

**Minutes of the Ordinance Committee meeting**  
*Sheffield Lake, Ohio*  
**June 6, 2013**

This regular meeting of the Ordinance Committee was held Thursday, June 6, 2013. Chairman Smith called the meeting to order at 7:17 PM.

**ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:**

Present: Smith, Kovach

Absent: McCullough, Mayor Bring

Attending: Service Director Smith, Law Director Graves

**MINUTES:** April 4, 2013, \*Motion by Kovach/Second by Smith to accept the minutes with any corrections. Yeas All.

**PRESENTATIONS:** None.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

***Expand the role of Architectural Review Board under Planning Commission:***

Law Director Graves advised I think that 167.05 had good intentions but I don't think that really is the appropriate way to go about what it was trying to accomplish and my recommendation would be to delete that section but to expand the role of the Planning Commission to specifically delineate powers of site plan review for any commercial development proposal that they would have specific criteria to look at. Some of the things would be; does it fit in with the nature and character of the neighborhood, various landscaping and aesthetics and so forth that goes beyond typical zoning. Now that is entirely up to the Council that this is the direction that you want to go with this, it would allow a lot of autonomy to the Planning Commission to approve or reject an application. For example, the recent situation of Dollar General – Planning Commission could have reviewed the original plan and determined that this wouldn't fit in. The key with zoning ordinances and things like that is they have to be specific and related to a specific purpose, the more specific it is the more likely it will be upheld in court. Now the flip side of that is you are giving a resident board a lot of say. Chairman Smith advised I was just going to say that is what we decided that we didn't want to do is to make them approving/denying – they are just a recommending site plan review, make recommendations is what we are talking about. We as a group at Worksession if I am not mistaken – we do not want them to be to take this plan and say no, it is not going to pass. Then it gets hung up in Planning Commission. Chairman Smith advised it just be site plan review, they review it but we have got to figure out how we want them to review it. Law Director Graves advised so then they would review and then make a recommendation one way or the other to City Council for ultimate approval. I think that we have decided that we are not going

to have them – that is just going to be a recommending review board for it. So I know that we are going to do. Law Director Graves asked did I give you a **copy of the Avon Lake ordinance**? Chairman Smith answered no. Law Director Graves continued it has specific criteria in it and I can try and get a copy for you. Chairman Smith advised there is all kinds of things but we definitely know that it is going to be the recommending body. We know the direction we are going to go in so we need to just keep working on it. Service Director Smith stated are you saying it is going to be a recommending body only. Chairman Smith answered they are going to review the plan in Planning. Service Director Smith asked and make a recommendation too? Chairman Smith answered we have to figure out where we want it to go, if we want it to come to Council for that approval. Law Director Graves advised that would be the next step beyond Planning Commission – it should be City Council. Chairman Smith advised when we talked at Worksession we wanted it to be a recommending body, we need to know if we want it to bring it to Council. Service Director Smith asked wouldn't you make that determination here and then take the finished product to Worksession. Chairman Smith answered absolutely, we are not going to be drawing up any ordinances or anything right away, we are going to try and spend some time on it and do it right. Law Director Graves advised I think that it is very important because times have changed and a lot of the unfortunate zoning decisions that were made in the 60's and 70's we are kind of stuck with them. Once something is zoned a certain way to go back now and try to zone it more restrictive would be actually taking of value from whoever the property owner is. They bought it as a commercial lot and to now say well that is only residential, they have lost value. We can work with that zoning that arose during a time when the idea was that the Shoreway would a business area but we can work with that and put parameters on the development and landscaping and things like that. Hopefully more development wants to come in.

***1139.06c – problematic piece of code; needs to be eliminated or to be explained what kind of standards and criteria the ZBA is supposed to use*** – Law Director Graves advised this is the B1 zoning/that is in the rear yard section and that is the clause that says on a corner commercial lot that abuts residential it has to come before Zoning Board of Appeals for review of size and location of the building. That is all it says – that language doesn't give any clarification, there is nothing in the minutes from back in 1969 or in the 60's whenever that came about. No minutes, no explanation of what criteria you are supposed to look at, what factors they are supposed to apply, what is the standard of review. It is very vague – it either needs to be eliminated or explained with some specific factors. Chairman Smith stated so this says if they are on a corner lot that faces residential it has to go to Zoning Board of Appeals. Law Director Graves added for approval of the size and location of the building. That is only in B1 and you know the current

