

FINAL

MEMBERS PRESENT: DENNIS BERGANSKY, CHAD CANFIELD, GREG LACKEY, JEFF PULSFORD, ANGELA DAUGHERTY, SCOTT BROCKMAN

MEMBER ABSENT: TED VAN HYNING

The meeting was called to order on Thursday, February 27, 2025, at 7:00 PM by Vice-Chairman Dennis Bergansky.

Roll call was taken with the following members present:

Dennis Bergansky, Chad Canfield, Jeff Pulsford, Greg Lackey, Angela Daugherty, and Scott Brockman

Member absent was Ted Van Hyning.

David Dietrich was present.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

The Commission members reviewed the meeting minutes from the February 13, 2025, meeting.

There were no comments regarding the meeting minutes.

Motion by Jeff Pulsford to approve the meeting minutes from the February 13, 2025, meeting. The motion was seconded by Chad Canfield. Vote: Bergansky, yes; Canfield, yes; Pulsford, yes; Brockman, yes; and Lackey, yes. The motion passed.

Under Old Business, the Commission continued the discussion on shipping containers.

It was noted that the Fire Department, if it is residential, has no authority regarding shipping containers. If the shipping container is used commercially, the property owner will have to have an architect or engineer certify that they can be used for commercial purposes and verify that the container it is structurally sound.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Brockman commented that he felt the containers could be permitted in the Industrial District but to keep them out of the other districts.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Bergansky commented that the Commission had come to the conclusion at the previous meeting to allow shipping containers in the commercial districts with the stipulation that the container needs to be located behind the foot print of the main structure and must also meet the other required setbacks.

A discussion took place about how many shipping containers to allow per lot or to regulate them by how many could be permitted per acre. It addition, it was also discussed whether or not to allow a shipping container to be located on a lot if there is no main building on the lot.

Mr. Bergansky commented that he is not opposed to shipping containers being located in the business and commercial district or locating them, based on the setbacks for the different districts, but not allowing them for any kind of human occupancy.

Held _____ 20 _____

Mr. Brockman commented that the containers will end up staying for ten plus years, if we allow them and they will deteriorate.

Mr. Dietrich commented that under the definition, the word temporary storage is used in the definition that the Trustees have already adopted.

Mr. Bergansky commented that at Eclipse they look nice and they are well maintained; so do we want to say if they are temporary that the container would have to constantly be moved.

Mr. Lackey commented that Eclipse is the best case scenario for shipping containers.

Mr. Brockman commented that we might make some changes to these, like maybe we need a better definition of temporary.

Mr. Brockman also commented that with 2a, we might need to “tinker” with that also and 2d we should go with the same setbacks as any other things.

Mr. Bergansky commented that we are in agreement that they cannot be stacked and cannot have anything attached to them or on top of them.

Mr. Lackey commented on the word “asphalted/concrete.

Mr. Dietrich indicated that the word is actually asphalt.

Mr. Brockman questioned if we want storage containers on a lot without a primary structure.

Mr. Dietrich explained that the location has to have a principal structure and item L would prohibit them in any residential area.

Mr. Bergansky asked if we do not want to put them in residential, but in a commercial district if the whole lots principle use is residential but zoned commercial would they be prohibited?

A discussion took place regarding restricting them or not.

It was again noted that the Building Department is not encouraging shipping containers to be used because of the issues getting them certified by a structural engineer or architect for them to be used in a commercial district. A discussion took place regarding the structural soundness of shipping containers.

In residential, it was noted that a person could always apply for a use variance.

Mrs. Daugherty questioned if the shipping containers have to be approved by the Building Department, why is this being addressed by zoning also?

It was explained that zoning monitors setback and use requirements that the Building Department does not monitor.

Mr. Bergansky explained that the Commission went through the points at the last meeting and agreed on some which is why there is not a question mark on all the outline points.

The Commission continued to review the points with a question mark.

A discussion took place regarding “e” and it was suggested to put in the biggest size which is 9.5 x 45.

Held _____ 20 _____

Mr. Lackey asked if flammable is considered hazardous and do we want to also limit things like gas cans. It was noted that it should not be treated any differently than an accessory structure.



A discussion took place regarding signage. It was noted that there cannot be any signage on the shipping container.

Mr. Lackey asked about running electric to the containers.

Mr. Dietrich commented that there may be something in the building code about the electric. A discussion took place regarding no plumbing, no heating, and no electric to be used in a shipping container; that they are to be used for storage.

Mr. Bergansky commented that we allow electric for a shed.

There was more discussion regarding how many and where they can be located. Mr. Lackey commented that the amount should be limited and if need be, they can get a variance if they need more.

It was decided that shipping containers will be discussed at the next meeting and everyone should bring an idea for limiting the number either by lot or an amount per acre and also what should be done in the B3 and B4 zoning districts.

Motion by Jeff Pulsford to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Angela Daugherty. Vote: Bergansky, yes; Lackey, yes; Canfield, yes; Pulsford, yes, and Brockman, yes. The motion passed.

The meeting adjourned.



Minutes submitted by:

Minutes Approved on:



Sarah C. Mulleman, Secretary

March 13, 2025

Dennis Bergansky, Vice-Chairman

