

Minutes of the Ordinance Committee Meeting
Sheffield Lake, Ohio
June 2, 2011

The regular meeting of the Ordinance Committee was held Thursday, June 2, 2011. Chairperson Huska called the meeting to order at 7:20 PM.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:

Present: Huska, Elliott, Kovach

Attending: Law Director Graves, Service Director Smith, Zoning Board of Appeals; Chairperson Jancura and Member Tatter

READING OF THE MINUTES:*Motion by Kovach/Second by Elliott to accept the minutes of the May 5, 2011 meeting with any corrections. Yeas All.

PRESENTATIONS: None.

CORRESPONDENCE: None.

OLD BUSINESS:

Internet Sweepstakes Cafes – Service Director Smith reported the Great Escapes that is operating out of the old Gus’s restaurant closed down Friday due to lack of business.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chapter 7 – Chairperson Huska advised this review will be next month.

Chapter 1383; accessory buildings – Law Director Graves advised this is an issue as I have talked about in the past, that really reared its ugly head last summer when we had an issue with an accessory building that had a number of issue. Everybody knows the one I am talking about next to the Community Center. While some of the issues were clear other issues were not and the ones that were not were in regard to the size of the structure. That problem is related to the conflict between Chapter 1383 and Chapter 1133 and also in applicability and I think the last time we had a pretty lengthy discussion on this. The boat house next to the Community Center last year, the obvious problem with it was that they built that structure spanning the property lines and then at last when he backed out of the lot split and ended up tearing it down. They ran into problems with inspections and so on and so on. It may or may not have been too big, there were arguments both ways.

1383.02 talks about metal sheds and accessory buildings; it defines storage shed as a building used as an accessory building. There is an argument as to whether this should only apply to metal sheds, it limits it to 192 square feet but is it applicable to pavilion style buildings. One way you could go would be to create almost a set of standards in the ordinance that talks about different types of accessory buildings

and the size for each one. Some communities have right in the ordinance like a grid; storage shed, metal shed, pavilion, gazebo and different sizes. Or you could make it more of a general limitation that would apply to all accessory buildings. Presently you are only allowed 1 accessory building. Chapter 1103.02 which is the R1 residence district chapter; says that an accessory building shall not exceed 12 feet in height, may occupy not more than 30 percent of the rear yard. So applying that an accessory that doesn't exceed 12 feet doesn't exceed 30 percent of the rear yard could be as large as you want it be so long as it wasn't going 12 feet tall. Chapter 1383 limits it to 192 square feet or 12 X 16 – so there is an inconsistency there as to how large these accessory buildings can be and also there is a question as to what constitutes an accessory building and whether 1383 should only apply to metal sheds or storage sheds but not other types of accessory buildings that are more for recreational use. We started this discussion, I think there is a lot of issues involved and I don't think we are going to make any firm decisions tonight. Councilman Elliott advised I think we should leave the term shed completely out of it, I think it should just be storage building and a recreational building. Councilman Kovach concurred, that makes a lot of sense. Councilman Elliott advised deeming one accessory building, just does not make any sense to me. I mean not there as we have gazebos and that kind of stuff and a gazebo is not a storage building. So I say just leave the term shed completely out of it and say storage building and recreational buildings. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised I agree but get a little clarification of what is a recreational building because a boat house could be – well that is where I store my boat too. So give some guidance of the difference between the two but I think that is a great idea – take shed out. Member Tatter advised I was not prepared for this discussion but it sounds like a good idea – what Mr. Elliott said. Service Director Smith advised two points – one is the industry tends to lead what kind of buildings are available to the consumer and having being in the market for a shed/barn/wooden shed on my property I happen to see a lot of them. You can pull the pamphlet out of any store to see what is available to the average consumer. Limiting what they can purchase I am against, some are multi-purpose; they have play areas involved with them. But the other aspect is having to be the individual who is responsible overall for the enforcement of the property maintenance codes in the city. There is a direct correlation of lack of storage and junk in the yard or a full garage and junk in the yard. So if you have the ability to store a lot of your personal property out of sight – it is not going to be in sight. I mean that is a walk you guys are going to have to make the decision on but personally that is something I tend to notice. If you don't have room to keep the stuff either in your garage or in a shed it is going to be in the yard. I do like the idea of a recreational building. Councilman Elliott asked wouldn't you think that would fall under how big? Service Director Smith advised they both gardening booth in a work shed, you can have a storage shed and then half of it is glass and has a potting bench and a flower center in it but it is still part