situation up there with the Dollar General is in B2 but B2 zoning says they have to comply with everything that is in B1. Chairman Smith stated with the Zoning Board of Appeals though is if they don't meet certain criteria? Law Director Graves stated that is why there is very little authority in cases, there is very little legal authority on how they are supposed to apply this because everything out there that the Zoning Board of Appeals is looking are appeals of the Building Inspector decision or if they are seeking a variance from the code where you have to apply practical difficulties in the Duncan versus Middlefield factors or you are looking for undue hardship. There is nothing, they are almost doing like a Planning Commission review where they try to argue the Master Plan – things like that. The problem you have with that is Council didn't give any further explanation in 19-whatever when they passed this but what Council did do was in 1969 they zoned it B2. We know that with all the rights and privileges that go along with a B2 zoning. Chairman Smith stated I don't understand why it would even go to the Zoning Board of Appeals because you are not appealing to anything, you are not appealing any part of the code. Law Director Graves explained this is the problem you have, you are trying to figure out what was the intent when they did that and we can only speculate on what they were thinking. Chairman Smith asked what do think they were thinking? Law Director Graves answered I can't find when this was actually passed. I know it was zoned B2 in 1969, this language was already there. I know it had been amended several times but this language was not the portion that was amended – it was still there. So I am thinking this went into the code sometime in the early to mid 60's and if you go back to that period of time in Sheffield Lake you probably had a part-time Building Inspector. Maybe they just felt that if you are going to put a business on a corner lot that abuts residential they just wanted the extra level of scrutiny – that you are going to come before BZA to make sure that it is meeting all of our frontage, setbacks, sideyard, percentage of lot coverage, height of buildings because it is specific to size and location of building. Chairman Smith stated so they probably put that in as a double check so the Zoning Board of Appeals looks at it and says yes you do meet all these requirements. Law Director Graves concurred right just as a double check on the Building Inspector. That is one interpretation but it could have been other things – that is just one theory. Who knows what they were thinking when this language went in there but it has been in there a long time. Service Director Smith advised is it in the Charter or is it in the? Law Director Graves answered no it is just in the ordinance. Chairman Smith asked have you gone back to the minutes back in the 60's? Law Director Graves answered oh yes with this Dollar General litigation – I pulled everything we could possibly think of and there is nothing there. I found the actual minutes when some of those codes were, I found all the minutes and everything when it was rezoned B2 from residential. Not a whole lot of explanation in that and I found minutes in

Planning Commission and everything when the codes were amended but nothing on that specific phase. Chairman Smith asked it doesn't say anything about like you say what is the zoning for just the location and the size? Law Director Graves answered nobody knows – this is the crux of the matter – nobody knows what the intent was, nobody what standard they are supposed to apply and there is plenty of case law out there that says when there is a vague and ambiguous zoning ordinance it is supposed to be interpreted in favor of the applicant or the property owner. Zoning laws are a taking away of your own personal property rights. So if they are not specific. Law Director Graves stated this is an issue that is going to be litigated, they are going to more than likely appeal. Chairman Smith asked they are going to appeal what – this piece that we have right here. Law Director Graves answered no the BZA's decision of the Dollar General case and we are kind of getting away from the discussion. This is the clause that gave rise to the whole issue. Chairman Smith asked do we get rid of it now or would it look better to do something with it later? Law Director Graves answered Council needs to decide if they want this extra level of review on corner business lots that abuts residential and if you do then you need to put specific criteria and standards in there. If you don't think it is necessary then it should be repealed but leaving it the way it is is just a recipe for more confusion and problems. So it either needs to be clarified or it needs to be repealed. Councilman Kovach stated this really has no effect on what went on prior to this anyways. Law Director Graves concurred no they were bound by the code as it existed when they made their initial application. Chairman Smith asked if we have the Planning Commission do some sort of site plan review that we are doing then this item here really will not need to be in there if we are expanding the role in Planning Commission. So why don't we deal with this and then that will determine whether we just get rid of this, it will go hand in hand. Once we get the site plan review then we can say well this is what – we don't need this anymore because it is incorporated into that. Councilman Kovach advised I don't think we need as it stands anyhow because. Chairman Smith asked or do you want to just put an ordinance to repeal that being there anyway. Councilman Kovach stated that piece he could probably go ahead and repeal because like I said it is totally problematic. I listened to this whole thing well over a year, I don't know how many more pieces of property that this really affects in this city anyways but it makes no sense and if you were to follow the opinion that you have made or your opinion of what they might have felt that there was just a stop-cap for a double check for a part-time Building Inspector which was the norm back then which is not the case now where we have full-time plus you have your other options. Chairman Smith added plus they have to meet certain criteria anyway and if they meet it all there is no sense in going back to the Zoning Board of Appeals Councilman Kovach added and it would potentially eliminate any problems affected by this in the future. Chairman Smith stated I think we have enough

