

**MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE CHESTER TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS HELD MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2025, IN THE TOWN HALL MEETING ROOM. AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE.**

Chairman Barton Ziganti called the Regular, September 8, 2025 Chester Township Board of Zoning Appeals meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**Roll Call**

Members present: Ms. Denamen/yes, Mr. Dobrzynski/yes, Mr. Enger/absent, Ms. Fadorsen/yes, Ms. Klemm/yes, Ms. Muehling/absent; Mr. Ziganti/yes  
\*Mr. Dobrzynski will serve as a voting member tonight in the absence of Ms. Muehling  
Zoning inspector: Mr. Alusheff  
Admin present: Ms. McCarthy

Mr. Ziganti led the committee in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Ziganti read the public hearing process of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

All members of the audience wishing to testify in this case were sworn in.

**APPEAL ZA-2025-3  
Area Variance  
Greg Baggott  
11692 Cambridge Dr.**

Mr. Alusheff – Gave a review of this case which was originally heard March 10, 2025 and asked for two variances. At that time, Mr. Baggott asked for a continuance as a potential Zoning Resolution amendment was imminent which would make his garage being placed in the side yard no longer a problem. As that amendment did go through, he was returning to ask that his existing shed (20' x 10') be allowed to remain where placed in his front yard.

Mr. Baggott – I bought the shed about a year ago. I did not know a zoning permit would be needed and I am here to clean that mistake up. (Mr. Baggott held up pictures of his property for BZA review. Those pictures are in the file and are marked Exhibit 1.) The first picture shows my home is in a wooded area and it is not visible from the road or by the neighbors. It also shows there is no other viable place to put this shed on the property. He also showed the graded gravel pad the shed is now sitting on and where it is placed on the driveway.

This is a very wooded lot and sits on about seven acres. The shed is used for yard equipment, tools, shovels, outdoor furniture and just general storage. There is no viable place to put this in an approved zoning location.

My neighbors have been notified and I have heard no complaints or objections. I don't see any conflict with where this shed is located. It's a structure that is modeled after the home. The lot is a unique lot. The home is not front facing and the shed will not cause an obstruction to the neighborhood. It's 215' away from the road.

**Board Review of Practical Difficulty Standards**

1. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Mr. Baggott – I would argue that the structure adds to the value of the property as extra storage. Without the shed it is not as valuable.

2. Whether the variance is substantial.

Mr. Baggott – This is a storage shed and the definition of substantial does not indicate it is substantial.

3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether the adjoining property owners would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.

Mr. Baggott – No.

4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services;

Mr. Baggott – No.

5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restrictions.

Mr. Baggott – I was not aware of zoning restrictions. That's on my shoulders.

6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a variance;

Mr. Baggott – Moving the shed into another location would not be feasible.

Mr. Ziganti – This is a pole structure isn't it?

Ms. Denamen – Addressing Mr. Alusheff – Did we verify that this structure would not put him over the allowed square footage of an accessory building?

Mr. Alusheff – His property is allowed 2,500 square feet of accessory building. This shed is 200 square feet and when combined with his new building, he will still be way below the max amount of allowable square footage.

The group reviewed Nearmap on the monitor indicating what was previously on the property, what was torn down, where the shed is currently and where the new accessory building will be.

Mr. Ziganti – Why could the shed not be moved to the west side of the house?

Mr. Baggott – That is where our septic is located. Plus, if the shed was there, it wouldn't be accessible to put our yard equipment in.

7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement(s) would be observed and substantial justice be done by granting the variance;

Mr. Baggott – Based on the unique contours of the property and the layout of the property, I don't feel any harm is being done to the neighbors themselves

Mr. Ziganti invited sworn in audience members who would like to speak to the Board to come forward. None came forward.

Public Comments was closed

Mr. Ziganti – My concern is there is indeed an area for this pole structure which is on a skid and should be easily moveable. There are areas at the same elevation as the existing shed. This appears to be a 100% variance and the problem with a 100% variance, in my mind, is that it goes into perpetuity. If an area variance is granted, that structure and any future structure can be there.

