

BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING  
APRIL 16, 2019  
7:00 P.M.

I CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Meeting called to order by Mr. Ramirez

II ROLL CALL

Members Present: Joe Ramirez, Dave Nienaber, Jeffrey Anderson, Robert Weidlich, Carolyn Ghantous, Carmen Daniels

Staff Present: Randy Campion

III PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

IV MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 19, 2019

President Ramirez: At this time members do we have someone to approve the minutes from our last meeting?

Mr. Nienaber: I move that we approve the minutes of the last meeting.

Mr. Weidlich: Second.

President Ramirez: We have moved and second.

(Minutes were adopted with a voice vote of 6 to 0.)

V CORRESPONDENCE

None.

VI REPORTS

A. Report on Council

President Ramirez: Mrs. Ghantous.

Mrs. Ghantous: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Well we had about the fastest City Council meeting on record, I think. We met on April 3, 2019. We only had one resolution on the agenda and that was R6-2019 and that was going to be the vote to appoint a replacement for our board to replace Mr. Johnson. Because we had two members absent from Council, Meghan Sullivan-Wisecup and Holly Emmerson, we tabled that resolution and that will be addressed at the meeting tomorrow night. The only other thing that we did was that the Mayor gave a proclamation observing National Public Health Week and so the Mayor read the Proclamation and presented it to Matthew Clayton who is our Health Commissioner here. Matt if you guys don't know him, he is amazing all of the things that he does to help people in our community. One thing that I want to just point out about one thing he said was that he said that Springdale is one of the four healthiest cities in Ohio in 2018. I thought, wow that's pretty impressive. That is about all that we did unless Jeff has something to add? So, it was quick and that is it unless anybody has any questions? That will conclude my report.

President Ramirez: Thank you for that report.

B. Report on Planning Commission

President Ramirez: Planning Commission met April 9, 2019. We had a number of different issues. Under the Old Business we had PSA Architects on behalf of Red Dog Pet Resort & Spa and the Circle Storage on the property located at 12010 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio on the Final Development plan. After a lot of discussion and a lot of it leaning toward the pole sign that they want on 275, it was in the end tabled with a 7 to 0 vote. So that will continue on. Item B under Old Business was Housing Network of Hamilton County, 242 West Sharon Road, Springdale, Ohio, Final Development Plan as well. That passed with a 6 to 1 vote. New Business, Professional Design Associates on behalf of Pipefitters Union Local 392, 1300 Century Circle North, Springdale, Ohio, Revised Development Plan. That was passed with a 7 to 0 vote. Not much changed here on the expansion of their parking lot. CF Partners also Zips Carwash at 11346 Princeton Pike, Springdale, Ohio, Minor Revision to a PUD. That was passed, not a whole lot of discussion. The one subject matter that was not passed and is still under discussion is the signage. The presentation passed with a 7 to 0 vote. Atlantic Sign Company on behalf of Ross Dress for Less at 485 East Kemper Road, Springdale, Ohio, Minor Revision to a PUD. That was passed as submitted with a 7 to 0 vote. Item D was the text amendments for the Springdale Zoning Code. It had to do with Tri-County Mall had requested electronic signage. They did not proceed with it so had been a while so that was removed from the code that is 153.460(C), so the highway sign has been removed from that discussion. That is all that I have on the Planning Commission. Any comments or questions?

VII CHAIRMAN'S STATEMENT

Chairman's Statement

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Public Hearing, and all testimony given in cases pending before this Board is to be made a part of the public record. All testimony and discussion relative to said variance is recorded, and it is from this recording that our Minutes are taken.

Citizens testifying before this Board are directed to sign in on the clipboard in the rear of the room, take their place at the podium, state their name and addresses and the facts as they are pertinent to the subject before this Board.

As this is a Public Hearing, being sworn in prior to giving testimony is required by law.

At this time, please stand up, raise your right hand and repeat after me:

President Ramirez: If you think you may want to testify make sure that you have signed in at the back. Okay. Raise your right hand and repeat after me:

I (state your name)  
Do solemnly swear  
To tell the truth, the whole truth  
And nothing but the truth,  
So help me God.

Please be seated.

Please be advised that anyone who was not standing and sworn in cannot testify unless they request the Chair to be sworn in as they come up to the podium.

VIII OLD BUSINESS

None

IX NEW BUSINESS

- A. DeCastro Management LLC, dba Kerry Automotive, 155 West Kemper Road and 150 Northland Boulevard, Springdale, Ohio, submitted a request for a variance from Section 153.351(B) & (C) to increase the light levels. (Application 34781) Public Hearing

President Ramirez: At this time staff would you please comment.

Mr. Champion: Kerry Ford, 155 West Kemper Road and 150 Northland Boulevard, Variance Request. Kerry Ford is requesting variances from Section 153.351 to exceed the light requirements of the zoning code. As part of their dealership upgrade, Kerry Ford installed new LED lights on the existing poles at 155 West Kemper Road and 150 Northland Boulevard. The initial installation which was done without zoning review, created a light spillage situation on both Kemper Road and Northland Boulevard with a glare that caused the City to receive complaints. The applicant was notified and revised the site lighting to elevate the prior hazardous conditions by the elimination of fixtures and the addition of shields. The number of light heads has been reduced from 210 to 203 and two light poles have been removed. The LED fixtures have reduced the wattage to 395 watts from the 1,000-watt metal halide fixtures that were installed in 1969 resulting in a 60% reduction in energy consumption. The lighting for the site, however; does not comply with all of the provisions of section 153.351. Kerry Ford is requesting variances to allow the existing modified lights to remain. Staff would consider the automotive dealership as a high activity level use since the merchandise sold is located outside and must be able to be clearly viewed in non-daylight hours. Additionally, the dealership obviously has a significant investment in the vehicles on the lot and needs to provide accurate light levels for security. The high activity level permits the following outdoor lighting design standards per table one 351.1:

Average Illumination	3.0 foot-candles
Maximum Illumination	15.0 foot-candles
Maximum/Minimum Foot-candles Ratio 15:1	
Maximum Illumination at Property Line:	205 foot-candles.