things with the building code and everything else to where it is kind of double checked and then we are going to have a site plan review but there is really no reason to go back to Zoning Board of Appeals because your not appealing to anything, you are following the code the way the code is. I understand what you are saying there is no reason for it to go back to Zoning Board. Councilman Kovach suggested that why don't you draw up legislation for a repeal which we can take in front of Worksession and for three readings. Law Director Graves stated there is only two ways to interpret that; either it was meant as just a double check – they meet our codes or it was meant as like a veto even where they do meet all of our codes. Now if you are going to sit up here as the Zoning Board of Appeals and tell a business no you are not allowed to come in even though you meet all our other codes then you better have specific criteria of why you are denying it. Councilman Kovach advised I think perhaps you ought to phrase we have already attempted to use this as a veto or at least that is the felling I got on this over the last year I don't see fairing. Chairman Smith stated I would think the interpretation would be as a double check just to make sure they meet all the codes. But we are going to have a site plan review and there is no reason for it in my mind that it would go back to Zoning Board of Appeals personally. I would say draw up legislation and repeal it, we will go through the 3 readings and discuss it at Worksession. We are going to do it in site plan review.

***1351; dangerous building code – is lengthy and cumbersome. Needs review/revise to tighten up process for demolition*** – Law Director Graves stated what I think we ought to do is take a look at the way other communities the way they treat the dangerous building ordinance. The dangerous building ordinance that we currently have I think goes back pretty far. Chairman Smith advised this is for demolition. Law Director Graves concurred right this is for condemnation and demolition. There is a lot of cumbersome processes in there, portions of this go back to 66 and some go back to 71, 78. It could be streamlined a lot more like a lot of communities do. There is a lot of cumbersome process to this. Chairman Smith stated you brought this to Ordinance because you thought that being that you are going through the process. Law Director Graves added and the Building Inspector too, we talked about it – it is just very unworkable and cumbersome. Chairman Smith advised why don't you come up with some sort of a plan of what you think want to do to streamline it so we can kind of go over it and see if it makes sense. If we get those we get an idea of what we are looking at.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

***Parking on berm of narrow road destroying the berm and if there is tile it destroys the underground*** – Service Director Smith advised the treelawn parking issue seems to be under control with what the Police Department has been doing, the Building Department and I don't believe we need any further ordinance or legislation. That is my opinion because its starting to be pretty effective.

Councilman Kovach stated we have enough ordinances in place to take care of it, we don't need another one. Service Director Smith concurred correct. **REMOVE.**

**Front-yard parking** – 351.21; needs to be under parking violations. Law Director Graves stated 351.21 is recreational vehicles districts, it is under parking and it does have penalties. Chairman Smith advised there is an ordinance about front-yard parking David but what they do is 351.21 is recreational vehicles in residential districts but then it says no individual corporation shall be parked in any front yard as defined in 1111.04. So I think this is the parking but it says recreational vehicles but it also includes all vehicles. Law Director Graves stated so it just needs to be retitled because it is more than just recreational vehicles – it is all motor vehicles. Service Director Smith stated so it is a correction. Councilman Kovach asked is 1111.04 is that the actual parking? Law Director Graves advised no those are definitions. But 301.2 just defines any motor vehicle so it just any front yard as defined in 1111 which is the zoning code – that is going to define the front yard and then it says any motor vehicle as defined in 301.2 which says all motor vehicles. You might be right, it might just need to be retitled. Chairman Smith stated I will look into it a little more, I will keep this on. I will go through some ordinances and see if I can't find anything for parking and see if this is where it is all combined into one. I am pretty sure that this is what this is for. Law Director Graves stated people are probably getting a ticket for parking in the front yard and the ticket is saying recreational vehicle and it is not a camper. Chairman Smith stated when they are ticketing the people in the front yard, find out what part they are ticketing. The people are saying this says recreational vehicles? I think that is the issue, you might want to check.