Addressing the Zoning Inspector, Mr. Ziganti asked if there is any way we might use Section 10 to allow this non-conforming building? With the stipulations in place in Section 10 and that this building is already in place, could we allow Mr. Baggott to keep his shed and in the future as the building becomes obsolete, not replace the structure?

Mr. Alusheff – Yes, my understanding is the board has the authority and if they determine the structure to be non-conforming and subject to the non-conforming regulations in Article 10, that structure could remain there.

Mr. Ziganti – So, if the structure was destroyed by an act of God, it can't be replaced. This is a way where things that shouldn't be there don't necessarily need to remain there in perpetuity.

Continued group discussion on alternative sites where the shed could be placed.

Public portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Ziganti – I know this shed could be moved and the problem with a variance is that it goes into perpetuity.

Perhaps we as a board could consider looking at Article 10. This is a non-conforming structure that would be allowed to remain. First of all, it wouldn't be allowed to go into perpetuity and a building always allowed to be there. We just keep getting into these situations where buildings are put in place and we are asked to deal with this.

Group discussion amongst the board about how approving the legal, non-conforming use of this shed could be allowed to stay under Section 10 and what that would like moving into the future. This would document the building, how it got there and how it is to be handled moving forward.

Mr. Ziganti - The board offered the opportunity to designate Mr. Baggott's existing building as a non-conforming structure which would allow him to keep the shed where it is at, use it as you testified how you wish to use it and that would negate the need for a variance. Would that be OK with you?

Mr. Baggott – I would leave it as is; I could repair it but not replace it. Is that what I understood?

Mr. Ziganti – You cannot replace it if it destroyed.

Mr. Baggott – I'm OK with that.

Ms. Fadorsen made a motion to approve ZA-2025-3, Ms. Denamen seconded the motion.

Ms. Fadorsen – I think the shed belongs where it is.

Ms. Denamen – I agree, I think it is a good compromise. My only challenge is, people need to start coming forward before they buy a property to find out what restrictions are on the property.

Mr. Dobrzynski – I am totally all for it.

Ms. Klemm – I agree it is a good use of the Zoning Resolution.

Ms. Fadorsen moved that the area variance request for ZA-2025-3 be approved. Ms. Denamen seconded the motion.

Ms. Denamen/no; Mr. Dobrzynski/no; Ms. Fadorsen/no; Ms. Klemm/no; Mr. Ziganti/no

Motion does not pass.

Mr. Ziganti made a motion to allow the 20' x 10' shed remain where currently situated and found to be a legal, non-conforming structure subject to Article 10 of the Zoning Resolution. Ms. Denamen seconded the motion.

Ms. Denamen/yes; Mr. Dobrzynski/yes; Ms. Fadorsen/yes; Ms. Klemm/yes; Mr. Ziganti/yes

Motion passes

### **Findings of Fact**

#### **ZA-2025-3**

Mr. Gregg Baggott requested an Area Variance for his property located at 11692 Cambridge Dr. for a 20' x 10' skid structure to remain in a pre-prepared location in the front yard. The combined accessory buildings on the property were below the 2,500 square foot allowance. The existing 20' x 10' structure is located 215' from the road.

The board determined that a better solution to granting an area variance would be to deem the existing accessory structure to be a legal, non-conforming structure subject to Section 10 of the Zoning Resolution for non-conforming building structures and uses.

Mr. Baggott was in favor of this designation with his understanding that he could continue to use the existing 20' x 10' shed in its principal location.

We the board incorporate into these Findings of Fact the applications, exhibits of the appeal including all corrections, clarifications and additions.

#### **APPEAL ZA-2025-8 Mitchell Geer 8966 Mayfield Rd. Area Variance**

All members of the audience wishing to testify in this case were sworn in.

Mr. Alusheff – This property has a barn that went up in 1999 as an Agriculturally Exempt structure. In the package is the affidavit submitted by the property owner attesting to that fact. At some point, after 1999, it was no longer used for agricultural purposes. It came to my attention when I saw the real estate listing for the property at which point, I contacted the agent who put me in touch with the property owner to bring this zoning issue to your attention. It is indeed a non-conforming structure where the maximum allowable square footage is 2,500 square feet.