of the building and still under one roof but only half of it is being used for storage and the other half is being used for another purpose. Likewise they have the same things for play houses for younger kids on one section of it and the next section is used for storage. When you look at it it looks like a miniature garage. That is what I meant by the industry's dictating what kind of styles there are out there, they vary across the board. If you limit one are you going to limit the other or if you don't define it. Law Director Graves advised last summer some of the debate that ensued, under 1383.01 the definition portion is says – for the purposes of this chapter a storage shed means any building used as an accessory building to a single family resident not intended to be used as a private garage. Basically any accessory building that is not a garage they are calling a storage shed and you get someone that builds a pavilion style building on the lake bank that they are going to use for just entertaining – that is not a storage shed even though this ordinance seems to apply to it by saying it is any accessory building. The language is unfortunate because this is only intent to apply to storage shed, it is not really intended to apply to other types of buildings. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised well perhaps a recreational building could be defined more as an open building that does not have defined walls and what not – that it is an open structure so we can alright you can have your pavilion bigger than your storage building. Law Director Graves asked what do you think about the size limitations because according to 1383 no accessory building can exceed 12 X 16 or 192 square feet. Service Director Smith asked what happens if you go up, you live on the lake bank and you want a three story building such as the gazebo which is in this city. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised I think it would be easier to have a large recreational building, especially if you are on the lakefront you might want a very large veranda so you can host parties and what not. But the storage shed now starts to look more like a garage. Law Director Graves advised unique situations like are still going to be able to come for a variance and say I need to build this and here is my practical difficulties. Again 1133 which is saying can't be more than 12 feet tall and can't exceed 30 percent of the rear yard. You can be way more than 192 square feet so long as it is not more than 12 feet high. Zoning Chairperson Jancura stated especially if you have a large yard. Law Director Graves stated that inconsistency needs to be reconciled at a minimum, we need to decide what you want to do with that. Do you want to take one out or the other one out or both out? Right now if somebody says I have an accessory building, we are not sure what standard to apply. Chairperson Huska asked what if we took 1383 completely out? Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised if you are looking for a variance guidance it would be easier for us to take out the one that limits the size, keep the one that says it can't be more than 30 percent of the rear yard. You will get less people in front of me because than you can tell people okay this is the maximum size you can build and people will build to the maximum size they can build. Chairperson Huska clarified that would be 1383 take out? Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised take out and just

leave no more 30 percent of the rear yard. I think that would be less variances needed. Councilman Kovach advised I guess that is the more reasonable of the choices as far as by elimination. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised if you have a bigger yard you are going to want a bigger shed, it makes sense – you have more stuff. Service Director Smith advised I guess if I am looking at the view through a lakefront home owner you have no rear set back issues. Zoning Chairperson Jancura stated they are non-conforming/they come in for non-conforming. Service Director Smith stated yes with a height restriction, so they are going to get one more and then they have to prove they have a hardship and then they have to fall within the lines of the hardships that they have which in turn isn't going to say it is a luxury or is it a hardship. I am looking at a certain property, owner has a gazebo in the back that is 3 stories tall that has been there since the house was built, the bottom is a boat shed, the middle is storage and the upper is actually living quarters with a bathroom and everything else. The middle portion feeds the pool and in that situation it is taller than 12 feet, it is actually exposed beyond the cliff so its base is on the beach. Law Director Graves advised that is a non-conforming use, it was constructed prior to the zoning code so it is grandfathered in and there is special treatment for those. Service Director Smith advised I know that, I guess input would be not to encroach into that. If someone else wants to build a building like that on the lake that ties in. Zoning Chairperson Jancura answered they would have to come to us for many reasons. Service Director Smith advised in my conversations with the person brought this light last year, one of his issues was that the tie-in wasn't via the roof, the tie-in was via the concrete base of it that went down. Councilman Elliott advised I think it is too early to take it to Worksession, we need to get a general direction and then we will take it Worksession. Councilman Kovach concurred I think this is going to take some time again to decide because it is not necessarily the industry that is driving these buildings I believe it is the consumers request that are going to the industry and they are meeting the demands and making more of these different types of structures and multi-tasking structures available for the consuming public. Chairperson Huska advised we will go back to this next month at Ordinance for further discussion.

