



# CITY OF BROADVIEW HEIGHTS BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING MINUTES

June 7, 2023

Editor's Note: The minutes are not an actual verbatim transcript of the meetings, but merely intended to be a detailed synopsis of the discussion and decisions that took place during the meeting. Upon acceptance of the minutes by the Board of Zoning Appeals, these written minutes will become the official minutes of the meeting. All recordings are kept and disposed of according to the Public Records Schedule of the State of Ohio.

The Board of Zoning Appeals meeting was called to order by Iain Crouch at 6:31 p.m.

Read Article V, Section 8(D) of the City Charter and explained that this is the standard in which the Board needs to decide on each variance request(s) before them.

## ROLL CALL

### **BZA MEMBERS**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Debbie Boop, Chairman     | <input type="checkbox"/> VACANT                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vacant, Vice Chairman     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Iain Crouch (alternate) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Scott Maitland | <input type="checkbox"/> Margaret Harshbarger (alternate)   |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob Routson    |   |

---

### **COUNCIL & CITY OFFICIAL MEMBERS present**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Mandato (Building Official)                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Jeff Hajek (Fire Chief)                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gina Zdanowicz (BZA/PC/Building Dept. Admin. Assist.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Joe Fleming (Assistant Fire Chief)     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Yelenosky, PE (City Engineer)                               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Price (Council Rep.)    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Richard Pignatiello (Assistant Law Director)                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Glenn Goodwin (Council Rep. Alternate) |

---

### **Additional CITY OFFICIALS present**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Sam Alai (Mayor)                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Robert Boldt (City Council)       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> David Schroedel (Service Director)                  | <input type="checkbox"/> George Stelmaschuk (City Council) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Vince Ruffa (Law Director)                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Tom Pavlica (City Council)        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joe Grandinetti (Assistant Law Director) | <input type="checkbox"/> Brian Wolf (City Council)         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dean DePiero (Assistant Law Director)               | <input type="checkbox"/> Jennifer Mahnic (City Council)    |

---

Iain Crouch chaired the meeting in Debbie Boop's absence. He made the announcement that this is a public hearing, and we do ask for anyone who plans on testifying or speaking at any point during this meeting, to please rise. We are going to do a mass swearing in. Mass swearing in was done.

### **CASE #2023-BZA #06:**

**Site Address: 8420 WINDSOR WAY**  
**PPN: 581-10-031**  
**Applicant: GAF Energy LLC., Anais Abello**  
**Owner(s): Angela Monateri**

**The matter under discussion is at the request of Anais Abello with GAF Energy LLC for a variance to install solar panels/shingles on a roof that fronts the street at 8420 Windsor Way. 1352.05(3) states: Roof mounted solar energy systems shall not be placed on the roof that fronts the street.**

**Can we have a report from the Building Department and Engineering.**

Mr. Mandato wanted to make a statement, that this is the third solar panel that has come to the Board of Zoning since this ordinance has passed, and went on to state that it is in the Building Department and Engineering Department's opinion, that this is not a hardship, because the panels could possibly be moved to other parts of the roof, so they don't front the street. Mr. Mandato stated that it is up to the Board to decide.

Mr. Crouch asked the applicant to come forward, sign in and state their name, and read their statement of hardship.

Angela Monateri, 8420 Windsor Way, Broadview Heights, 44147, and Jonathan Day, GAF Energy, spoke to the Board and read the letter of hardship.

This letter is being written to request a variance in regard to the installation of solar shingles at the above referenced address. Our initial permit request was denied due to an ordinance that restricts solar from being installed on the front or side of a home. If this installation were to be limited to the rear of the home only, it will result in a significant system downsize and loss of production. Attached in the letter are the two mock ups of the two proposed systems, one being the system as designed producing 602 kWh annually, and the second one being shingles installed on the back of the home only producing 4532 kWh annually.