The applicant is requesting a variance to allow the following light standards:

Average Illumination:	5.0 foot-candles
Maximum Illumination:	42.6 foot-candles
Maximum Illumination at Property Line:	The light levels at the property line do not consistently exceed 2.5 foot-candles but there are areas where the light levels exceed the 2.5 as follows:
Northland Boulevard:	7.8 foot-candles
West Kemper Road:	7.1 foot-candles
West Property Line:	5.8 foot-candles.

Staff believes that per section 153.206 that special conditions do exist given the need of the retailer to property display and store their merchandise. Similar consideration has been given to other automotive sales facilities in the area. Additionally, the new

lighting not only reduces energy consumption but also reduces light spillage at the site. Staff does not believe the variance to be substantially given the use of the property and the location. The applicant has indicated that without the variance it would be difficult to produce a reasonable return. Staff agrees that it is difficult to sell something that customers cannot see clearly. The character of the area will not be altered. There are a number of automotive dealerships in the area and surrounding properties are utilized for retail and business purposes. The variance would not negatively affect the dealership, affect that and the public services and may reduce the number of police runs to keep the lot illuminated deterring damage or theft to the vehicles. The special circumstances are due to the use of the property which has been in existence for over 50 years. The spirit and the intent of the code will be upheld should the variance be approved as mentioned. The granting of the variance will confer the same opportunity to Kerry Ford as other dealerships are enjoying. Submitted by Anne McBride, City Planner.

President Ramirez: Thank you for that report. At this time would somebody representing Kerry please step forward?

Mr. Emmert: Good evening.

President Ramirez: Good evening.

Mr. Emmert: My name is Andrew Emmert and I'm an attorney representing the applicant.

President Ramirez: Could you state your address.

Mr. Emmert: It is 221 East 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

President Ramirez: Thank you. At this time could you please give us a statement why we should approve a variance?

Mr. Emmert: Yes. The applicant seeks a variance from the outdoor lighting standards per 153.350 and in order to be granted such a variance the owner must show that the literal enforcement of the code would result in unnecessary hardship unless the variance is granted. The factors to determine if unnecessary hardship exists are as follows: there are several factors in 153.260 A to J. The applicant believes that the special conditions do exist in light of the need of the auto retailer to properly display and store their merchandise. So, as you are aware there are other dealers in the area and they are in the same area as the Kerry dealership so we feel that is a legitimate concern of ours and an appropriate use for the approval of the lighting. The requested variance is not substantial since the light spillage at the property line is minimal and generally does not exceed the code requirement of 2.5 foot-candles.

President Ramirez: Could you pause for just a second.

Mr. Emmert: Sure.

President Ramirez: Did you stand to be sworn in?

Mr. Emmert: I did not because I am there attorney.

President Ramirez: You still need to make the statement and we still need to swear in you don't mind.

Mr. Emmert: Okay that's fine.

(President Ramirez sworn in Mr. Emmert.)

President Ramirez: Thank you. Please proceed.

Mr. Emmert: So, with respect to the requested variance it is not substantial since the light spillage at the property line is minimal and generally does not exceed the 2.5-foot candle requirement of spillage onto nearby properties. The other automobile dealers in the vicinity have been granted similar consideration as what Kerry is seeking today. The new lighting plan at this site has eliminated seven light heads and two light poles from the site in addition to saving substantial energy. A 60% energy reduction. Therefore, we believe that the variances requested are not substantial given the use of the property as an automobile dealership in the location in that vicinity of other car dealers and other retailers and business establishments. The applicant believes that without the variance it would constitute an unnecessary hardship because the owner would be unable to yield a reasonable return from the property due to the competition with other car dealers in the area that have already upgraded their lots and a lighting on the lots. So, it is I think, you would acknowledge that it is difficult to sell a product sitting on a lot when it is difficult to discern the proper color whether is white or silver, what the wheel covers are in particular. So, we feel that the variance request would not also and negatively affect the delivery of government services in the area and that the enhanced lighting may in fact deter theft and vandalism in the vicinity of the property. Furthermore, this applicant has been a responsible corporate citizen for 50 years, operating the same location and we believe that the spirit and intent of the Springdale zoning code would be of held in large part and that the variances that we seek are small and light of those factors. Thank you.

President Ramirez: Thank you. Standby. Members of the board do you have questions for the applicant? Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Actually, I have several questions. So, before I start it is really just three or four questions but I do you want to acknowledge that I know the dealership has been here a long time and has been a good resident. Please don't misunderstand my questions as being anything but trying to understand the variance that is being requested so that we can come to a good conclusion. Some are very specific and I just want to make sure that I understand what we are talking about here. In your discussion, you mentioned that the special conditions are that it is an auto dealership and I know that you have mentioned several times in this hearing that other dealerships in the area have similar considerations. This first question is probably more for Randy is, to the considerations that we have given do they cover the maximum illumination in the lot as well as spillover and shielding requirements or is it some combination of it? What considerations have been given?

Mr. Campion: You mean to other dealerships?

Mr. Anderson: Yes.

Mr. Campion: I am not aware of other variances that have been granted. All I can say is that when they first changed the lights you couldn't drive down from the street it was blaring and hurt your eyes. Now as you look at the map, where it exceeds 2.5 lumens it is pretty much at the edge and none of that is when you get to the street area. But in answer to your question I don't know of any variances that have been granted.

Mr. Anderson: So, when we say special considerations from Mrs. McBride and from the applicant, we are not aware of any special considerations that have been given?

Mr. Campion: Not that I know of.

Mr. Anderson: Okay. My second question is to a comment that you had made that this is not as substantial as generally it doesn't spill over. I noticed in the application the standard for the area that we are talking about for the standards is 2.5 I think or 3

foot-candles for spill over. The areas noted in the application are three times the limit. Looking at the lighting diagram this is really the first question, is that lighting diagram, is this results of readings that were done after the installation or this the intent because I've gone down that path and even the pictures that were presented as evidence it looks like more .5 and .2, some of these areas that are highlighted. I'm having a hard time reconciling what is on the plan verses what is in the exhibits. So, you're confirming that what we were given, this site light diagram is actual readings that were done after the installation?

Mr. Emmert: That is correct. Yes, and we've got Kevin Sturm is here as the lighting consultant and he is the one that prepared this. He could speak to that.

(Talking off mic. not audible)

President Ramirez: Please, we have to record for our minutes so please state your name and address.

