

Minutes

Clark County Board of Zoning Appeals

Regular Meeting ~ 2:00 p.m.
Thursday January 22, 2025

Springview Government Center
3130 East Main Street
Springfield, Ohio 45505

Mr. Paul Hazlett called the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. and asked for a Roll Call.

Present For Roll Call: Mr. Paul Hazlett, Mr. Gerald Shaw, Mr. Tom Frank, Ms. Breanne
Parcels, and Mr. Tom Duffee

Absent For Roll Call: None

Also in Attendance: Mrs. Stephanie Dunlap and Ms. Rachel Ward of Clark County Community &
Economic Development.

Chairperson Hazlett reminded everyone to sign in and asked everyone to turn off their
cellphones. Mrs. Dunlap then asked if the board would like to elect the Chairperson and Vice-
Chairperson.

Motion to appoint Mr. Paul Hazlett as Chairperson of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Motion by Mr. Duffee, seconded by Ms. Parcels, to **appoint** Mr. Paul Hazlett as
Chairperson of the Clark County Board of Zoning Appeals for 2026.

VOTE: Yes: Mr. Duffee, Ms. Parcels, Mr. Frank, and Mr. Shaw

No: None

Abstain: Mr. Hazlett

Motion carried.

Motion to appoint Mr. Tom Duffee as Vice-Chairperson of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Motion by Chairperson Hazlett, seconded by Mr. Parcels, to **appoint** Mr. Tom Duffee as
Vice-Chairperson of the Clark County Board of Zoning Appeals for 2026.

VOTE: Yes: Mr. Frank, Mr. Shaw, Chairperson Hazlett, and Ms. Parcels

No: None

Abstain: Mr. Duffee

Motion carried.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if there was any discussion of the minutes from December 18, 2025.

Approval of the December 18, 2025 Minutes

Motion by Mr. Shaw, seconded by Mr. Frank to **approve** the minutes.

VOTE: Yes: Mr. Shaw, Mr. Frank, Chairperson Hazlett

No: No

Motion carried.

Chairperson Hazlett and Mrs. Dunlap explained how the meeting would be conducted, and then asked that the first case for the meeting be introduced.

Case #BZA-2026-01 ~ Property Owners: Theresa Siejack ~ Agent: Mark Scholl ~ Location: 4690 Urbana Rd.; Moorefield Township ~ Request: Variance to Chapter 2 Section 216.06.02 to reduce the side and rear setback requirements for a MU-2 Mixed Use District from 20 feet to 10 feet and a Variance to Chapter 5 Section 501.02 to allow for a graveled parking lot.

Mrs. Dunlap introduced the case. She showed the property location along Urbana Road and noted that it was 12.04 acres. She also noted that the variances were part of the approval of the property's rezoning from PD-M Planned Development-Mixed Use to MU-2 Mixed Use-High Intensity, and that the rezoning was official as of last week. The PD-M district had no setback requirements in the zoning code, but the MU-2 district did, so the variance would bring them into compliance with the MU-2 district. The surrounding zoning is primarily A-1 Agricultural with I-1 Industrial across the road. The Comprehensive Plan called for mixed-use low-intensity in the area. Urbana Road is a Primary Arterial with a right-of-way of 100 feet. She showed a site plan with the locations of the variances requested highlighted. The MU-2 district required side and rear setbacks of 20 feet, and there were a few buildings that did not meet that. She also said that they were looking to continue the existing use of gravel parking; no expansions were planned. She showed the zoning code that stipulated the setbacks and the requirement for paved parking, as well as the findings of facts. The Engineer had no objections, but noted that stormwater management reports and site plans would be needed for any new impervious surfaces, that an easement would be needed to allow the northern planned parcel to continue to use the gravel parking that would be on the southern property, and any new driveways would need approval.

Ms. Parcels asked if the gravel parking was already present. Mrs. Dunlap answered that it was extant overflow parking and that the applicant could speak to how it was used

Mr. Duffee asked if the lot that the gravel parking would be on would be owned by another party. Mrs. Dunlap deferred to the applicant on the subject. He then said that the easement required by the Engineer typically involved ownership by a third party. Mrs. Dunlap clarified that the Engineer was making the request as a condition of the lot split, so that in the event that the lot is sold access will be preserved.

Mr. Shaw asked if the case was being decided based on MU-2 zoning. Mrs. Dunlap said yes, and he asked if the 15 foot wide perimeter of screening mentioned in the zoning would also be required. Mrs. Dunlap said that screening wasn't strictly defined, and as there were well-developed treelines bordering the mostly undeveloped neighboring properties, that would be considered sufficient. Mr. Shaw then asked again if that was considered acceptable under the zoning requirements and noted the specific section as 216.06.04. Mrs. Dunlap said that it was a little strange, but there was already screening. She said the Board could add a variance for the 15 feet of screening, but that it wasn't needed because they were already requesting the ten-foot setback and that the section was not well-written. She also noted that the intent of the screening section was being met by the current level of screening if the intent was to provide a physical and visual barrier.