Mr. Day explained, that if we are limited to using the rear of the home only, this will result in a 25% system size decrease and a 33% loss of production. The pictures on the illustration are a heat map of the radius, so obviously south is the best, with east being second best. The shingles located in those areas are the most efficient of the panels. Timberline solar shingles are a different type of product, that he believed, was not around when this ordinance was created. It is not a solar panel, it does not weight 40 lbs. and it does not lift off the roof of the home, it is the roof of the home. It is flush to the roof and walkable, and it is attractive. They are A Fire rated with a wind rating of 130 mph. Again, for the monetary home, and using a smaller system size as may be required by the ordinance, it would reduce her warranty of about 50%. He went on to explain, that if the Board was worried about what it looked like, it is a shingle. It is not bulky, it is lightweight, and you can nail it down. He passed out photos to the Board of what they looked like on a roof of a house. Mr. Day went on to state, that the owner, Angela Monateri, out of concern for her neighbors, has chosen a charcoal asphalt shingle, and as you can see, it very much makes the product difficult to see to the naked eye, unless you use a 4K lens. The shingles are mounted directly to the roofing deck, there is no place for pests to hide, or snow to collect, it is walkable, and doesn't create a leak liability for the structure. It protects the home and provides energy for the home. Mr. Day stated that he hoped this will be the first of a few different variance meetings he can attend with us.

Mr. Crouch asked if anyone on the Board had any questions.

Mr. Routson stated, that looking at his representations, they don't really look like regular roofing shingles. He stated that he could see a different in texture, a different look. Mr. Day stated that he had a sample that he brought with him if he wanted to look at it. Mr. Routson said that in his description, it appeared that they would be looking like a regular roofing shingle that would be nailed down and would be indistinguishable. In this representation, you can see there is a difference between a roofing shingle and the solar apparatus. Mr. Day stated that he didn't see a

difference between the product being a shingle, because it is in fact a shingle. It is a roofing material rated as such. It does tie in with asphalt shingles, because currently fire code regulations require a 3 ft. walkway around the ridge, and the outside of the area, and is installed with a nail gun by a roofer. Mr. Routson stated that maybe his definition and interpretation of an asphalt roofing shingle is antiquated, but he can tell a distinct difference. Mr. Day asked Mr. Routson, if he found that difference to be unattractive. Mr. Routson, stated that aesthetically, no. As to the hardship, in terms of reduction, whether it's on the eastern or western exposure, you are still able to generate power, and asked Mr. Day if that was correct. Mr. Day, stated yes, but less power per day, because of the shadows and trees on the backside of the house. Mr. Routson asked if that reduction resulted in them, being able to use one appliance a day or two for several hours. What does the hardship translate into usable energy? Mr. Day stated that it is not going to limit the appliances used because this system is still going to be grid tied. The monetary household can use as much power as they like. How much they are able to offset using their energy production is really the issue. In this case it would cut their production and savings back by about half, by using the backside only.

Mr. Mandato wanted to clarify with Mr. Day, before he went any further on that, that there is no ordinance that doesn't allow it on the side of the house. It is just the front of the house, that fronts the street, not the side of the house. Mr. Mandato stated that he had two areas on the side of the home that he could move the solar panels to. Mr. Day stated that one area is north, and he would not dream of putting them there, and the other area is just too small.

Mr. Routson asked in terms of the generation, in terms of offset, would roughly 50% be offset. Mr. Day answered with the full system as proposed they would offset 81% of her previous year's history, with a reduced system offset of 54%. Mr. Routson confirmed that the goal would be to use as a substitute to current electrical supply systems rather than a full offset, and putting power back into the grid. Mr. Day stated that the goal is actually a monthly basis, so net metering is an agreement between the utility company and the homeowner, and went on to explain it. He stated that over producing is not their goal, which is why they set the design at the 81%, because over producing to try to meet the needs of winter is astronomically silly. They designed a system that allowed her to retain the full value of electricity at retail price, but not to sell additional power beyond what she uses back at a discount. Mr. Routson asked what other cities or towns have their product. Mr. Day stated that there are 50 in Pittsburgh. Mr. Routson asked in Ohio. Mr. Day stated that in Ohio, the first install was done last week in Columbus. Ohio is their 17<sup>th</sup> state as far as bringing the product to market. His family and he moved here 14 weeks ago for that purpose, and he lives in Akron now. The next three installs are going in, the week of the 25<sup>th</sup>, in Akron, Ohio.

