FINAL 10/24

MEMBERS PRESENT: CHAD CANFIELD, DENNIS BERGANSKY, SCOTT BROCKMAN, JEFF PULSFORD, TED VAN HYNING, ANGELA DAUGHERTY

MEMBER ABSENT: GREG LACKEY

Meeting called to order at 7:02 PM by Chairman Ted Van Hyning.

Roll call was taken.

Members present were: Chad Canfield, Dennis Bergansky, Scott Brockman, Jeff Pulsford, Ted Van Hyning and Angela Daugherty.

Member absent was Greg Lackey.

The Commission reviewed the meeting minutes from August 22, 2024. There was no comments or corrections.

Motion by Dennis Bergansky to approve the August 22, 2024, meeting. The motion was seconded by Jeff Pulsford. Vote: Bergansky, yes; Brockman, yes; Canfield, yes; Van Hyning, yes; and Pulsford, yes. Motion passed.

A discussion took place regarding the proposed addition to agriculture suggested by David Dietrich, that was updated in the Ohio Revised Code.

It was agreed that if a new barn is proposed, that the applicant may be required to provide proof that the proposed structure qualifies for an agriculture exemption.

It was noted that that is reasonable and should be added as suggested.

A discussion took place regarding when the Commission should initiate the change and also the food truck amendment. It was also noted that the family cemetery amendment needs to be reinitiated.

Mr. Van Hyning indicated that the two items should be initiated separately but at the same meeting and possibly the next meeting.

A discussion took place.

The Commission discussed the proposed accessory building height change from twenty-three feet (23').

Mr. Brockman commented that initially, when this was increased, there was a concern regarding aesthetics for building heights just to match the roof line of the main structure.

Mr. Bergansky commented that it really depends on the ceiling height for the main floor, if there is going to be enough room for a second story.

Mr. Brockman commented that the current height of twenty-three feet (23') for an accessory building was calculated that way just to be able to match the pitch of the roofs aesthetically.

A discussion took place regarding whether residents should be able to build a second story onto their garage?

Discussions took place regarding in-law suites and adding living space in an accessory building, requiring a variance or making it a conditional use.

Mr. Brockman commented that if they want an in-law suite, they can attach it to their dwelling and it will not be an issue.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Bergansky indicated that he felt lowering the building height makes sense considering what is trying to be addressed by limiting the height of an accessory building.

Mrs. Daugherty asked if the eighteen feet (18') height is adopted, will it be high enough for an RV and/or a car lift?

More discussion took place.

Mr. Van Hyning commented that it sounds like the Commission needs to help eliminate the problems and issues with taller accessory building heights.

Mr. Van Hyning asked if the Commission is ok with how this change is presented.

Mr. Pulsford commented that it is impossible to put an RV in a building in Auburn if this is passed.

Mr. Bergansky commented that if they request a variance with a plan showing a fourteen foot (14') door and needed more height to accomplish that, they would likely say yes.

Mr. Brockman commented that they could make that case to the BZA, because it would show that there would not be any room to put in a second floor.

A discussion took place.

Mr. Pulsford and Mr. Van Hyning commented that they would be more comfortable with an accessory building height of twenty feet (20') to avoid needing variances for things like RVs or a car lift truck.

Mr. Bergansky commented that he did not think that there is any issue with them coming in for a variance to build a taller building.

Mr. Van Hyning discussed if there could be different requirements for a one (1) story building versus two (2) story buildings?

Mr. Bergansky explained that the tallest vehicle that can travel down the road can be 13' 6" and with that being said, maybe the height could be based it on how many feet a second story could be over the first floor.

It was again noted that at a previous meeting, Mr. Dietrich said other townships have not widely adopted a higher height limit for the accessory buildings.

Mr. Bergansky commented that most normal campers would fit into the eighteen (18') feet high building.

Mr. Brockman suggested that this be tabled until Mr. Deitrich is here the next time. Mr. Brockman also commented that he will draw up a couple little models, so the Commission can see what those would look like.

Mr. Van Hyning agreed and discussion moved onto food trucks.

Mrs. Daugherty questioned the amount of times food trucks were being limited per month. She further explained that her notes from the June 27th meeting mentioned that food trucks were only going to be allowed two times per month but discussions then were to allow them every week if they want to.

Mr. Brockman commented that he thought we were trying to limit the amount of times per year and then through discussions it was decided to make it simple and leave it to the weeks and special events restrictions.

Mr. Van Hyning commented that listening to the attendees that were here weeks ago, we supported having food trucks, because people said that they like them.

Mr. Brockman noted that about half the attendees at the meetings did not even live here in Auburn Township.

The Commission was reminded that all of these things have been discussed many times previously; so beside Mrs. Daugherty's question about trucks being limited per month, there probably is no need to discuss this again.

Mrs. Daugherty reiterated that this amendment, as written, "kind of gives away the farm", and that was not the intent of the Commission's original discussion.

Mr. Pulsford commented that he felt everyone was just tired of discussing it and moved on.

Mr. Van Hyning commented that it was addressed to make it friendlier to businesses, so that they did not have to pick which weekends per month they would be having food trucks.

A discussion took place about rehashing the amendment or letting it as currently written. It was noted that it can be readdressed in the future, if it is not working.

Mr. Brockman commented that his thinking was we never wanted to restrict a food truck from coming to the community, we just wanted to restrict the business from having a food truck too much and too often.

Mrs. Daugherty again commented that the point is, we want people to come to our community and invest in brick and mortar rather than having transient business like a food truck. She further explained that the novelty of food trucks is nice, but we do not want them to be a mainstay in the community.

Mr. Canfield commented that with this two day a week allowance is there any incentive to build a kitchen.

Mr. Canfield also commented that his notes reflected to leave it at two days per week and limit it to two times per month.

Mr. Van Hyning commented that hearing the notes read back reminds me that because of the special events they could be potentially have every weekend anyways so let's just leave it at the limit per weekend.

It was noted that trucks are limited to one (1) truck at a time, except for special events which allows for two (2) trucks.

Mr. Brockman suggested that four (4) days per month consecutive or non-consecutive would be a good idea.

Mr. Van Hyning commented that this will be tabled to next meeting.

The next meeting will be October 24, 2024.

There was no further comments.

Motion by Jeff Pulsford to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Dennis Bergansky. Vote: Bergansky, yes; Brockman, yes; Canfield, yes; Van Hyning, yes; and Pulsford, yes. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned.

Minutes submitted by

Sarah Mulleman, ZC Secretary

Minutes Approved on:

October 24, 2024

Ted Van Hyning, Chairman