The public portion of the meeting was opened at 2:18 p.m.

Minutes

Clark County Board of Zoning Appeals

Theresa Siejack, of 4690 Urbana Road, was sworn in. She noted that there was a creek directly behind the property, as well as farmland. Chairperson Hazlett asked what the treehouses were, and Ms. Siejack said that it was lodging. Mr. Duffee asked what the plan was for the second parcel with the overflow parking. Ms. Siejack said that her plan was to keep it the way it was. He then asked if she understood what the Engineer wanted with the easement, and she said that it was her understanding that it would be needed if there was further development. She also said that the overflow parking was only used a couple of times a year. Mrs. Dunlap explained that the easement was the same request as the one made in the rezoning and would be needed in the event of a sale of either parcel to a different owner. Having it done now would prevent it from being missed at the time of sale. Ms. Siejack asked if she would need to do it now, and Mrs. Dunlap said she would need to work with Mark Scholl on it and on the other easements for the utilities as needed, and that they would need to be done before the lotsplit.

Ms. Parcels asked if the parcels were serviced by public sewer and private water, and Ms. Siejack said yes. Ms. Parcels then asked if there were wells on both properties, and Ms. Siejack said there were not. Ms. Parcels asked if the health department had weighed in about the need to install a second well, and Ms. Siejack said that "it made perfect sense." Ms. Parcels noted that the well was marked on the survey, and that it said something about a water valve, and then asked again if it was on public water. Ms. Siejack said no.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if the area that the overflow parking was on was vacant. Ms. Siejack said that the area around it was agricultural. Chairperson Hazlett asked if she was letting someone grow hay or farm it, and she said yes. She added that it had access coming from the road, but that in the event of a larger wedding the gravel parking was needed. He then asked why the setbacks were needed, and Ms. Siejack said it was because of the buildings that were already there.

Mrs. Dunlap added that there would be one additional building that would need to be included in the variance because it would be too close to the planned lot split boundary between the parcels.

Mr. Shaw asked whether there were three tree houses on the property, and Ms. Siejack said yes. Mr. Shaw asked if she was planning to put in two more, and she said that she was zoned for two more and had been for years. The existing treehouses were 13 years old.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if there was anyone else in favor of the project who wanted to speak. Steven Coppess, of 225 E. Main Street, Medway, Ohio, was sworn in. Mr. Coppess stated that he was an elected official in Bethel township but in this case was speaking on his own behalf and asked what the plat. Mrs. Dunlap told him that it was the Simon Kenton Inn. Chairperson Hazlett asked if there was anyone else in favor of the project who wanted to speak.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if there was anyone else in favor of the project who wished to speak. Hearing none, he asked if there was anyone against the project who wished to speak. Hearing none, public comment was closed at 2:25 p.m.

Chairperson Hazlett had no issues with the project. Ms. Parcels noted that the lot split could be for tax purposes.

Action on Case #BZA-2026-01 ~ Property Owners: Theresa Siejack ~ Agent: Mark Scholl ~ Location: 4690 Urbana Rd.; Moorefield Township ~ Request: Variance to

Chapter 2 Section 216.06.02 to reduce the side and rear setback requirements for a MU-2 Mixed Use District from 20 feet to 10 feet and a Variance to Chapter 5 Section 501.02 to allow for a graveled parking lot.

Motion by Mr. Duffee, seconded by Mr. Parcels to **Approve** the variance request, adding the existing lodging that would eventually be 15 feet from a parcel line with a future lot split.

VOTE: Yes: Mr. Duffee, Ms. Parcels, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Frank

No: None

Motion carried

Chairperson Hazlett said that Staff would be in touch with the applicant. He then asked Mrs. Dunlap to present the next case. Mrs. Dunlap asked to present both of the next cases together, as they were directly related, which was permitted. The votes would occur separately for each case.

Case #BZA-2026-02 ~ Property Owners/Applicants: Dear Dinah Inc~ Location: 500 Quick Road; Bethel Township ~ Request: Conditional Use under Chapter 7 Section 711 for a Campground

and

Case #BZA-2026-03 ~ Property Owners/Applicants: Dear Dinah Inc~ Location: 500 Quick Road; Bethel Township ~ Request: Variance to Chapter 10 Section 1001 "Campground" to allow residents to stay on-site for up to two years, conditional on approval of the Conditional Use