Mr. Maitland asked if the shingles have to be rectangular shaped. Mr. Day stated that they do, there is future talk of creating a transfer shingle that will allow for a "u" shape to go around many of the dormers that are in architecture, but at this time it is just a rectangular design. There is a minimum of 12 shingles to make a circuit. Mr. Maitland asked that the one panel they have on the dormer near the front of the house, could that go towards the back. Mr. Day stated no, because there are 12 shingles needed that have to be 10 ft. wide x 6 ft. tall. The downside of Ms. Monateri's home, is that it is a beautiful architectural home, and there are many facets. There are places you could install a traditional solar panel by itself, and do an ugly design on the front of the home, but they are limited to a rectangle.

Mr. Crouch asked if there was anyone in the audience here to speak in favor of the variance.

Angela Monateri, 8420 Windsor Way. She is the homeowner of the house. She stated that part of the hardship also, is a solar tax credit that they can currently get from the IRS, and it is a 30% tax credit that is only on the solar portion of that, and talked to her CPA about the tax credit she would lose or might not be eligible for. Also in consideration, the solar panels have come a long way, they

wouldn't have wanted to install the big green and blue solar panels. These are beautiful shingles and she wouldn't have considered anything else for her home in Broadview Heights.

Jimmy Smith, 8870 Chaucer Blvd. He stated that he is in favor of the variance. He had some questions, and asked Mr. Mandato the reason behind the ordinance. Mr. Mandato stated that the City does not want the solar panel look in our communities, where houses are looking at other houses, so Council passed the ordinance. Mr. Smith confirmed it was the visual aesthetics not functionality. Mr. Mandato stated that was correct. Mr. Smith stated that he read about the new technology, and in response to Mr. Routson asking what cities had them, Mr. Smith wondered what cities didn't have solar ordinances. Mr. Routson stated that was not within his purview with the City of Broadview Heights. Mr. Smith stated that many cities don't have solar ordinances, and it is unusual that we have it here. Mr. Smith asked if we had an ordinance on the aesthetics of a chimney. Mr. Mandato stated that we have an ordinance on the condition of it, it has to be well maintained, but not the aesthetic look, but everything gets reviewed when it comes in for a permit. Mr. Smith said he asked, because chimneys used to be the primary type of energy, solar is the next level, and it is vastly taking over how we use energy. Mr. Smith asked if we had an ordinance on the aesthetic look beyond the material itself. Mr. Mandato stated that there are no aesthetics, a roof is a roof, and stated he wasn't sure where he was going with this. Mr. Smith asked if this primary grouping gets mis-categorized as a solar project. Should we even have this meeting if it is considered a roofing material. Mr. Mandato stated that it is not roof material it is solar array, regardless of being classified as a roofing material. There is a distinct difference in look on the roof that faces the front of the street and that is why the ordinance is in place. It is up to the Board to make a decision on the hardship. Mr. Smith stated that he is struggling with some of that, is it aesthetics because it is seen as new vs. the old. Mr. Crouch stated that this is something that could be directed to Council, because it is their ordinance that they passed, and working with Council on if there is interest to change it, that would be the avenue, not this Board. We look at the information that is submitted to us, and we compare it to the ordinance, we look at the hardship, and then we make a decision.

Mr. Price stated that it seems like Mr. Smith is fishing for a reason, and the reason is the aesthetics. We are a very pro solar generation, but the ordinance is to protect the aesthetics of the neighborhoods. Mr. Price asked to look at the sample of the shingle that he brought to the meeting. Mr. Day showed him.

Mr. Maitland asked Mr. Smith how close he lived to the house in question. He stated that he doesn't really know, he tried looking that up on the way over to the meeting. Mr. Maitland confirmed that he can't see it from his house. Mr. Smith stated no, he wouldn't think so.

Mr. Day showed the sample of the shingle to the Board, and explained the installation of it.

Mr. Crouch asked if there was anyone in the audience here to speak against this project.

Michelle Salis, 8532 Windsor Way. She stated that she moved into the neighborhood 18 years ago, and they have a very strict homeowner's association. They cannot have sheds in their yard, or forward facing garages, mailboxes have to be exactly the same. She was very surprised to hear that this was being considered, she didn't know why the homeowner's association hasn't addressed it, maybe because it is not in the by-laws. Ms. Salis stated that they have fantastic home values. From what she has seen so far it is not a shingle, it doesn't look anything like the houses in their neighborhood. They have made a lot of investment, their home values have gone up year after year, and she thinks it would be a detriment to the neighborhood. In the back would be fine, but not the front, it just wouldn't look nice in their neighborhood. She understands that there is just a 30% difference in savings, and that is still good. She has talked to other neighbors that were not able to make it tonight, and there is a handful of people that are against it.