Mr. Sturm: Kevin Sturm, 2045 Brantwood Drive, Hebron, Kentucky. They are not actual readings Mr. Anderson. What we do is we take the lumen outputs of the light fixtures, the mounting heights that are on them and then we enter them into a computer simulation and it gives us a point by point. Obviously if I were to take a light meter and go to very single point on that drawing it would be rather time consuming so that is what the visual lighting software does and that is normal for when we apply for lighting studies, photometric studies at different projects.

Mr. Anderson: Sure, and I understand the plan but there's definitely variation based on the installation itself so the angle of the pole can have a substantial impact.

Mr. Sturm: Sure, absolutely.

Mr. Anderson: Especially when you have lights as you have selected with area lights that don't have louvers or hoods. The spill over potential is much higher.

Mr. Sturm: Correct, but we did install back shields on the lights that are on the back to prevent the spill back. What you see with where the light goes at the property line, we would pretty much have to eliminate those poles because of where they sit on the property line. If you look at where the poles sit there is nowhere just going straight down reflecting off of the ground would shoot light past the property line at those certain spots.

Mr. Anderson: That gets to the heart of my question right, as when we are talking about shielding one of the requirements in the code is around shielding to prevent that issue specifically and you can prevent that with either lower poles or having hoods or louvers that would stop that before the sidewalks.

Mr. Sturm: Well what the back shields do is when you look at a light it comes out like a cone. So, what the back shield does is it eliminates the cone from shooting backwards out towards the street. What it doesn't prevent is the light shooting straight down or angling slightly when it hits the ground and going past the property line at those places. Where you see the poles are further back from the property line there is no spillage what so ever, but along West Kemper where it turns into Northland Boulevard it is right on the road where those poles are so it would be beyond putting a lens underneath the light or removing the light itself it would be difficult to near impossible whether the pole was lower or not to eliminate some spillage onto that property line.

Mr. Anderson: I can certainly see a challenge without having a hood or louver that would prevent for the longer ones. You've installed the same lights on all pole regardless of the pole placement.

Mr. Sturm: We put the back shields on the lights that were along the roadside only/

Mr. Anderson: And that includes the highlighted ones, so you've got the main lights in that area with back shield the highlights or not?

Mr. Sturm: No, the highlighters have no shields on them they are just pointed down. Their intent is to point out, they shouldn't be causing any disturbance to the property line what so ever as they are not really even pointed down.

Mr. Anderson: So, it is just the area lights and the double model back shield ones that that have the back shield but none have louvers or hoods?

Mr. Sturm: No sir.

Mr. Anderson: So, I guess my concern, I'm less concerned about the interior lighting inside the parking lot. I can understand and appreciate that.

Mr. Sturm: Yes sir.

Mr. Anderson: My concern is really still the spill over into the right-of-way. I drive those roads all the time especially on the Northland and Kemper Road line. It is not 2 foot-candles or 3 foot-candles. It is 7, 8 9, 10, it is a substantial amount of lighting that comes off of that. So, are you saying that there is not, I guess my question is, is this really a decision that you have made with the lighting fixtures and the placement of them based on the current poles?

Mr. Sturm: The placement was the current poles yes sir.

Mr. Anderson: So, is there a way to, in those areas where you have the spill-over effect, wouldn't it be possible to address that part of the variance by moving the poles?

Mr. Sturm: You could move the poles; you would be moving them actually into the parking lot where they are storing their vehicles.

Mr. Anderson: Right.

Mr. Sturm: Is it physically possible to move the poles where those poles are would be right where the dealership is attempting to sell their cars, along that roadway as their main sales area.

Mr. Anderson: Well, we're really talking about five or six of the 180 poles, right?

Mr. Sturm: Yes sir.

Mr. Anderson: Okay so it is not taking over the outdoor extension of the sales floor it's the ones that you are not able to control with the lighting fixtures that you have selected?

Mr. Sturm: Yes sir.

Mr. Anderson: Alright, thank you.

President Ramirez: Mr. Nienaber.

Mr. Nienaber: Thank you. I would like to direct this to Sturm Electric. Thank you. When DeCastro gave you the contract did you check the city's requirements at all or did you just do it?

Mr. Sturm: No sir we did a one for one replacement on the lights and normally that is not something we need to, that is my fault. That is not an excuse that is why I did not.

Mr. Nienaber: Okay, that was all and I was asking because if I'm having something that I would want them to check with the zoning.

Mr. Sturm: Understood.

Mr. Nienaber: Okay, thank you much.

President Ramirez: In your mind is there anything that could be done? I understand totally, I have bought cars from Kerry previously and shopping at night is difficult to see the outside of the car and the outside features when you are shopping at night but is there anything that you can do or make a recommendation to get this closer to our code? I have heard other comments on how bright it is for even motorists driving around that corner there on Northland Boulevard. Have you discussed any options?

Mr. Emmert: Again, I would defer that, since I am the attorney and Kevin is the Engineer, I think he's, could you come back?

Mr. Sturm: So, as far as I can tell Mr. Ramirez, there's three ways that I could really attack that issue. One is what Mr. Anderson stated; you could relocate the poles further away to prevent the light spillage. At those locations where the spillage is, we could try to use a lower wattage fixture. I don't know that louvers would help but I don't know that they wouldn't. I have never seen louvers that go straight underneath the pole. I could do it but you wouldn't have made that up so I am sure that you know about them. So, I could look at that. Dimming lights is a possibility but it is very troublesome. I would have to run low voltage conductors through conduits that are 50 years old and hope that the pipes aren't rusted out and they are rusted out because I have torn a couple of the poles out. So, really those are the options that we would look at in those trouble areas.

President Ramirez: You being the subject expert, what would you recommend for your use as long as City of Springdale's code, what would be your fix amongst those three items without incurring a lot of expense but still meeting the needs?

Mr. Sturm: I would want to look into Mr. Anderson's suggestion of the louvers.

President Ramirez: Okay.

Mr. Sturm: I think that maybe see if a lower wattage fixture might prevent it as well and I think those are the easiest solutions for just those lights that would still allow that side of the road to still be useable in terms of illuminating it while preventing the spillage that is causing the nuisance.

President Ramirez: A question for Mr. Anderson. You seem to have a pretty good handle on this. Any further comments from you on the louvers and how that might help the situation?

