we are trying to negotiate with what we would be comfortable with.

Mr. Delia states if the water's edge is 5 feet off the property line, that means the pool wall would be 4 foot off the property line, that would be asking for a 12-inch variance.

Ms. Clements states next to the pool is a 12-foot-wide wall that acts as a side of the pool wall, the water's edge is 5 feet, off that wall is 1 foot, so the back of the wall is going to be 4 foot off the property line.

Mr. Schatschneider says can they move the pool 4 feet towards the house, since the pool will not be smaller?

Mr. Delia states the pool is 14 foot wide currently, by most pool standards that is on the narrow side, average pools these days are 20 foot wide, that is why it is long. Instead of a classic 20x40 we went 14x50 to accommodate for that extra shortness.

Chair Ladegaard states if the pool is closer then there will need to be another variance.

Mr. Schatschneider states you need to be 15 feet off the house.

Mr. Delia states that is correct, they are moving it one way or the other. That is the goal.

Ms. Clements states that they will need to come back next month because the notice for the variance is for the current request, not the variance for the house.

Mr. Delia states when they start to lay this out, to move it 5 feet closer this way or that way, has no impact on the lot behind it or the stormwater management on the neighbor's property. He says there is only 1 neighbor to the north. If we move it forward, then the purpose of that rule is a safety concern in case someone were to jump off a roof. It is a tradeoff. By maximizing the lot, you are putting safety first and eliminating any future threats. He further states that less than a 14-foot pool isn't worth investing in.

Chair Ladegaard asked if they want the board to vote as requested or to table this and come back at the April meeting because of an additional variance request.

Mr. Delia states they will table this until April.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Schatschneider, to table the Michael and Megan McChrystal appeal to allow an 8 ft. 4 in. setback variance. The vote was: "AYES" all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

2. 4 ft. 6 in. setback variance. Code requires 5 ft.; applicant proposes 6 in. Section C.O. 1262.08(c)(1) Minimum Yard Requirements for Accessory Structures.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Schatschneider, to table the Michael and Megan McChrystal appeal to allow a 4 ft. 6 in. setback variance. The vote was: "AYES" all. The Chair declared the motion passed.**

**10. The HBAS Charitable and Education Foundation; Loren and Lynn Olson, 33678 Via San Angelo; 11-24**

Proposal consists of a covered patio.

The following variance is requested:

1. 10 ft. 8 in. rear yard setback variance. Code requires 20 ft.; applicant proposes 9 ft. 4 in. Section C.O. 1262.04(d)(1) Lot and Yard Requirements, Front Yard.

Ryan Puzitello, Parkview Homes (Agent for Loren and Lynn Olson), 22517 Valleybrook Lane, Strongsville, Ohio 44136 was sworn in.

Jim Weidner, Weidner Creative (Landscape Contractor), 122 Brooklyn Street, Elyria, Ohio 44035 was sworn in.

Mr. Puzitello states that Mr. and Mrs. Olson are moving back to Ohio from Connecticut. He states that due to the rear setback requirement there is not enough space, and they are not able to have outdoor furniture, a fireplace, and a grille. Mr. Pizzitello states they are requesting a 10 ft. 8 in. variance so they can have a 24x24 covered patio. This home is adjacent to the 18<sup>th</sup> hole of the Red Tail Golf Course and there is a retention pond directly behind it. He refers to the pictures shown on the screen. There are no rear neighbors that this variance will affect.

Chair Ladegaard states that a letter was submitted from the neighbor that is building a new home on the property that is located next to Mr. and Mrs. Olson home. The letter indicates that these neighbors are not in favor of the variance.

Mr. Puzitello acknowledges Chair Ladegaard's statement.

Ms. Clements states the letter was from the builder of that new home. She had some correspondence with the homeowner of the new home that is being built on that property. That homeowner had some water, drainage, and flooding concerns. Ms. Clements sent those questions to Ryan Cummins, the City Engineer, and he responded to those concerns. Those answers were sent to the new homeowner, and she did not have any other concerns. Further she did not state whether she positively or negatively supported the variance request.

Chair Ladegaard states the requested variance is more than the board would usually grant as far as the size of the variance. Chair Ladegaard asked if they would consider reducing the variance by 2 feet which would be an 8-foot variance.

Mr. Weidner states he thinks that Mr. and Mrs. Olson would be agreeable to that. However, it is getting tight with what they are requesting of the project because they entertain a lot. When they prepare a design, they look to accommodate the customers' needs. Mr. and Mrs. Olson would like certain amenities in their outdoor space. With the size of the investment, they want to make sure it is a workable area. He thinks reducing the variance could be workable for them.

Chair Ladegaard states right now if it is at 24-foot structure, it would be a 10 ft. 8 in. setback variance. If we change it to an 8 ft. variance that would be a 2-1/2 ft. reduction, so it would be 21-1/2-foot structure.

Mr. Weidner states reducing the size of the structure by 2 ft., to be a 22-foot structure be acceptable.

Chair Ladegaard states he thinks 2 ft. would be acceptable.

Mr. Bulger agrees with reducing the variance.

Mr. Miller agrees with reducing the variance also.

Mr. Schatschneider thinks they should reduce the variance even more. He thinks the variance should be reduced by 4 feet, to a 20-foot structure.

Mr. Weidner states by reducing the variance by 4 feet it would eliminate the dining table underneath the covered patio. It would mainly be a seating area around the fireplace, which makes it a little difficult for the homeowners, that is what we requested the 10 ft. 8 in. variance. However, reducing it by a couple of feet could be acceptable. They could get smaller furniture.

Chair Ladegaard states Mr. Schatschneider would like to see a 6 ft. 8 in. variance.

Mr. Weidner states a 22-foot structure would be acceptable, a 20-foot structure would be tough. He refers to the drawing and states that everything is drawn to scale. They want to make sure it's a livable space. There needs to be enough space to put a dining table and have seating around the fireplace. There will also be a grille and serving area.

Mr. Miller states as they look at the roofline there is a little bit of room between the window and the outside area to make it wider.

Mr. Weidner states they are trying to keep it, so it does not darken the main family room window area inside of the house. They wanted to limit the areas that the covered roof would darken. He doesn't think the width is as much of an issue as the depth would be. He states that a 2-foot reduction would be acceptable.

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to approve the HBAS Charitable and Education Foundation; Loren and Lynn Olson appeal to allow an 8 ft. 8 in rear yard setback variance. The vote was:**

**Mr. Bulger "yes", Mr. Miller "yes", Mr. Ladegaard "yes"**

**Mr. Schatschneider "no"**

**3, "AYES"**

**1, "NAY"**

**The Chair declared the motion passed.**

## COMMENTS

Mr. Schatschneider had no comments.  
Ms. Fechter states Ms. Clements birthday is March 8<sup>th</sup>.  
Mr. Ladegaard wished Ms. Clements a happy birthday.  
Mr. Miller had no comments.  
Ms. Clements wished everyone a Happy Easter.  
Mr. Bulger had no comments.  
Mr. Gasior had no comments.  
Mr. Streator had no comments.

## ADJOURN

**Mr. Miller moved, seconded by Mr. Bulger, to adjourn. The vote was: “AYES” all. The Chair declared the motion passed. The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.**

---

Mark Ladegaard, Chair

---

Susan Pintz, Planning Commission &  
ZBA Secretary

---

Date