Sandra Lesnick, 8520 Windsor Way. She is against the solar panel/shingles. She understood that a hardship is necessary to get a change, and she doesn't see a hardship shown here. The definition of a hardship, is severe suffering, is there a severe suffering that this person is experiencing, because she hasn't heard anything. It is not something they want in their neighborhood. It just doesn't look right. You can install on the side, in the rear, wherever it is permitted by the City, but not on the front. She doesn't know much about solar panels, but wondered how long it would last. It can withstand 135 mph winds and if there is damage, will they repair it, and how long would it take. She went on to stated that if they can't afford the utilities, that they are looking at alternative measures, then maybe they should consider a change of address, or an area that would accommodate the panels. She and her husband are totally against it.

John Lesnick, 8520 Windsor Way. He stated that the homeowner's association made rules, and they should be followed. He is a farmer, and he has a farm in Pennsylvania, where he can do anything he pleases on the farm. When he came to Windsor Way he struggled to follow the rules, but he follows them. The next step would be litigation, and he doesn't want to get an attorney involved because it would take another 20 years.

Mr. Crouch asked if there were any other questions from the Board. Seeing none, he asked for a motion to vote.

**MOTION BY:**                     ROB ROUTSON                                          **SECOND BY:**                     SCOTT MAITLAND                    

**VOTING:**

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>RECUSE</u>		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>RECUSE</u>
Debbie Boop	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Iain Crouch	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scott Maitland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Margaret Harshbarger	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rob Routson	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>DENIED</b> <input type="checkbox"/> POSTPONED <input type="checkbox"/> TABLED <input type="checkbox"/> REMOVED							

**CASE #2023-BZA #04: - Tabled from the May 3, 2023 Meeting**

**Site Address: 9083 AVERY RD.  
 PPN: 583-14-001  
 Applicant: TERRY SPETH  
 Owner(s): TERRY SPETH**

**The matter under discussion is at the request of Terry Speth of 8151 Overlook for variances to lot split 583-14-001 into three lots. Variance (1) needs a lot width variance of 63 feet (ord. 1268.06(D) - each lot must have a minimum width of 125 feet); all three lots need an additional Variance (2) for the dwelling not to front the dedicated street (ord. 1268.06(C) – each dwelling's front elevation faces only the dedicated street).**

**Can we have a report from the Building Department and Engineering Department.**

Mr. Mandato stated that he was correct with the variances that are needed, but he wanted to make a clarification from the last meeting, about what was asked without Counsel present was about the easement for the driveway for the one parcel. He received a comment from Gary Yelenosky, our City Engineer, "based on their plat submission, it shows a proposed easement area, ingress, egress and utilities. He felt this should be sufficient for the meeting. If approved

this should be a stand along document that goes with the details of the easement.” Mr. Mandato stated that took care of the easement question. Also, there is a letter from the Fire Department with regards to the fire hydrant being installed:

**The Fire Department has two issues we will need to have addressed:**

**1. Water Supply**

Due to the location of the existing water supply on Avery Road, and the location of the proposed single family homes, this will require a fire line and hydrant to be installed between parcels 1A and 1B.

See City of Broadview Hts. Codified Ordinance 1630

**2. Fire Department Access Road**

As mentioned above the proposed ingress/egress easement can serve as the access road required by code. (See Ohio Fire Code section 503). It is worth mentioning the applicant should carefully read all of the sections in 503. There are requirements for width, paving, turn-around, gates, etc. that will need to be followed.

A detailed site plan that conforms to section 503 of the Fire Code and section 1630 of the Codified Ordinances will eventually have to be submitted and approved.