The 4,800 square foot structure that he originally intended to build and attached to the home by a breezeway was never built. There is no evidence that this structure was ever used for agricultural use.

Mr. Ziganti asked if Mr. Alusheff agreed that this is a 172% variance request?

Mr. Alusheff – Yes, that sounds right.

Mr. Geer – I'm from California. My brother died and left this property in my lap. For 28 months I have been working on this property. The barn is really not visible from the road. I really don't know much about zoning and zoning rules in Ohio.

I'd like to sell the home and get back to my life.

Ms. Klemm – What condition is the barn in?

Mr. Geer – Great.

Ms. Klemm – I'm confused why you wouldn't keep the Ag Exemption and try to sell it as a horse property.

Mr. Geer – That's fine with me.

Mr. Ziganti – It was built under Ag Exemption and Ag Exemption remains as long as it remains in an agricultural use. It doesn't appear the property has been used in an agricultural use and has actually been used by the prior owner as storage.

Group discussion on what Ag Exempt is and how it works. Also, what it does to any future potential buyer.

Mr. Ziganti – This situation is similar to the case just heard.

Mr. Alusheff – If there were horses in that barn prior to the prior owner passing away, I would not have even brought this up. If that were the case, this hearing probably wouldn't even be happening right now.

If you handled this similar to the prior case and made this a non-conforming structure, the future homeowner could only operate permitted home business such as found in Section 5.01.02 of the Zoning Resolution. It still gives the Zoning Inspector the ability to file a violation against that person if they don't operate in the guidelines of the Zoning Resolution.

Ms. Denamen – If there was a disaster, and the building was used for Agricultural, could the homeowner rebuild the structure?

Mr. Alusheff – Yes.

The Public Comments portion of the meeting was opened.

Ms. Gifford – Has driven by this property two to three times a week for the past 30 years. We all agree this is a non-conforming building. There is no evidence of ag use that I could ever see.

Mr. Roger Roseum – There was never any agricultural use in this barn. My concern as the adjoining property is, what is to stop the next person who claims agricultural use to use the barn for something else? Jocko (aka- Mr. Jay Geer) was a good neighbor who didn't throw things onto our property, but the prior property owner did throw his debris onto our property. I also believe that barn exceeds the height of any other structure on the property.

Mr. Alusheff – Do you remember [Mr. Roseum] when the building went up?

Mr. Roseum – 2019

Mr. Alusheff – This is the unfortunate part of different Zoning Inspectors. At that time, it's quite possible that "someone" told them to declare the building as Ag Exempt. Once that building is up, it's very difficult for the township to get the building down.

Mr. Alusheff went on to detail what Ag Exempt is and what CAUV is and how it relates to a property. Group discussion continued.

Ms. Linda Roseum – My concern is how will we keep someone from using this building for storage?

Mr. Ziganti – If we determine this building to be a legal, non-conforming building using Article 10, the Zoning Inspector would be following up on any complaints filed about this building.

General discussion about steps residents can take when they see a zoning violation and how to go about reporting it; and what the follow up would be from the Zoning Inspector.

Mr. Ziganti – The reason we have not yet gone through the Duncan Factors is we may determine not to grant a variance and instead allow this structure to remain governed by Section 10 of the Zoning Resolution.

Ms. Fadorsen made a motion to grant an area variance for ZA-2025-8. Ms. Klemm seconded the motion.

Ms. Fadorsen/no; Ms. Klemm/no; Ms. Denamen/no; Mr. Dobrzynski/no; Mr. Ziganti/no

Ms. Klemm – I don't think we want that size building going into perpetuity for any reason. I motion we label this building as a legal, non-conforming structure as determined by and subject to all articles of the Zoning Resolution – especially Article 5 and 10. Ms. Fadorsen seconded the motion.

Ms. Klemm – I think this is allowed.

Ms. Denamen – So we're going to say it's allowed as long as it stays standing and in good repair and not used for uses not listed in the Zoning Resolution.

Mr. Ziganti – Just for clarity. This resolution/determination would make this structure follow the Zoning Resolution to a greater degree than it has in the past. We're looking at a prospective buyer could choose to use it as agricultural and if it is not used agriculturally, it falls under Section 5.01.02 which limits the use to only a personal use.