Chapter 161.02 – Law Director Graves advised 161.02 of the administrative section of the ordinances requires that if an application for building permit is not made within 90 days after the granting of a variance by the Zoning Board of Appeals which is required for the issuance of a building permit that the variance shall expire and shall deemed to have been denied. He explained we had a situation arise where the Zoning Board of Appeals did grant a variance and the individual did not pull a permit and was unaware of this. It was in the middle of the winter and the weather was very poor and was waiting for spring to pull the permit. Most other communities don't have language of this nature, what they instead do is say that construction must be complete within one year. Presently if you pull a building permit it is good for 6 months and it is able to be renewed one time for a good

cause for another 6 months. So that would tie the variance to completion of construction or you could have language that says construction must commence within one year. But you may want to consider changing the language from simply tying it to the pulling of the permit. So someone could have some time – it is in the middle of winter and then get the permit in the spring but you still have 6 month or 1 year to commence construction. Councilman Kovach advised I think commence makes more sense than completion because if you can go 6 months before you pull a permit and then 6 months for completion – that is 1 year. I think the commencement would be more appropriate. Councilman Elliott advised I guess I am on the fence but I would agree with what Steve says. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised after discussing this with Planning Commission, my husband Scott Jancura and we are both real estate attorneys. We talked about – yes, tying it to pulling of the permit but also tying it to the issuance of either the residence permit or the occupancy permit because that would then be the beginning and the ending of the construction. So you would have 2 very set standards, alright you have your permit but now you have to have the permit for your residency or your occupancy and we could tie it to those 2 events occurring. Whether it be 1 year or whether it be 1 year and an extension for something but what we both really talked is not so much the guy remodeling his house or building a garage but Shoreway. If the city needs any kind of variance for something like that. We are going to need to have somebody to have the authority to say based on the size and the complexity of this project, it is going to need more time. So whatever language is written, the Service Director or somebody from building should have a discretion to say we are going to allow 6 months, another year or whatever to build or complete the construction based on the scale of the property. So I don't know if you guys wanted to write it on – definitely I can keep within a year but if you wanted to do it within the year of issuing the permit to the issuance of the residency or the occupancy permit than that would give them quite a long time. The problem with the variance is when we grant the variance it runs with the land so the guy that doesn't go and get the permit – if he forgets and he wants to do it at a later time, it expires and is deemed denied and now they have to go to the court as they can't come back to us to get their variance because it is deemed denied. It is now out of our hands and you have to go to the court to have it overturned and ignorance of the law really isn't an excuse. Now what we can do in zoning be mindful and this is where David is writing a new packet that we can always if it is going to be an issue we can make it more clear that your variance has to be basically exercised within so long a time frame. So we can condition the variance subject to you have to pull your permit within X amount of days and just be more mindful to tell people “alright you have your variance but these are the conditions of that variance being utilized”. Zoning Tatter advised my only thoughts are is that the variance should be consistent and similar language to existing building codes as far as construction goes for instance new housing developments. Builders come in with proposals, they have to appear

before different commissions, before Council and they run sometimes 6 or 12 months just to get permission to build and part of that is conditioned on accepting variances and you have to maintain some consistency in considering language not specific just to the variance but consistent with the issuance of building permits and so on. So it's probably a little more complex, I don't have an answer or even a recommendation but I do say that for Planned Unit Developments and different things – builders going bankrupt, some houses that may have lots with variances may not be constructed if we approve a variance for an entire subdivision and there is still some land in the city that can be developed into subdivisions so you maintain consistency. Service Director Smith advised Mr. Tatter covered the majority of what I was going to say with the exception of there is a lot of land purchases that are done on contingency as he brought up. But what happens if that land purchase is in the court/estate/probate where the circumstances will cause external delays depending on the time frame and how long it is going to take. I personally know of a situation on Lake Breeze right now where the gentleman purchased the property 4 years ago and just found out he doesn't own 2 of the 3 lots – they never transferred title. There was never notification process and now it has turned into a big bucket of worms. That case there was no zoning issue or variance granted but very well could have been, it is a vacant lot sitting on Lake Breeze and very well could have been and if that was the case that situation is going to take it well beyond it's time frame. So I would be supportive of what the Zoning members have said of tying it to the permits and giving it a total of a year or the maximum of a year. The problem is in this situation that brought this to light, the gentleman did not act in enough time and we were faced with the situation of what happens when they don't act in the right time. Like Mrs. Jancura said the only appeal procedure is through the courts and at that point and time there is nothing that we can do. So it has to be changed is what I am basically saying in order to make it work. Councilman Kovach advised we could design an application for an extension couldn't we? Law Director Graves asked an extension to what? Councilman Kovach explained in case they were unable to comply with the year time frame due to whatever? Law Director Graves answered if you tie it to the building permit then you could put language in there that the building permit would have to be pulled within 6 months or have to be pulled within a year giving them more time. Then keeping in mind that the permit itself would be good for 6 months and then able to be renewed for up to another 6 months. They would essentially have 2 years from the granting of the variance to get the project done/a year to pull the permit and then a year to complete. Service Director Smith stated like we said commercial projects do take a long time. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised that is what I am really thinking it more of the large scales, it is easy enough for us to deal individuals but the large scale things are going to take a long time and you don't want the city to have to shut down construction because it let its own variance go. Councilman Elliott stated I think we were thinking more of