Mr. Crouch asked Mr. Speth to come forward and state his hardship once again. Mr. Speth asked if he was allowed to decline if he wanted to wait until next month until more members were present. Mr. Crouch said yes, that was allowed. Mr. Speth said that he would like to still like to discuss it at least. Mr. Crouch stated that he was o.k. with it. Mr. Speth stated, that as Mr. Mandato talked about the fire hydrants that came up last time, he will follow the rules and install at hydrant between Parcel 1A and 1B, and the easement, the driveway, based on code 503, he will follow the rules there as well. Mr. Speth stated that he is flexible, and will do whatever he needs to get this done. He has spoken with several neighbors in Summerwood. Last meeting there was a gentleman to the south, a retired pediatrician that was in favor of the lot split, he didn't think that was duly noted. He spoke to the neighbors to the north, and they would be interested in buying Parcel 1A, and build a new house on it. Some others neighbors on Summerwood were indifferent. He felt it was worth noting that if the residents that are directly related to the driveway, which he felt was the main concern here, they should be the ones to oppose the layout, and if they are not, we should move forward. The point of the Board is to protect the residents aesthetically, have their best interest based on the law, but again if there is support there, it should be noted that they have an interest in buying one of the parcels. Some of the neighbors did say that the way it is laid out would be too close to the property lines. This was just a layout to give more detail about the properties and how the houses can sit. It can be changed.

Mr. Routson asked Mr. Mandato, who bears the cost of the fire access, and the hydrant and water line. Mr. Mandato stated that it is 100% the cost of the applicant. Mr. Routson asked Mr. Speth if he was okay with that. Mr. Speth stated that he understood, and obviously will put all his costs together, and if it is something he cannot afford, he would not move forward. Mr. Routson asked Mr. Speth, if he thought it would be a deterrent to bear those costs, for someone purchasing Parcel 1A. Mr. Speth stated that all of that will be built out before the lots go up for sale.

Mr. Maitland asked Mr. Mandato if there was room for a roadway. Mr. Mandato stated that private roads are not allowed in Broadview Heights anymore, no dead end streets, no cul-de-sacs. The road would probably have to have an ingress and egress so this would not qualify. This would be a private driveway only, and that is why it has to be put in the easement for the three parcels.

Mr. Crouch asked if Mr. Mandato could qualify the cul-de-sac, the no cul-de-sac rule. We have had one in the past where the cul-de-sac was required, for one reason because of the emergency vehicles, so why is it not required here. Mr. Mandato stated that he will have to put something in, it will have to be a "T" or something, it's not shown on the drawing, he will have to put something in for the Fire trucks to turn around. Tonight he is just looking to get the variances on the lot frontages and the position of the houses not fronting the street. If it does get approved tonight or another night, it will have to check all the boxes, once it comes over to us for the lot split, and it will go back to Planning Commission for the lot split showing those details.

Mr. Price clarified with Mr. Crouch that he was making reference to the other case on Boulderwood Drive. Mr. Crouch stated that he was. Mr. Price stated that was at the end of a street that was cut off. This is actually coming off of a roadway like a driveway. The other one was a continuation of the roadway, and he couldn't just put a driveway at the end of a dead end street.

Mr. Maitland clarified that they needed the same two variances. Mr. Price stated that was correct.

Mr. Speth asked if Mr. Grandinetti was the Law Director. Mr. Grandinetti stated he was one of the Assistant Law Director's. He asked if he saw any issues with the drawings, and how they were laid out, the easement and the frontage. Mr. Speth stated that he was not in attendance the last time. Mr. Grandinetti stated that he was not, and he was also not an engineer, or commissioner, he is an attorney. He doesn't look at drawings and determine whether or not they look good, that is up to the Building Commissioner and Engineering Department. Mr. Mandato stated that Gary Yelenosky, our City Engineer has already signed off on that, that is shows it in the easement.

Mr. Crouch asked if anyone on the Board had any questions. There were none

Mr. Crouch asked if there was anyone in the audience here to speak in favor or against the variance.

Lisa Karakostas, 9003 Avery Road. She is the very first parcel outside the Summerwood subdivision. She has a Bachelors in Science in Biology, and built her own home. She has some concerns, she and her neighbor Rick Smith, Jr., are not for it, because they do not want a road right next to their home. Even though Dr. Barich may be in favor, who is on the other side of this new road, he also has more acreage and a good buffer. She and her neighbor next door only have a half acre. Parcel A1 is literally right behind them. Mr. Smith has a pool, and they would be looking right into his swimming pool, which is not ideal. She doesn't have a lot of trees in her yard that are not ornamental or as short as she is, but her neighbor has many trees, and she was concerned with the fire hydrants because if something caught fire there, obviously if the trees fell, they would fall onto her house. She is not able to say anything, if someone purchases the lot and wants to build, and they follow the rules, but she does not want a house that close, and she felt that Mr. Speth could put himself in her shoes, as she has lived there 17 years, and having the area empty was very nice. Also he doesn't cut the grass and they have been getting a lot of vermin, i.e., snakes, mice, possum, raccoons. She went on to say that the previous owner was like a 98-year-old man, and somehow he managed to do it. That really hasn't been good or neighborly.