Mr. Anderson: It can. I think the idea of lowering wattage is interesting as well. I do think that might be a very cost-effective way of doing it without a lot of physical intrusion. I think there are probably more substantial shields in the LED world that you can get.

Mr. Sturm: Sure.

Mr. Anderson: More directional cones. The ones that I saw you selected are very much flood downlight LED's and there is not a lot you can do with that; it is just a cone.

Mr. Sturm: No and that is really what we were replacing if you looked at what Kerry Ford had originally, they were Cadillac and that is not an exaggeration they were Cadillac size flood lights that were pointed at a 45-degree angle. So, trying to use that same mounting system that they had before caused us to use a similar light fixture.

Mr. Anderson: Part of my other concern with it is the variance that we are talking about out lives the auto dealership so if we were to grant a variance to the property, if later it turns out not to be sufficient that corner can do crazy things with lighting in perpetuity.

Mr. Sturm: Sure.

Mr. Anderson: So, I am very concerned about spill over

Mr. Sturm: Sure.

Mr. Anderson: More so than interior concerns. I mean it is still in a high use area.

Mr. Sturm: Sure.

Mr. Anderson: So, I am very concerned about that. I noticed that your application did not include a request to void section D, was that just an oversight, because that's really where the shielding shows up in the code? So, they had asked for B and C, section D is around shielding and spillover.

Mr. Sturm: We did provide the manufacturer rear shields.

Mr. Anderson: No, but the section of shielding in the code talks about the spill-over effect of the lighting which is what a large section of what Mrs. McBride and what we have talked about tonight is the lighting with the reflection specifically when you talk about bouncing reflection of lighting. That is the section that says it is not just the plan but actuals. I just wondered if that was intentional or just an oversight and something that we would have to deal with as well tonight?

Mr. Champion: It might have been an oversight. Something else that I wanted to note is on that corner that you are talking about its elevated quite a bit above the street grade and I am not sure that shields will work there or not. You know I mean that might be why she didn't address that.

Mr. Anderson: The lower wattage would help

Mr. Champion: Yes.

Mr. Anderson: Substantially as well. You could also change the material that it is bouncing off of depending on the place that it is hitting. I should, as a disclaimer, I am not a lighting designer it just turns out I married one and she saw these plans sitting on my desk before I came over and just started tearing through them. So, my wife was a lighting designer in Chicago for residential and she was a specifier so I picked up some of the, I see catalogues and I read a lot of things. I am not a lighting designer though so don't misunderstand, if there is a better way to do it, I'm not telling you that, I just have questions.

Mr. Sturm: No, I understand. No offense taken.

Mr. Anderson: It feels like, I'm struggling because it feels like there's ways that have not been explored that could address the spill over without providing a permanent variance to the property that would allow any use to have this high intensity lighting that would spill over into the roadways.

Mr. Sturm: Sure.

Mr. Anderson: So, that is my concern.

President Ramirez: Thank you. Any other questions for the applicant? At this point what's before us now is a variance and as Mr. Anderson stated to pass the variance it would pass as is and that stays with the property and would stay there forever once a variance is given. So, we can take a vote and see whether or not we will pass that as presented or we can, at this point table it and give you the opportunity to come back with a different solution. We can do either one. Whatever you desire.

(Talking from audience not on mic. not audible. Mr. Emmert asked for a moment to confer with his client.)

President Ramirez: No not at all.

(Talking from audience not on mic. not audible.)

President Ramirez: You are welcome. Is there anybody else that wants to speak on this subject, we could do that now? Have concerns? Yes.

(Talking from audience not on mic. not audible.)

President Ramirez: Please step forward and we will allow them some time. State your name and address.

Mr. Garrard: Terry Garrard, 207 West Kemper Road. I was going to file a complaint last year about their lighting before they ever came up with this and when I saw it, I thought it would be a good opportunity. They do not pay attention to anything with the residential side of it and last year I'd try and sit in my back yard and I knew they changed the lighting or something because it is like I get search lights shining in my back yard at night. You try and just sit at a picnic table and you get these constant beams just hitting in your eyes and I was going to say something last year. I don't care about the changing lights but they need to block the over carriage that is going into the houses and homes because when I moved in there in 49 the only thing I had was a lightening bug to worry about at night and I used to ride my horse through Kerry Ford when I was a kid. I put up with it for years, never had any trouble with it but something happened with the lighting now and I don't know what's changed. Well part of the thing is that the trees keep getting cut down so we are losing all of the tree foliage that used to block it off and then I guess this new modern lighting is more like a spot light than it is just a glow, you know what I am saying. It is so irritating because it looks like I have the Carnival Cruise line parked next to my back yard 365 days a year. Like you say I just want it contained more towards where their business is not into my back yard. That is all that I have to say.

President Ramirez: Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you. Just a question on your comment about spill over. I just want to make sure that I understand the concern. Are you seeing the actual light fixtures at the top or is it spill over?

Mr. Garrard: I can actually see all of the lights. It is just like looking at spot lights all through. They shine into our yards.

Mr. Anderson: So, you are actually seeing the pole? It is 26-foot poles and you in those apartments and you are seeing the pole lights?

Mr. Garrard: I think it's, like I said the trees used be, it disbursed a lot of it plus the old lighting was more of a glow light, you know what I'm saying. Now it seems like all of this new stuff is more like spotlights like what you would see on a search light or something.

Mr. Anderson: But it is definitely a whiter, the color has changed over time from yellow to a white.

Mr. Garrard: Yeah.

Mr. Anderson: And then you are seeing the actual, so the light itself is very flat with a hood so you are seeing inside the light?

Mr. Garrard: I don't mind the lighting; I don't like the spotlight effect.

Mr. Anderson: Okay.

Mr. Garrard: Where it is just, you are looking and all of a sudden you see these big bright lights hitting you in the eyes. That's all I'm really trying to say is they need to put trees in there again or something on that side that faces towards the residential areas or something. That is all that I am saying. What they want to do with their lot and stuff I don't care because it has been there for 50 years, of course I have been there for a lot longer but I'm just saying that,

President Ramirez: We have a couple more questions.