garages and houses and that kind of stuff, we weren't thinking about large scale projects like you brought up Shoreway. We have actually looked at bigger projects at Shoreway that probably even take 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 years, we weren't thinking about them. So you really don't want to tie it to the end of the project. Zoning Chairperson Jancura stated there needs to be some vehicle for an easy extension whether it is the Service Director has the authority to grant an extension under reasonable grounds and we can write okay these are going to be the factors, so long as Council approves it because you can't really come back to the Zoning Board. Once I have given the variance then you are done but then let Council approve the granting of the extension. Law Director Graves asked extension of the permit? Zoning Chairperson Jancura concurred of the permit, correct because once the variance is on it – it is on it. Councilman Elliott stated yes and why should you revisit it once you have already granted it? Zoning Chairperson Jancura answered we can't, we can't revisit it. Law Director Graves advised it would be an appeal which you would only have 30 days by that point, you would be outside the time frame to appeal it anyway. Zoning Chairperson Jancura asked is there any way you could rewrite the ordinance that if it is not pulled it would be deemed dismissed and not denied? Law Director Graves answered no. Service Director Smith stated what about if someone wanted to build a 4-story building, there is a variance right there because of our height requirement? So that is going to go right into that and then that preliminary is in the design phase, so I think a year's time frame? Law Director Graves advised I think that a year to pull the permit would be sufficient, I think that would be sufficient. You have already got code in here that says the permit is good for 6 months and can be extended for another 6 months so that gives 2 years. You could revisit those sections of code too I guess, you could give a second extension I suppose. I think that you need to keep in mind that the point is that you want to drive the action. You don't want to grant a variance and then have the property sit there for 5 years with nothing going on. Zoning Chairperson Jancura stated even a year is a long time because if you do your permit and you come to variance which means you had blue prints drawn up and you should get going. The average "Joe" who is going to get a variance is going to do something about it. I would say 1 year is plenty of time. Law Director Graves stated along the lines, in a major commercial development like that you are going to have all the plans submitted and everybody is going to know the relief that is going to be necessary. It is probably going to be reviewed through Planning Commission and then the variances would be like the last contingency, so I don't really see that as a problem. Councilman Elliott asked are you saying that you are against the extension at all? Law Director Graves answered no personally I would leave the extension on the permit alone but if you want to tie it to the permit, I would increase to a year to pull the permit after the granting of the variance and then leave the rest of the code alone - it says the permit is good for 6 months and can be renewed for another 6 months. So that essentially gives you 2 years from the