**Soliciting** – complaints from residents; senior citizens, people coming way too late in the evening especially in fall and winter. Chairman Smith advised this was brought because people can come until 9 o'clock at night and I think it was to get an ordinance to reduce the time. Service Director Smith stated I thought when they were talking about it the Mayor was considering just eliminating the soliciting. Chairman Smith stated I think Rick brought this up and they wanted to reduce the time down because like the 6 o'clock – you are done. None of this 9 o'clock at night beating on your doors in the winter time when it is dark out, they wanted the time shortened down. Way too late in the evening especially in the fall and winter. There was a brief review of times. Law Director Graves advised it is Monday through Friday from 9 am to 7 pm. Chairman Smith advised I get them on the weekends all the time. Service Director Smith advised I get them at dinner time all the time – 6:30 pm. Law Director Graves read code and advised if they are just informational, they are not restricted at all. But if they are selling something, they are restricted. I mean 7 o'clock seems a lot later in the winter time then in the summer time. If they are coming around like now then it is not a big deal. Service Director Smith stated people don't get home until 5 o'clock so I think it is a fair

window – it is either whether you support it or you support the green river ordinance. Chairman Smith stated for some reason I thought they were coming like at 9 o'clock at night. Councilman Kovach stated maybe certain people were showing up. In thinking of what goes on on my street, mostly I will see like kids coming around or perhaps or Church of Latter Day Saints or Jehovah's on a weekend. Law Director Graves asked you guys have gone door-to-door for petitions, have you ever gone out after 7. I know I did when I ran. Service Director Smith advised I have people coming with toy boxes selling toys and books at all times and hours. Law Director Graves advised well that is wrong, if you are selling something you can't go after 7 but petitions or political or censuses; things like that you can go. Councilman Kovach advised the kids you are talking about, when I mostly see them is on the weekends. Law Director Graves advised they aren't supposed to be selling anything on Saturdays or Sundays or any holidays. Service Director Smith stated well that means it is not being enforced right? That is the real answer, it is not being enforced. Chairman Smith advised I will bring it up at Worksession. Councilman Kovach stated we probably need to work on that anyways because I think what you will find thought is that quite a bit of the time you have got your scouts going around and a lot of the kids going around either from Brookside selling or doing some fund raising which they are doing on the weekends. Them I have seen but it is usually during the day but never have I seen any of these people at 8 or 9 o'clock at evening. Service Director Smith advised I could bring my neighbors and they would tell you stories. Chairman Smith stated I am going to bring it up at Worksession with Rick or Dennis.

***Tile in ditches; no code for catch basin or standup within that 100 feet*** – Service Director Smith explained that is why so many of these streets have tiled ditches with no road drains on them to take care of the surface water. I don't know why that was and I checked with Jon Wiblin and he agreed, he said the same thing – it has always kind of been basically a verbal. I checked with the Road Department and they make a suggestion but recently over on Hollywood in the I believe 700 block we had 2 issues; 2 neighbors tiled their ditches and called Pat to set the grade and they did everything on a weekend and they finished it up and they put no standup's. I sent a letter out saying they had to put standup's because they are destroying the road, water is pooling there and has nowhere to drain. So I would like to Ordinance Committee to look at possibly putting in the ordinance that allows the ditches to be filled in and set by grade that either a double wall 12-inch standup and/or a catch basin with a grate lid as required per application by the Service Department or the Service Director and the grade and the standup and catch basins must be approved by the Service Director or his designee before covering the ditch. I would like to get that possibly in ordinance form. We can discuss it on-going but I don't want this to slip through the cracks. Councilman Kovach asked is that possibly in the application but not by ordinance? Service