Mr. Garrard: Like I said I was going to complain last year because I noticed that something was new and I just noticed, well the summer ended and I migrated into the house and when I got this noticed, I says well I didn't say it last year, I need to say something now. So, like I said whatever lighting they put in is fine I just don't want it shining up into the residential homes like spotlights.

President Ramirez: Thank you for coming in and thanks for those comments. We have a couple more questions from the board if you don't mind. Mr. Nienaber.

Mr. Nienaber: Joe, I lit my light to make sure that we did ask whether there was anybody that wanted to complain. The paperwork that we received also said that there were other complaints. Were those ones that were addressed? Randy can answer this. Were those the ones addressing cars going by that were blinded by it or were there other residents that had also?

Mr. Champion: It was mostly people that were driving, traffic where they were blinded when the light came up.

Mr. Nienaber: Thank you.

Mr. Garrard: That's what my back yard is like all the time. If you sit at the picnic table you see these so, just like something put on the west side of the parking lot to do something, whatever they want to do. That is all that I had to say.

President Ramirez: Mr. Weidlich.

Mr. Weidlich: I have a question for you sir. Is your home on the other side of the Olde Gate driveway? Roadway?

Mr. Garrard: It is on the south side, south side of Kemper on the west side

Mr. Weidlich: Right but

Mr. Garrard: It is on the west side of

Mr. Weidlich: You're west of the Olde Gate entrance there correct?

Mr. Garrard: West side of Northland, south side of Kemper.

Mr. Weidlich: Okay but you've got the entrance to Olde Gate in between you and the Kerry Ford Correct?

Mr. Garrard: Yeah, there's Olde Gate and then there's a house, two houses and I am the third house up.

Mr. Weidlich: Where I am going with this is the light that you are speaking of is that on the back of the building that is shining out because a lot of

Mr. Garrard: No, no this is poles. You can see them, they put a bunch of extra lights in or something in between the old Kerry Ford and I guess where they took over where the motorcycle used to be. I don't know what they are selling in there now or if it is all Ford now. Then they've that the Buick dealership. I noticed that those lights, they just got different. It used to be it was just like a glow light and now it is spotlights. That is all I wanted to say.

Mr. Weidlich: I was just trying to get a feel for where you were and which building, if it was on a building or one of the pole lights.

Mr. Garrard: No, it is poles.

Mr. Weidlich: Okay, thank you sir.

President Ramirez: Thank you. Anyone else in the audience that would like to step forward and comment? If you would sir. Have you come to a conclusion what you would like? What direction you would like us to go with the vote?

(Talking off mic. not audible.)

President Ramirez: That's fine

Mr. Emmert: I think, given the concerns of the board, the applicant would like to table it for now and consider what alternatives could reduce the concerns that were expressed tonight.

President Ramirez: Okay. Thank you. If you would like, we can pass along to our staff comments or suggestions. We are not going to make the plans for you but just some of the things that we don't like and we would like to see changed and if you want to work with them, you don't have to but if you want to but if you want to work with staff on what they believe would work for us it might make it easier on you instead of coming back and coming back with different solutions.

Mr. Emmert: That sounds fine.

President Ramirez: At this point we need a member to make a motion to table this subject matter. Mrs. Ghantous.

Mrs. Ghantous: Thank you Mr. Chairman. So, when you guys are looking at it would you also see if there is some type of shield that could maybe go on the back that would reduce the light going into that gentleman's back yard? I mean it might be just

one or two poles back there that if there was some type of a shield it would make it at least better for him. So, if you would just look at that, that would be great. Thank you.

President Ramirez: Thank you for that comment. At this time chair will accept the motion to table. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a motion to table application 34781 from DeCastro Management LLC dba Kerry Automotive to the next meeting.

Mrs. Ghantous: Second.

President Ramirez: We have a move and a second. Secretary would you please poll the members.

(Secretary polled the members and the motion to table the application was approved with a vote of 6 to 0.)

President Ramirez: Thank you. So, we have tabled this subject and we look forward to you coming back.

Mr. Emmert: Thank you for your time tonight.

President Ramirez: Thank you. Do we need to vote since we are tabling I don't think we need to, the Public Hearing portion?

Mr. Anderson: If you'd like we can. I'd like to make a motion to continue in process the Public Hearing related to application 34781 from DeCastro Management LLC on 155 West Kemper Road in process.

Mrs. Ghantous: Second.

President Ramirez: We have a second by voice vote this time.

(Voice vote taken and motion to continue in process was approved with a vote of 6 to 0.)

President Ramirez: Okay that has passed also with a 6 - 0 vote.

B. Glenview Subdivision (H.O.A.), intersection of Vista Glen and West Sharon Road has submitted a request for a Variance from Section 153.459(B)(4)(e) & Section 153.459(B)(4)(d) to be able to place an internally lit subdivision sign within the public right-of-way. (Application 34892)  
Public Hearing

President Ramirez: Would an applicant please step forward.

Mr. Rickard: My name is Dave Rickard, 10937 Fallstone Drive.

President Ramirez: Thank you. Would you please give us a statement on why you are asking for this variance?

Mr. Richard: Our subdivision is about 25 + years old and we had to do some landscaping. We had brick walls where our name of the subdivision was there, Glenview. So, we took the wall down, it was deteriorating and now we don't have a sign. So, we need somewhere, somehow to let everyone know what subdivision that they are coming into. We got, as you saw on the papers there that we have Tri-State

Sign help design this for us. The bit issue is that we have it internally lit and your zoning code says that we should not have an internally lit sign. The previous sign was on a wall and we had spot lights on it but because of where we want to put this, it is in a right-of-way, it is like a boulevard between, in the driveway or the road and we feel a spot light would be blinding to people driving in and driving out so internal lighting won't affect anything like that. The sign is well, it is at least 10 feet beyond where people drive in so they won't be blocked on the sidewalks. Another reason that we wouldn't want to put the sign where it was before because the landscaping doesn't allow for that. If we put a sign in front of the landscaping it is kind of hiding everything that we put in there. That is about all that I have.

President Ramirez: Okay. Thank you for those comments. Could you please pause for a moment? Alright, staff comments on this subject.