variance to get it done. Zoning Chairperson Jancura and Member Tatter concurred and Member Tatter stated if the extension would expire then we would be allowed to have it revisited at Zoning right? Zoning Chairperson Jancura answered no, once we grant the variance it has nothing to do the permit anymore. Member Tatter stated if the variance expires because they did not pull a permit? Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised it is deemed denied. Member Tatter stated it would be deemed denied and they can revisit then? Zoning Chairperson Jancura answered no, we can't – if it has been denied by us then they have to go to the court. Law Director Graves answered they couldn't even do that because it would be beyond the time frame. If you rule on a variance one way or the other, you are precluded from reconsidering it. Member Tatter asked then the expiration is considered a denial? Law Director Graves stated that is what the code says now. There is a whole lot of case law out there that says that the Zoning Board of Appeals can't reconsider these issues. You have ruled on it and you can't come back rule on the same one, the only way you can rule on it again is if it has substantially changed. So if someone comes and says I want to build a 2 car garage and I need a variance and you deny it, they can't come back unless they say well now I want to build a 3 car garage. It has to be substantially different then you can look at it again but other than that, you can't and going to court beyond that would be an appeal of the administrative decision of which you have 30 days to file that. Law Director Graves confirmed basically change 161.02 from 90 days to 1 year? The question is do you want it to pulling the building permit for commencing construction and I thought that the consensus was you wanted to continue with it being tied with the pulling the building permit? This was agreed through members participating in discussion. Zoning Chairperson Jancura asked David, can we change the language for the variance “shall expire and deemed to have been, the application withdrawn”, is there anything we can do to write a friendlier ordinance? Law Director Graves answered I think you are going to be precluded from considering it again. Zoning Chairperson Jancura asked even if we say the application would be deemed withdrawn, so that it was never even in front of us? Or is it hey we considered it because remember we had a guy withdraw his application because we said look we are going to deny this, if you force it we are going to deny and so he withdrew the application. We told him come back in another time with this, this and this because we didn't want to be forced to vote because we are going to deny it so we let him withdraw his application so he could come back with a different proposal. Law Director Graves stated I suppose you could put language in there that said that if it has been granted – that any time within that first year they could come back to Zoning Board and ask for an extension of the time period to pull the permit. You would not be reconsidering it on the merit, you are just asking for additional time. So I think that would probably be alright. Service Director Smith stated the question here is the pulling of the permit, it isn't the length or duration of the variance. So why couldn't there be something where if there is no permit pulled

upon a variance that it is really not a variance, does the hardship follow the property or does a hardship follow the applicant of the variance? Zoning Chairperson Jancura answered the property. Well the variance runs with the land once it is granted. Law Director Graves advised once it is granted and they follow this they pull the permit. Service Director Smith stated but a different property owner; say they don't do it, they don't exercise and a different property owner comes and purchases the property such as the Delavilla property down on the west end and wants to do something entirely different. Say there was a variance granted, is that going to affect/that was never exercised – is that going to affect anything of the next variance that might be needed? Law Director Graves answered no. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised it depends on what kind of variance, if you are going for the exact same variance as the first guy then I believe it would affect it but if it is a different variance/different kind. Service Director Smith asked then the only thing we are dealing with is the permit time/the building permit itself? Zoning Chairperson Jancura answered right, we are trying to make sure the expiration of the building permit doesn't somehow negate the variance granted. Law Director Graves advised so we can amend 161.02 to include language that the permit has to be pulled within 1 year. Do you want to include language that anytime within that 1 year they can come back to Zoning Board of Appeals to request an extension. Councilman Kovach asked how about just for commercial projects because if you are doing a garage or something like that there would really be no reason to extend past a 2 year time frame but a commercial project that might require more time would be the one that could apply for extensions. Zoning Chairperson Jancura answered David could write language that based on the scale and complexity of the project that an extension could be granted. Councilman Elliott recommended I would go along with that – an extension. I would not be opposed to giving them the authority to revisit anything. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised but the Service Director would have the discretion to grant the extension because the variance does not need the extension/it is the permit. Law Director Graves advised it is still going to say that they got to pull the permit within 1 year or the variance is deemed denied and this is under the Zoning Board of Appeals section of code. The proposal would be to allow them within that 1 year period to come back to Zoning Board of Appeals and ask for an extension of time to pull the permit for good cause shown. You are not reconsidering the variance on the merits, you have already granted the variance. All you are saying is that we recognize that you are having the additional hardships or whatever and we are going to give you additional time to pull your permit. Zoning Chairperson Jancura stated I didn't realize we had governance over building permits. Law Director Graves advised the Charter says the Zoning Board of Appeals has certain powers and then such further powers as designated by Council. So if Council wants to give the Zoning Board of Appeals certain authority they can do that. **Law Director Graves advised I will draw up for Worksession.**