Director Smith answered I couldn't find it anywhere, he said that to me a couple weeks ago and I have been looking since and I still can't find it. I checked with Pat and I also checked with Jon Wiblin and they both agreed – there is no requirement for a standup or catch basin. Chairman Smith advised I will check myself too and I don't have a problem putting that in there but when I did mine I got a copy of an ordinance that was attached. Service Director Smith stated no we were told to put them in. Chairman Smith advised no I got an ordinance with the thing that I had to follow. Law Director Graves stated didn't the procedure used to be that you got a petition together, everybody got their money together and then the city did it? Service Director Smith stated no. Law Director Graves advised the city did it on Oakwood. Councilman Kovach advised there was one time and Bill was doing it where he was actually setting it, there was no program but there was a time when he was doing that. I believe they did it on Kenilworth. Service Director Smith advised they did it on Robinwood because I petitioned all my neighbors in 1995. Law Director Graves advised they did it on Oakwood, it is one thing if the city does it then the city can make sure that it is done correctly. Service Director Smith stated I believe that is why my street has standup's every lot. We have an on-going issue where homeowner's apply to fill their ditch and they are going to pay a contractor to do it; I have had 3 of them on Lafayette alone in the last 12 months and they bring a contractor in and the only it requires is the city has to set the grade of the pipe. Councilman Kovach stated let's just make it short and simple, David research it and if this isn't there then draw up some legislation. I don't think we will get any slack, we will just do it. Law Director Graves advised the only question I have is do you want to continue to let private individuals fill in their own ditches? Then you are in a situation where are the following the code, are we going to inspect it? Councilman Kovach answered we set the grade, he just wants final approval to inspect it. Chairman Smith advised it is not a problem because they have to meet double wall pipe. Law Director Graves stated right but we have to make sure they do – that is the point, you got to go out there. Chairman Smith answered they have been. Service Director Smith stated we have been, according to what the code is. The code is insufficient, the code says nothing about a standup. Law Director Graves asked you have you have no problem doing all the extra inspections and making sure that residents. Service Director Smith advised we inspect the pipe before it goes in, what is the difference if the pipe is in there or the pipe has a T in it with a standup. Chairman Smith advised you are going to have to inspect it whether it is a contractor or the city. Councilman Kovach advised you just want to ordinance updated really. Service Director Smith advised I am dealing with roads that closed ditches with no standup's; Roberts Street, both sides of the street. Chairman Smith advised Steve said it correctly, just research it and if there is nothing in the ordinance then put something together. I don't think there will be any issues. Service Director Smith advised I will get the



information for David. Councilman Kovach advised I think you are just looking to update your ordinance that is already there. Chairman Smith asked I only have one question on that, is there an issue or do you think there is an issue that when they do cover up their pipe and when you set the grade not of the pipe but there should be something in there to set the final grade to either road level, above road level because what is happening is they get their grade set and then they come in and bring dirt and build it up 4 inches higher than the road and it blocks everything. Service Director Smith advised the ordinance on the pipe and I don't have it in front of me, the ordinance on the pipe has to do with not to impede the flow. The city sets the grade so that the flow of the street is not needed. It doesn't say anything about that it is a certain road height or an inch or anything like that. Chairman Smith advised see if you might want to add something about final grade. I think if you put final grade must be set to road level. Service Director Smith advised I think the final grade needs to be set lower than road level, not at road level or above road level. Chairman Smith stated I agree because you have to have a place for it to drain to. Service Director Smith advised the guy over on Hollywood put 2-3 inch pieces of pipe sticking sideways to drain the road off his 12-inch double wall because the ordinance doesn't say it. But David is correct about Oakwood, they have them in there and there is no standup's whatsoever and that is where the road is destroyed. Law Director Graves stated what happened to all of them on Oakwood is the treelawn's slope up from the road and they will put a drain but the drain is probably 6 inches higher than the road. Service Director Smith stated I went looking for the drains today at Oakwood and I couldn't find any.

***Incentives to draw businesses*** – Service Director Smith advised we had a business that wanted to come into the city; relocate from another city and come into the city. This business owner would have created 17 full-time jobs here in the City of Sheffield Lake and there was no way an incentive package for relief from city ordinances that the Mayor could offer to them to lure this business to relocate here, build new here. We found out that there isn't anything that allows the Mayor to negate tap-in fee's or anything to in some way lure a business in. If the city so chooses that they just want to be stand-off and not realize that we compete with other cities for businesses. But we got to have some type of system in place that allows for incentives to be, when it is in the best interest of the city to be give it and I think David had tapped on that with the CRA zone. I was hoping that maybe we could explore an option that gives the Mayor some type of authority over ordinances that are requiring permits or fees that he could negate them in certain situations and maybe legally if that was possible or not, to give some type of incentive for a company to relocate. It is not a lot of money. Chairman Smith stated I don't think that deleting fees that everybody else has to pay, maybe some type of tax incentive or something but just to start relieving fees and things.