Mr. Champion: Request to construct an internally illuminated permanent development sign for the Glenview subdivision, located in the island of Vista Glen Dr. The proposed sign consists of 11.67 sq. ft. and is attached to a masonry wall 8' long and 4' high as shown on the application. The subject property is zoned Residential Single Household-Low density (RSH-L). Section 153.489(B)(4) states the following:

*For single-family developments, permanent development or subdivision signs shall be permitted subject to the following regulations:*

*a.) A maximum of one permanent monument sign or two signs attached to a supporting wall or fence may be permitted for each primary entrance to the subdivision that is located on a collector or arterial street.*

*b.) Each sign may have a maximum sign area of 25 square feet not including any fencing, wall, supporting base, or other material used to frame, brace, or otherwise provided structural support for the sign on which the sign is located.*

*c.) Maximum height is six feet.*

*d.) Signs shall not be internally illuminated.*

*e.) Signs shall be set back ten feet from the public right-of-way and ten feet from any adjacent lot lines.*

To construct the sign as requested, a variance from section 153.459(B)(4)(e) is required, since the sign is proposed within the public right-of-way, and a variance from 153.459(B)(4)(d) is required to allow the sign to be internally illuminated. The applicant has provided an agreement for the maintenance of the sign, the insuring of the sign and indemnification of the City regarding any liability regarding the sign. The agreement has been reviewed and approved by both the City Administration and the Law Director. However, the variances described above must be granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals before the sign can be approved. A statement of conditions and finding listing the factors for consideration of the granting of a variance is included. Each of the factors should be considered by the board. As stated in 153.206(B)(4)(j), "No single factor listed above may control, and not all factors may be applicable in each case. Each case shall be determined on its own facts." Gregg H. Taylor, Building Official.

President Ramirez: Thank you for that report. Comments or questions to the applicant from members. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Two questions. One, do we have any idea how bright this sign is? It seems to be a lighting night for me. It is internally illuminated; do we have an idea for that?

Mr. Rickard: What the sign company gave us is, I guess to answer your question, I don't know how bright this is. This is just what they gave us here. The 120-volt electric sign, 3" LED lighting which will be inside and the letters will, the light will

come through the letters. The letters are actually acrylic so it is not direct light coming through the sign it's coming through the acrylic letters.

Mr. Anderson: I did want to note for the record that I do notice that this is unusual that an existing island is not typical in the right-of-way for any of our other subdivisions. That seems to be a very unusual situation for Springdale which makes things a little bit, it makes more sense for me to have something like this when it is an unusual situation. I do note that for the record. Thank you.

President Ramirez: Mr. Nienaber.

Mr. Nienaber: Thank you. Here's the part that puzzles me. Normally we are granting a variance to someone's personal property and in this case the right-of-way is the City's property is it not?

Mr. Champion: Yes, probably.

Mr. Nienaber: On the application it does list name and address of property owners and it names a Mr. Bob Hadley. Where does he fit in to the picture?

Mr. Rickard: He is on the board with me.

Mr. Nienaber: Okay.

Mr. Rickard: They suggested to me to have another person on the form.

Mr. Nienaber: Sure, okay.

Mrs. Ghantous: So, does the H.O.A. own that property? Does the H.O.A. own that island?

Mr. Rickard: No, that's not, it is city owned.

Mrs. Ghantous: But you guys maintain it?

Mr. Rickard: We maintain it.

Mrs. Ghantous: That's probably where that's probably how it came to be this way if they are maintaining it and they are paying dues for the use of it. It seems that they would have the right to sign there.

President Ramirez: Mr. Champion.

Mr. Champion: The applicant might know this answer, I don't but is Gilford Court a private street? Do you guys maintain that street or does the City maintain it?

Mr. Rickard: Gilford?

Mr. Champion: Well the street that goes in?

Mr. Richard: Oh.

Mr. Champion: Does the City plow your streets when it snows?

Mr. Rickard: Yes, they do.

Mr. Champion: I'd say it is a City street.

President Ramirez: Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you. I guess to Mrs. Ghantous' point the last time, the City has requested variances before didn't we have a discussion like that with the temporary signs. Didn't the City have to apply for the variance when it was a City owned spot? So, I guess I have the same question. Is that okay? I guess the Law Director already reviewed this. They are requesting a variance for City property.

President Ramirez: Mr. Campion.

Mr. Campion: It would be, yes, if we have a zoning code and the City wanted to deviate from that they would probably need a variance or change the code. I mean if the City wanted to build a 20-story building here and it didn't meet the zoning code

Mr. Anderson: I guess that is my question because the application, the summary from the City says that it is within the public right-of-way, it doesn't note who owns the property. I guess that's is the core question is that part of what's owned by the H.O.A., is that part of their property or not? It is in the public right-of-way, that doesn't mean that the City owns it, right? So, just because it is in the right-of-way doesn't mean that it is City owned. So, I am inclined to continue

Mrs. Ghantous: We probably need to get an answer to that question.

President Ramirez: Mrs. Ghantous.

Mrs. Ghantous: I think that it is wrapped up in, originally when the subdivision was developed there would have been all of the little, you know components of all of the H.O.A. and the planting beds and the sign as it was originally although it was on the side originally. Probably all of that was laid to rest at that time but we probably do need to get an answer before we move forward.

President Ramirez: Mr. Weidlich.

Mr. Weidlich: Thank you. So, I am assuming the island, since it is in the middle of a public street makes it part of the public right-of-way correct?

Mrs. Ghantous: We are not sure.

Mr. Weidlich: I guess my other question is, Mr. Campion, what is the reason that the City does not allow internally lit signage?

Mr. Campion: It is in their zoning code.

Mr. Weidlich: Okay.

Mrs. Ghantous: Do you think probably this was written before that was a thing so now that is common?

President Ramirez: Can we go in order, I think Mr. Nienaber had a question as well?

Mrs. Ghantous: I'm so sorry.

President Ramirez: Are you finished Mr. Campion?

Mr. Campion: Yes, I'm finished.

President Ramirez: Mr. Nienaber.

Mr. Nienaber: Thank you. As I follow the story line, there was a previous sign there?

Mr. Rickard: Not in this location, it was to the right of the island.

Mr. Nienaber: Okay.

Mr. Rickard: On a brick wall that we took down.

Mr. Nienaber: Okay, so this isn't replacing in the same situation, you are moving the application?

Mr. Rickard: Correct. That's right.

President Ramirez: Mrs. Ghantous, something?