Ms. Fadorsen/yes; Ms. Klemm/yes; Ms. Denamen/yes; Mr. Dobrzynski/yes; Mr. Ziganti/yes

Motion passes

### **Findings of Fact**

#### **ZA-2025-8**

Mitchell Geer requested an area variance to allow a 6,800 square foot, formerly agricultural exempt structure to remain on the property located at 8966 Mulberry Rd. Testimony was given that the accessory building was originally built under an agricultural exemption. The Zoning Inspector indicated there was no recent indication that the building was used as such, but rather as storage of equipment, vehicles, etc. Mitchell Geer is in the process of disposing of the property and has requested this 172% variance to streamline the sale process. The board elected to vote down the Area Variance request and instead designate the existing 6,800 square foot building as a legal, non-conforming structure subject to Article 5 and 10 of the Zoning Resolution.

We the board incorporate into these Findings of Fact the applications, exhibits of the appeal including all corrections, clarifications and additions.

#### **APPEAL ZA-2025-9 Armstrong/Hesse 13241 County Line Road Lot Split**

All members of the audience wishing to testify in this case were sworn in.

Mr. Alusheff – This is an existing 5.67 acre lot including the road right of way at the corner of Cedar and County Line Road. It currently has one existing home and two ag exempt structures. The proposal is to split it roughly in half which would create a 3-acre conforming lot and to keep one of the accessory structures and remove the second structure. If a lot split is granted, they would possibly build a new home on the 3-acre lot.

Mr. David Hesse – The client purchased the property at auction. They looked at the existing home, barn and other structure. It was a horse property prior. The previous owner went bankrupt and his wife was selling it. The existing home is older and not in good shape. It needs quite a bit of remodeling.

Our client intends to remove the red roof structure which was previously used as a horse arena. It is a large property. There are barely any trees on the property and a lot of grassy area. There is a small stream that runs through the property seasonally.

We discussed building a new home and splitting the property virtually in half. The smaller, existing accessory building would stay with the new property by getting rid of the gravel road currently in place.

Mr. Ziganti began reviewing the Duncan Factors.

1. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Mr. Hesse – We believe the property over time has become rundown as it is no longer used for horse riding.

Mr. Ziganti confirmed there is a livable residence currently on the property.

2. Whether the variance is substantial.

Mr. Hesse – Yes, it is. The split would allow another resident to enjoy the property.

3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether the adjoining property owners would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;

Mr. Hesse – The essential character of the neighborhood would improve. I believe it would be preferred by most existing residents. They could technically tear down the current home and put up one home, but I believe two homes would be preferred.

4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services;

Mr. Hesse – No.

5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction;

Mr. Hesse – Yes.

6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a variance;

Mr. Hesse – We don't believe so.

Mr. Armstrong – Referring to the question, is it a functioning property. We bought it at a sheriff's auction because it went into bankruptcy. Is that still considered a reasonable return?

General group discussion, no resolution to the question as asked above was determined.

7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement(s) would be observed and substantial justice be done by granting the variance;

Mr. Hesse – Yes.

Ms. Fadorsen – Are the other lots in the surrounding area all close to the three-acre size or are they larger like this five-acre lot?

Mr. Hesse – The neighborhood behind this one are all three-acre lots.

Ms. Denamen – Asked Mr. Alusheff to indicate this property on the Zoning Map and the zoning districts around this property.

Mr. Ziganti – One of the things the BZA is charged with is to try and minimize the amount of variance that is requested and try to move things toward conformity. That's why we have been asking where your practical difficulty is. So, I would like you [Mr. Hesse] to summarize what your practical difficulty is for us to consider granting this variance.

Mr. Hesse – The existing home is more than they wanted to handle. The horse barn is in much more distress than they initially thought. To maintain the property as it is designed is just not feasible. There are no other equestrian environments around.

Ms. Fadorsen – If you were to put up a new home on the southern property, would you have to put in a new well and septic?

Mr. Hesse – Yes, the new lot would need both. He also showed where the existing house well is and septic.

Ms. Denamen – If the intent is stay on the property, why not tear down the horse arena, stay in the house and enjoy the five-acre lot?