Service Director Smith advised I just used that as an example, my point is when that situation arises the Mayor has nothing that he can do instantly to do that. Law Director Graves advised one of the things that we talked about and we are going to put together the CRA package once we get the housing study squared away. Once that is in place we will be able to enter into agreements with new business to offer tax abatements/for new construction and expansion. We are working on that, so that would be an economic development incentive. But one of the things that we had talked about was maybe not waving these fees for commercial but maybe the ability to have a payment plan or something like that that would alleviate the direct. So total costs was like \$7000.00. Service Director Smith concurred a little under \$7000.00. Law Director Graves continued so if someone wants to come in and try and build a building they are looking at over \$7000.00 in just hookups and tap-ins and things. If those maybe could be if the Mayor would have the authority to say well we will let you make \$50.00 a month payments on that. I don't know, it is just an idea. Service Director Smith advised just an incentive but we did run into the problem and the issue was raised if we didn't have anything and then we kind of looked around and other city's do things but they don't talk about it, they don't tell everybody what they do. Chairman Smith asked are you just talking strictly fees or what because how are our fee's compared to all the other communities? Service Director Smith answered comparable. Chairman Smith asked can he do that make payment plans, why wouldn't he be able to make payment plans – does he have the authority to do that? Law Director Graves answered arguably, we talked about it. Service Director Smith stated but in a situation that would create less of a start-up financial burden on a company that wants to build. Law Director Graves advised the problem is the way Bill Gardner had a lot of these ordinances written was to – they actually kind of work against incentivizing building. They actually work to ensure payment, in a way a lot of the language reads is all fees must be received before any construction begins or something to that degree. The direction that Len would prefer would be you could start with a payment plan agreement. If you make these payments over time to the city and it would alleviate some of that upfront costs. Service Director Smith advised tax abatement is the same way, you give a company tax abatement they are guaranteeing to have employees for how many years. Law Director Graves advised when you agree a tax abatement agreement, they would agree to create a certain number of jobs or retain a certain number of jobs over 10 years and that would be reviewed annually by a housing counsel and if they were not meeting their obligations the abatement could be terminated and you would have the ability to go back after them for all the unpaid taxes. It is tough to do that though because you would be penalizing a business already struggling. Chairman Smith stated it is something to look into, I wouldn't have a problem with you know like \$7000.00 worth of fees and say you know you got a year or two pay. I don't think spreading over 10 years, that seems

like an awful lot. Service Director Smith stated well let's say 5 years. But to not recognize that if the business is new construction for businesses is a competitive market. It is competitive and if we sit here and build walls up and say basically hey we don't want business here – that is what we are saying when we have no type of incentive. I think the CRA is awesome and I think that is great, I think being able to offer tax abatement – it's great and why we don't have it now I don't know. Chairman Smith stated I don't have a problem looking at it, we will put it on the agenda and kick some ideas around and see if we can come up with some ideas. Councilman Kovach stated verify the legality of what you want to do of all aspects, not just a loan persay/elimination or reduction in fee's or time payment in fee's. Decide what will possibly what will work best for the administration of it and bring that package to us. Chairman Smith stated I think that if you really look at an incentive, you are looking for the Mayor to have some sort of clout when he says something. You want for him to look at the situation and say this guy is going to come to town, each situation is going to be different, the Mayor needs some sort of flexibility in order to offer incentives – whatever would work best for that business but you want to limit this, this and this and I don't know how you would come with that. I think that every business that comes is different, every need is different. Service Director Smith stated David has stated that and David and I have had multiple talks and conversations regarding this. This is for the Mayor to have some type of economic benefit or economic development package that he can offer to a business that is contemplating whether or not to come to Sheffield Lake or not. We have kind of found out that we have no incentives that the Mayor can offer anybody. **Chairman Smith advised put on the agenda.**

**CITIZEN'S COMMENTARY: None.**

**All ordinances before Council at this time:**

**MEETING ADJOURNED:** With no further business before this committee,  
\*Motion by Kovach/Second by Smith to adjourn at 8:10 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/COMMITTEES**

*Kay Fantauzzi*

I, Kay Fantauzzi, duly appointed Clerk of Committee  
Of Sheffield Lake DO HEREBY CERTIFY that this

---

**CHAIRMAN**

*Alan Smith*

Is a true and exact copy of the Minutes of the  
Ordinance Committee of June 6, 2013.

---

COUNCIL PRESIDENT

*Rick Rosso*

*and/or*

---

COUNCIL PRO TEM

*Eric S Elliott*