ATV/Recreational Use – Chairperson Huska advised we had a man who wanted to know why he couldn't teach his granddaughter how to run an ATV in his yard. Councilman Kovach advised first of all, the gentleman chose not to come to the meeting. Councilman Elliott advised at this point I don't really see a need to revisit this. Councilman Kovach concurred, we only had the one person who came and asked about it and chose not pursue it any further. Law Director Graves advised presently you are not ride all-terrain vehicles in the city for recreational use. You can use them on your property for landscaping and snowplowing and things like that but you can't drive them for recreational use anywhere in the city. Every so often someone wants to know if Council would reconsider that. Councilman Elliott advised I would also remind this committee that when we passed this ordinance, the only Councilman that wasn't on this committee was Leanna Stark. So at the time we passed it, it passed unanimously. Zoning Chairperson Jancura advised with the dangers they should be banned from all humanity use. Member Tatter advised I think that for non-recreational use there is a purpose in a city like Sheffield Lake but not everyone has a large enough lot on some of these postage stamp lots it could be a dangerous situation. Councilman Elliott stated we banned them from the streets. Law Director Graves advised in my discussions with the Mayor, he would prefer language that more closely tie to the actual concerns with the ATV's rather than just saying you are not allowed to have them for recreational use. In other words the concerns are the noise, the damage they would do to the yards, the nuisance that they might create and it is really the size of the yard – Sheffield Lake is a very dense community with a lot of small yards, very few yards like Mr. Tatter said other than probably some of the lots on the lake where the yards are really big enough to ride these things. Perhaps legislation that would allow them for the recreational use if you have so much land, a yard of sufficient size. Zoning Chairperson Jancura quipped we could encourage golf carts. Councilman Kovach advised that is what brought this to a head which he explained. Councilman Elliott advised I just don't see the point in revisiting something over and over just because somebody brings something to Council. There was a brief discussion. Chairperson Huska instructed Clerk to – **REMOVE FROM AGENDA.**

Occupancy permit inspections – Law Director Graves advised I know that this is something that we have brought up a number of times but for some reason it keeps becoming an issue and it keeps becoming an issue with especially Tradewinds apartments. I have good reason to believe that the issue could be resolved if Council would consider and this committee has been very clear – in addition to the inspections go along with the annual rental license, to continue with the occupancy inspections for each individual single family unit in these multi-family dwellings and also continue to charge a fee for those inspections. I can tell you that the inspections have been very successful. The Building Inspector inspected 2 units at the Tradewinds apartments just this past week, they wanted to rent this past

weekend/needed occupancy – went into 1 unit and found at least a ½ dozen violations. So he told them I am not going to let this be occupied and they had to correct all those things. If we didn't do that, that unit would have just been rented with the violations in place. I have good reason to believe that the issue could be resolved if Council would consider reducing the current inspection fee from \$50.00 to \$25.00. If that is something that this committee wants to recommend. Councilman Kovach asked the inspection fee or the occupancy? Law Director Graves answered the occupancy inspection fee per unit, the per unit fee every time there is an occupancy. This is just every time someone moves in or out of a single apartment, the city is supposed to go in and inspect that and it is supposed to be \$50.00. Councilman Kovach advised I believe we would be in concurrence with that because as I believe we discussed last month and prior to that it was the inspections we want. Councilman Elliott concurred I believe we were very clear that the inspections stay. Dave and I have talked about this pretty much every time we see each other and I told him at the time that I wasn't against dropping the fee from \$50.00 to \$25.00 if that is their biggest gripe. My biggest thing was that the inspections stay and Steve has also said that too. So if they wanted the fee lowered I don't see a problem with it. Law Director Graves advised it would show that the willingness of the city to work with them and also I think it would call their bluff because I really don't think the issue is the fee, I think they don't want the city inspecting those units. Councilman Elliott advised I think at this point the inspections themselves is non-negotiable – they are going to stay. So my opinion is I am fine with it. Chairperson Huska concurred I am fine with it. But I don't think that is the issue. **Law Director Graves advised I will draw it up for Worksession.**

Ordinances before Council at this time:

CITIZENS COMMENTARY: None.

MEETING ADJOURNED: With no further business before this committee,
*Motion by Kovach/Second by Elliott to adjourn at 8:15 pm. Yeas all.

CLERK OF COMMITTEE AFFIRMATION: This Meeting Of The City Committee Of The City Of Sheffield Lake, Ohio Was Held And Conducted Under All Rules And Regulations Governing The Sunshine Laws Of The State Of Ohio As They May Apply. All meetings are recorded and available in council's office.

CLERK OF COUNCIL

Kay Fantauzzi

I, Kay Fantauzzi, duly appointed Clerk of Committees of Sheffield Lake DO HEREBY CERTIFY that this is a true and exact copy of the Minutes of Committee

CHAIRPERSON OF COMMITTEE

Diana Huska

of Ordinance for June 2, 2011.

COUNCIL PRESIDENT
Edward R Podmanik

and/or

COUNCIL PRO TEM
Richard Rosso