Mr. Ziganti – If you're going to tear down the horse arena, why not tear down the stable as well?

Mr. Hesse – That would not be the intent. The horse stable would remain on the second property and be turned into an accessory building.

Public Comment Section was opened up

Mr. Sean McGrath – I live in a Payne and Payne house. I know they do beautiful work and it would be a beautiful house. I worry that this could set a precedent that other properties will be split into smaller lots. Larger lots is one of the reasons we moved here.

Mr. Nick Watts – We definitely like how things are. We picked this area because it is more picturesque. Large open spaces, with or without horses. I would ask the question if the intent was originally to live on the lot and repairs to the home would cost too much, why was the lot bought? It seems pretty clear to me that they were looking to split the lot and sell off part of it.

Ms. Gina Wiandt – Also a Payne and Payne house. The neighborhood is very quiet. My first question is, what would you use the outbuilding for that is not being demolished.

Mr. Ziganti – Testimony given was that it was for storage of equipment.

Ms. Wiandt – That was my concern, is it going to create more noise and traffic?

Mr. Nathaniel Dunn – My concern is the same as the others. I moved here liking the openness and the sparser density. My main concern would be having two homes on that lot would affect the density of the lot.

Mr. Hesse – I would think removing the large horse arena and having a nice looking house would be beneficial to the property owners. I think this would increase the value of the neighborhood.

Mr. McGrath – So, what would prevent you from building that home on the lot as it is? Why not tear down the existing house and put a new one on the lot?

Ms. Sarah Armstrong – The house that is there right now needs a lot of work. It would be a shame to tear it down as the structure is good. It would be a lot to send to a landfill. The neighbor's lots are basically the same size.

Public Comments were closed.

Mr. Alusheff clarified the legal size of the lots as shown on the survey. The road right-of-way is making the lot sizes appear much lower than the lot actually is.

Ms. Fadorsen made a motion to approve the lot split of case # ZA-2025-9. Ms. Denamen seconded the motion.

Ms. Fadorsen – The larger lot of the two is closer to the Hunting Ridge lot size. I really don't think this split would be detrimental to the neighborhood. Rather than look at the big ugly barn, I think that neighborhood would be better off.

Ms. Denamen – [Addressing Mr. Alusheff] When it comes to the Land Use Plan that is currently being evaluated, what percentage of our land use is designated to 3 or 5 acre lots?

Mr. Alusheff – I don't know what percent of the township is comprised of that lot minimum. What I can say is, our residential districts are based on a land capability analysis from 1976. It's an outdated method of determining what lot minimums should be. The basis of Zoning is health, safety and welfare. Now, 50 years later, it would not be determined in the method that it was. With the septic capabilities today, according to our current environmental health director, two acres is the minimum required with today's septic technology.

Mr. Dobrzynski – If I had purchased two 5-acre lots and I wanted to build a home right in the middle of that, what restrictions would there be?

Mr. Alusheff – You would have to consolidate the two lots by performing a lot consolidation through the county.

Ms. Denamen – If you take two properties and combine as one, you're actually removing the ability to build an additional home in a township that already has a housing shortage.

Mr. Alusheff – That would definitely take away a buildable lot. There is nothing in zoning that would stop them from doing that.

Ms. Denamen – Was a market study done on this property and how it would affect the property value of your neighbor's?

Mr. Hesse – No. I can tell you that it would be substantially higher than what the property is at right now.

Ms. Klemm – I do observe that further north on County Line Rd, all the lots are smaller and east on Cedar are similar lots to this one if it was split. Right now, the lot is out of character for this district.

Mr. Ziganti – What we presently have is a residential area that is supposed to be three acres and above. We are supposed to do our best to maintain conformity. In the past two appeals, we did our best to find solutions that would work with the homeowner and prevent any future problems. If we were to split this property, it would turn that property into a non-conforming property which is not a BZA objective. In my opinion, splitting this lot is strictly for financial gain. We had a number of neighbors indicate they would be impacted by this, and we are supposed to concern ourselves about the impact of the neighborhood. I'm inclined to not vote for this variance.