Mr. Speth stated that he spoke to Rick today, and he mentioned this as well. He is concerned about it being too close to his property, but in this drawing, they are probably 30 ft. He asked Mr. Mandato what the setback have to be. Mr. Mandato stated 50 ft. Mr. Speth stated that there will be 50 ft. from the property line. Mr. Speth stated that a suggestion was made when he talked to him today, the two houses north of the easement, they would purchase 20-30 ft. of Parcel 1A, and extend their

back property line, that would give them more cushion, and then from that extra 20-30 ft., an additional 50 ft. would be the new house. Bottom line is there is three acres, and it goes down to two, that is still a lot of land. Mr. Mandato stated that he thought he was confused with the setbacks. The front setback that would be off of the driveway would be 50 ft. The side setbacks are only 10 ft., so he can move the house far back to the east Parcel 1A and use 60 ft. rear, and 10 ft. side yard setback, if you get the variances. The house can be moved quite a bit on that parcel.

Mr. Speth stated again that he is flexible. If he builds the house for himself, he wants to know his neighbors and enjoy the neighborhood. If that is something that people want to see, by all means, he would do it. He is in no hurry to do the project, he lives in a house now that he is comfortable in, he can look at it again with someone, or submit new plans.

Mr. Routson stated that probably in fairness to Mr. Speth, to have a full Board with his project, and since he is under no constraints, and he can further refine his plans. Mr. Speth agreed.

Mr. Mandato stated that the next meeting is on August 2, 2023.

Mr. Routson asked if that presented a problem. Mr. Speth stated that it did not with him. Mr. Mandato suggested to Mr. Speth, instead of hearsay, if he could get something in writing from his neighbors, or they can attend the meeting, that would be more helpful.

Ms. Karakostas stated that she got the notice from Rick Smith, she did not get the mailing, and it is directly behind her home. Thankfully, he did get it to her, and they had a lengthy discussion about it. Mr. Mandato said that he wasn't accusing her of lying, it is just better for him to have proof of what he is saying.

Mr. Speth asked what the Board would like to see in more detail. Mr. Routson stated that he would like to see the orientation of the house on Parcel 1A and 1B. Mr. Mandato said to show the buildable space, and show where the house could range in area and location.

Mr. Routson stated that the whole issue of proximity in neighborhoods is unavoidable. Everyone likes to have space. You have limited space, and as long as you meet the setbacks, then develop your property. With some additional refinement, I think you can give us a better sense of what direction you are going. Mr. Speth understood.

Mr. Crouch asked if there were any other questions from the Board. Seeing none, he asked for a motion to table.

**BZA MOTION BY: ROB ROUTSON SECOND BY: SCOTT MAITLAND**

**VOTING:**

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>RECUSE</u>		<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>RECUSE</u>
Debbie Boop	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	VACANT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
VACANT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Iain Crouch	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scott Maitland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Margaret Harshbarger	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rob Routson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>				
<input type="checkbox"/> APPROVED	<input type="checkbox"/> DENIED	<input type="checkbox"/> POSTPONED	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>TABLED</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> REMOVED			



**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

May 3, 2023 Minutes – Mr. Crouch stated that they did receive the meeting minutes from the May 3, 2023 meeting, but with the Chairman absent this evening we will hold them. Mr. Routson agreed, they will hold them until the Chairman is present at the next meeting.

---

---

**OLD BUSINESS:**

None

---

---

**NEW BUSINESS:**

None

---

---

**Mr. Crouch stated with no further business to come before the Board of Zoning Appeals I will make a motion to adjourned the meeting at 7:28 p.m.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Iain Crouch, Acting Chairman  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
City of Broadview Heights**

**Approved Date:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Gina Zdanowicz  
Building Administrative Assistant  
Board of Zoning & Planning Commission Secretary**