Mrs. Ghantous: (talking off mic. not audible.)

President Ramirez: No problem. Is this a two-sided sign?

Mr. Rickard: No, one sided.

President Ramirez: Mr. Weidlich.

Mr. Weidlich: Thank you. The island there, I gather from what you have been saying that the H.O.A. maintains and landscapes that?

Mr. Rickard: Correct.

Mr. Weidlich: And the City doesn't mow the grass or mulch the planting beds or anything?

Mr. Rickard: No, they do not. No, we take and we do that.

Mr. Weidlich: So, it is 100% with the H.O.A.?

Mr. Rickard: It is, yeah.

Mr. Weidlich: Okay, thank you.

President Ramirez: Mr. Champion.

Mr. Champion: Okay, I just wanted to point out that the staff report says that they are requesting, they would need two variances, one to have the sign in the public right-of-way and one to have that sign internally lit.

President Ramirez: Any other questions for the applicant. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you. The variance request itself; I understand that is for two sections, the light and the sign in the right-of-way. Is there, I guess my concern is the longevity of the variance. So, does the request put any boundaries around the size or type of sign? My concern is theirs, if as written we'd allow an internally illuminated sign in a public right-of-way that right now is for the H.O.A. or for the subdivision, the variance lives with that location and they could put any sign that is internally illuminated in that island in the future and that would then be permissible? Is that right or are there constraints inside of the variance request that would prevent that?

Mr. Champion: I would think that you would structure the variance to say that you are allowing a maximum of 6' high and the description of what is in the request so it would be specific to this sign. There's also the maintenance agreement that is with the H.O.A. so I don't know if it, I am just thinking ahead but what if there is no H.O.A. in the future? Would that agreement go away? I don't know.

Mr. Anderson: So, it would be acceptable to say the dimensions in the variance we would say the dimensions permissible and say subject to the condition of the ongoing maintenance agreement?

Mr. Campion: Exactly.

Mr. Anderson: Okay. Approved by both parties. Okay.

President Ramirez: Are we clear on what we can and cannot do as it concerns Springdale's property and a sign on Springdale's property? I'm trying to think of another situation where we may have this in Springdale. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you. Would the corner down here at, where the Beef O' Brady's and Days Inn sign, where there's that pole sign, right that's I believe City owned in that spot? It used to be owned to the church that then I thought deeded it over to be part of that PUD. I believe that sign is on City property but we maintain, we cut the grass there and maintain it. So, is that a similar situation?

President Ramirez: I suppose it would be.

Mr. Anderson: I guess I'm kind of in the dark here to.

President Ramirez: Mr. Weidlich.

Mr. Weidlich: I'm assuming that since the City Administration and the Law Director has approved these two variances that the City is agreement with it. That is my interpretation.

President Ramirez: Mrs. Daniels.

Mrs. Daniels: Thank you. I see where you said the maximum height is 6'. How wide is the sign going to be?

Mr. Rickard: About 8 feet or 96 inches. I think we have a 10-foot area that we can put it in.

Mrs. Daniels: Okay. Thank you.

President Ramirez: Seeing no other questions, any questions at this time the chair accepts a motion for, Mr. Anderson. We have two subjects to that we will motion on the variance for the signage itself and then the subject to put a sign in that location.

Mr. Anderson: So, would you prefer them to be separate?

President Ramirez: Yes.

Mr. Anderson: Separate motions?

President Ramirez: Yes. Does anyone in the audience have a question or would like to discuss this? Nobody. Okay, that closes the public portion of this. Going forward with a motion it will be just a minute. Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you. I'd like to make a motion to approve application 34892 for Glenview subdivision H.O.A. for a variance to section 153.459(B)(4)(e) allowing a sign not to exceed 96" high by 48" wide to be permitted within the public right-of-way.

Mr. Weidlich: Excuse me, isn't that the opposite 96" wide and 48" high?

Mr. Anderson: I'm sorry I meant that 96" by 48", so 96" wide and 48" high.

President Ramirez: Do we have a second?

Mr. Nienaber: Second.

President Ramirez: We have a first and second. Secretary would you please poll the members.

(Secretary polled the members and the motion was approved with a vote of 6 to 0.)

Resident Ramirez: Thank you. That portion has passed. Now for the second subject matter do we have a motion for that? Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'd like to make a motion to approve application 34892 for Glenview subdivision H.O.A. at the intersection of Vista Glen and West Sharon Road for a variance to section 153.459(B)(4)(d) allowing an internally illuminated sign at that location subject to the condition of an ongoing maintenance agreement agreed by both parties, the City and the H.O.A. ongoing.

Mr. Weidlich: Second.

President Ramirez: Mr. Weidlich second. At this time secretary please poll the members.

(Secretary started the polling process and stopped with a question.)

Mrs. Daniels: I have a question. Can I, because he made a comment about how bright the signs was going to be. Is there any way that, because I do have a concern with it being too bright, not knowing that and how that will illuminate to the road? So, I want to vote yes but I also have a concern with that so I am not sure how to interject that.

President Ramirez: Well at this point we would have to amend the motion.

Mr. Anderson: So, I believe that you can make a motion to amend within a vote if you want to which then could open up discussion in terms of procedure. I believe but I defer to the Chair on that. I believe that that is permitted if you want to make a motion.

President Ramirez: But at this time, we are in the middle of the vote process, it has not been approved at this point so.

Mr. Weidlich: You could amend it after the vote to.

President Ramirez: The chair requests any discussion for amendment to the lighting density on this. Does anybody have anything to discuss on this before we go forward?  
Mr. Nienaber.

Mr. Nienaber: I suggest that we add an amendment to what we're already working on to allow that the lumens not to exceed the same kind of thing that we were talking about with the DeCastro. Something like, is it five candles, let me pull up that part and see what the.

President Ramirez: Well this will be different because this is backlit as opposed to a broadcast.

Mr. Nienaber: It would be hard to get a backlit that lit, that bright but it would certainly be within our realm to suggest that the

President Ramirez: Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I believe that there are already some guidelines around signage inside the zoning code so if we are not granting any variances to the lumens permitted based on that other section of the zoning code, it is only that this sign is permitted to have it. So, is that right, I believe that there is already back light lighting standards. This doesn't give them an out for any of that.