Ms. Klemm – That’s the direction I’m leaning. There is an intent to improve the property, but the applicant was unable to prove the Duncan Factors to afford relief. I think the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered, there is no hardship condition created, the Zoning Resolution would not be observed by granting the variance. There are several Duncan Factors that need to be met.

Mr. Dobrzynski – I have a struggle with there didn’t seem to be enough information on how the practical difficulty has been met. Based on the neighbors input, I think the neighbors have exerted there is more of a negative impact on themselves than what we’ve had with the proposed owners have done showing their practical difficulty with that property. I’m inclined to not be in support of this lot split.

Ms. Denamen – I kind of have to lean toward the Land Use Plan and withholding some of the integrity of Chesterland and the size of the lots. The neighbors voicing their concerns. This leads me to think there is not really a practical difficulty.

Ms. Klemm/no; Ms. Denamen/no; Mr. Dobrzynski/no; Ms. Fadorsen/yes; Mr. Ziganti/no.

Motion does not pass.

### **Findings of Fact**

David Hesse and Sarah Armstrong requested a lot split at 13241 County Line Road to create two lots in the R3A: One Family Residential District. This is a corner lot on Cedar and County Line Road. The split of the 5.67 acres would take into account that .67 acres would be in the road right-of-way. Therefore, the split posed would be for a three-acre lot to the south of the lot and a two-acre lot to the north. The proposed split would have the existing residence remaining on the two-acre lot. Testimony was given that the riding arena would be torn down should the variance be approved and the smaller accessory building remaining in the southeast corner.

Testimony was given by four neighbors that voiced their opinion of being against the proposed lot split. The appellant indicated that no market study was completed to indicate what impact the proposed lot split would have on the adjoining neighborhood.

We the board incorporate into these Findings of Fact the applications, exhibits of the appeal including all corrections, clarifications and additions.

### **Duncan Factors**

1. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return and whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;

Denamen/yes; Dobrzynski/yes; Fadorsen/yes; Klemm/yes; Ziganti/yes

Majority of Board: Yes

2. Whether the variance is substantial;

Denamen/yes; Dobrzynski/yes; Fadorsen/no; Klemm/yes; Ziganti/yes

Majority of Board: Yes

3. Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether the adjoining property owners would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;

Denamen/yes; Dobrzynski/yes; Fadorsen/no; Klemm/yes; Ziganti/yes

Majority of Board: Yes

4. Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services;

Denamen/no; Dobrzynski/no; Fadorsen/no; Klemm/no; Ziganti/no

Majority of Board: No

5. Whether the property owner purchased the property with the knowledge of the zoning restriction;

Denamen/yes; Dobrzynski/yes; Fadorsen/yes; Klemm/yes; Ziganti/yes

Majority of Board: Yes

6. Whether the property owner's predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a variance;

Denamen/yes; Dobrzynski/yes; Fadorsen/yes; Klemm/yes; Ziganti/yes

Majority of Board: Yes

7. Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement(s) would be observed and substantial justice be done by granting the variance;

Denamen/no; Dobrzynski/no; Fadorsen/yes; Klemm/no; Ziganti/no

Majority of Board: No

### **Special Meeting to work on BZA Bylaws**

Group agreed to October 7, 2025 at 6:30 p.m. for a Special Meeting.

**Approval of Minutes**

- Ms. Fadorsen motioned to accept the August 11, 2025, minutes as modified. Ms. Klemm seconded the motion.  
Ms. Denamen/yes, Ms. Fadorsen/yes, Ms. Klemm/yes, Mr. Dobrzynski/yes, Mr. Ziganti/yes  
Motion passed.

**Old Business**

- Sheet 1 – Zoning Information Sheet – Review for suggested changes - TABLED
- BZA Bylaws review - TABLED

Meeting closed at: 10:50 p.m.

Approval Date October 13, 2025

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathleen McCarthy, Admin. Assistant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Barton Ziganti, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mindy Denamen, Vice-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Dobrzynski

\_\_\_\_\_  
Alternate  
Justin Enger

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy Fadorsen

\_\_\_\_\_  
Christina Klemm

\_\_\_\_\_  
Margaret Muehling