Mr. Campion: That is correct. You are just granting a variance or not granting a variance to allow illuminated signage. If the sign is illuminated brighter than the code then we can go back to them and have them turn the lights down.

President Ramirez: So, we can go, we can continue the vote but the signage would have to meet the code. You can check with staff on what that lighting is. If that is okay with the members we will continue with the vote.

(Secretary polled the members and the motion was approved with a vote of 6 to 0.)

President Ramirez: Thank you that has been approved with a vote of 6 to 0. Please make note that it will have to meet the current requirements for density on the light.  
Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Anderson: Sorry, one thing before we close that out. Just because that was a large motion. I believe that we were quite clear in the section motion about it being subject to the maintenance agreement. I honestly don't recall if we included that in the first motion. Is that necessary to do both? Do we need to do an amendment at this point to address that or is it based on the discussion that we had included, is it one variance or two and did we miss that part of it?

Mr. Campion: It should be two separate variances.

Mr. Anderson: Right, the first variance when I believe we were saying it, I'm not sure that we included the subject to the agreed maintenance, the maintenance agreement that we included in the second. Is that an issue?

Mr. Campion: If you want to poll the board and make sure that is part of your discussion.

President Ramirez: Well let's do this, we will go back to that, that's been approve and amend to add that just to cover all of the bases.

Mr. Anderson: Okay.

President Ramirez: So, at this point would you like to give us the terminology for the amendment for the 153.459(B)(4)(e).

Mr. Anderson: Thank you. I'd like to make a motion to amend the variance granted to section 153.459(B)(4)(e) permitting a sign in the right-of-way to include the language subject to an ongoing mutually agreeable maintenance agreement between the H.O.A. and City Administration to maintain the variance.

President Ramirez: Do we have a second?

Mr. Weidlich: Second.

President Ramirez: Move and second, please poll the members.

(Secretary polled the members and the motion to amend the variance to 153.459(B)(4)(e) was approved by a vote of 6 to 0.)

President Ramirez: So we went back and what we did was just stated that just carry on what you are doing with the maintenance of that current property but we have in there so you will need to maintain the sign as well which would mean the grass around the sign, the sign itself, the illumination of the sign so that would be on you even though it is on Springdale property.

(Talking off mic. not audible.)

President Ramirez: Okay. Thank you.

X DISCUSSION

President Ramirez: Discussion and confirmation of the future meetings. Mr. Nienaber.

Mr. Nienaber: On that topic, Christmas Eve is the only one that really looks awkward, other than that I have no problem with changing the meeting dates.

President Ramirez: On the 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Mr. Nienaber: December 24, 2019.

President Ramirez: Oh, the first one, yes, I agree. Are we all in the agreement with the date for number 2, December 24<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Anderson: I would prefer it to be either the week before or, well the week before because the week after is New Year's Eve, which I think is a challenge also.

President Ramirez: Is everyone okay with December 17<sup>th</sup>.

(Voice vote taken 6-0 in favor.)

President Ramirez: Okay, we will ask for that to be changed. Any other changes to be made? The 24<sup>th</sup> of November, that is a Tuesday and then Thanksgiving will be two days later so other than for travel purposes, anybody else have. Mr. Weidlich do you have something to say about that?

Mr. Weidlich: I was just looking at what Mr. Campion had put out, about the November 26<sup>th</sup> with the alternate on November 19<sup>th</sup> because of Thanksgiving week.

President Ramirez: Are we speaking of number 4?

Mr. Weidlich: Two or one actually.

President Ramirez: Number one.

Mr. Weidlich: Of this year.

President Ramirez: Is member okay with moving to the 19<sup>th</sup>?

(Voice vote taken 6-0 in favor.)

President Ramirez: Mrs. Daniels.

Mrs. Daniels: I had the same question.

President Ramirez: Are we okay with the other dates? What about December 24<sup>th</sup>, that is two days I think only if you are traveling. We moved number one. We are talking about number four. Mrs. Daniels.

Mrs. Daniels: I would like to suggest that we move those and just be consistent we just move a week ahead for Thanksgiving and Christmas just in general because people may travel.

President Ramirez: I'm okay with that. Members have discussion or are you okay with changing both of those? That would be number four and number five to November 17<sup>th</sup> and December 15<sup>th</sup>. I'm okay either way.

Mr. Weidlich: Are we keeping number three as is on the 26<sup>th</sup> of May?

President Ramirez: Day after Memorial Day.

Mr. Weidlich: It doesn't bother me I'm just asking.

Mr. Anderson: I'm okay that Tuesday is fine.

President Ramirez: Is everybody okay with number three. Okay we are going to leave number three. We are going move all of them except number three then. We are going to move number four to November 17, 2020 and number five to December 15, 2020. Are we okay with both of those moves?

(Voice vote taken 6-0 in favor.)

President Ramirez: Anything else for discussion, nothing is on the list but anybody have anything else to discuss. Mrs. Daniels.

Mrs. Daniels: I heard you mention earlier that a vote will be made tomorrow regarding who is getting appointed to our board is that correct? Do we have any names that are, how many applicants were considered?

President Ramirez: Mr. Anderson had something to say?

Mrs. Ghantous: Do you remember their names?

Mr. Anderson: I don't. So, the original intent was that we were going to vote last time. There was at least one name that was presented and one that was believed but since there were several members absent, we tabled it. I believe that there is more than one. I believe that there was at least two but technically until they are nominated it is not, I mean they are not nominated.

Mrs. Daniels: I was just wondering (talking off mic not audible)

Mr. Anderson: Yeah, I don't know that there's, I don't have them with me, I know that there are several.

President Ramirez: I heard that one of them was with the Recreation Commission.

Mr. Anderson: I'm not trying to be quiet I just don't have that.

(Talking off mic. not audible)

Mr. Anderson: There's certainly an opportunity, I mean it's tomorrow, it is on the agenda for tomorrow so up until the meeting tomorrow, applicants can be presented by any Council member.

President Ramirez: Anything else?

XI ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Nienaber: I move that we adjourn.

President Ramirez: That's a good one.

Mr. Weidlich: Second.

(Voice vote taken 6-0 in favor.)

President Ramirez: We are adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman, Joseph Ramirez

\_\_\_\_\_, 2019

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary, Carmen Daniels