Mrs. Dunlap presented the cases. She showed the site location along Quick Road, which was 18.99 acres. The property was zoned A-1 Agricultural, and was surrounded by A-1 Agricultural, I-1 Industrial to the north and across the road, and OA Office-Apartment in New Carlisle across the road. There was also more I-1 and R-1 Rural Residential down the road. Ms. Parcels asked if the OA zoned parcel was a cemetery, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes. She showed an area map with the property highlighted in yellow. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the area as Rural/Agricultural. Quick Road is a Collector Road with a ROW of 60 feet. She showed the applicant narrative, which was provided to the board with the staff report, and noted that the county defined the tiny homes that the applicant planned to use as recreational vehicles, which were required to be parked in a campground when used. She also explained that the specifications for a campground were found in Section 711 of the zoning code, while the specification that a stay could only be 60 days was found in the definitions section. Section 711 contained the portion of the code that stated that the BZA could regulate the length of stay, which played into the conditional use and the variance. Ms. Parcels asked if campgrounds were also regulated by the Ohio Department of Health, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes. She showed the site plan and findings of facts. The applicant was proposing to have 10 tiny homes on the property. The Health District had no objections, and stated that the applicant would need to work with the Ohio Department of Health regarding water and sewer. GIS stated that each home would need a separate unit number for 911 purposes. The Engineer deferred to the board, but noted that a site plan and stormwater management report would need to be reviewed and approved by the Engineer, an easement and maintenance agreement for the driveway would be needed as it went through another property, and trees and brush should be removed for better visibility. A public comment was received from a township trustee acting as a

private citizen with some thoughts about the property. Legal counsel noted that the BZA could not require the housing to be women only, and could not discriminate against families with children either as those would violate the Fair Housing Act. Other public comment was received and given to the board by email and by hardcopy.

Ms. Parcels asked if there was floodplain on the parcel. Mrs. Dunlap said no, and then showed that the nearest floodplain was across the road.

Mr. Duffee asked what zoning changes would be required if the ten tiny homes were permanently sited. Mrs. Dunlap explained that at that point there would be some kind of rezoning needed, because that sort of use would not be permitted in the agricultural district. In this case, she would recommend going to a Planned Development so it could be tailored to their needs, but other options would be R-4 or condos, but the subdivision process would be needed at that point after the rezoning. The campground was chosen because the applicant had intended from the start to use the portable tiny homes, and the campground was the only place that those could be.

Ms. Parcels asked if the occupants would own the trailers or if Dear Dinah would. Mrs. Dunlap deferred to the applicant.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if the property was being used as a campground currently, and Mrs. Dunlap said no. Chairperson Hazlett then asked if this was a "baseline proposal," and Mrs. Dunlap said yes.

Mr. Shaw asked whether New Carlisle was across the street from the parcel, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes, the OA and some of the I-1 were part of New Carlisle.

Ms. Parcels asked about utilities, and Mrs. Dunlap deferred to the applicant but said that she thought that discussion had determined that running utilities from New Carlisle was not feasible.

Chairperson Hazlett opened the public portion of the meeting at 2:37 p.m.

Josh Reed, of 536 Quick Road, was sworn in. Chairperson Hazlett asked him to walk through exactly what was being asked for. Mr. Reed said that Dear Dinah was a non-profit that existed to serve female victims of human trafficking. He said that they had been around for 5 years and operated a house in Dayton that is a drop-in center for homeless and vulnerable populations, but wanted to make a lower-cost place for long-term transitional housing for the women they served to find community and heal without the distractions of a typical transitional residence. The up to two years was required to give time for healing and for the ministry to find them resources and community.

Ms. Parcel asked who would own the homes, and he said that Dear Dinah would.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if the tiny homes would be "park models" that were more like a home than travel trailers, and Mr. Reed said yes, they would be approximately 287 square feet. Chairperson Hazlett then asked about plans for security. (42:29) Mr. Reed said that there would be gated access, limited access to the property and 24/7 monitored surveillance cameras. Chairperson Hazlett asked if the plan was to have the women live there for 2 years, and Mr. Reed said that was not the goal; the plan was for the women to stay for the length of time that they needed. Chairperson Hazlett then asked what the "comfort zone" was, and Mr. Reed said that it was difficult to have a specific time frame given all of the comorbid issues the women

would face. Chairperson Hazlett then asked if the applicant was still comfortable with the two year limit, and Mr. Reed said yes.

Ms. Parcels asked who owned the property where the driveway would be. Mr. Reed said that he and his wife did. She then asked if the gate would be off of Quick Road or at the parcel boundary, and Mr. Reed said that would be negotiable. She then asked how they would comply with Health District regulations requiring the campground be inspected on a regular basis. He said that he has not considered that.

Chairperson Hazlett asked where the utilities would come from. Mr. Reed said that a new septic system would need to be put in along with a new well and new electric.

Mr. Duffee asked whether he lived at 536 Quick Road. Mr. Reed said yes, and Mr. Duffee then asked how long he had lived there. Mr. Reed said that he had lived there since May of 2025. He then asked whether they had purchased the other property, and Mr. Reed said that it had been donated to the ministry. Mr. Duffee asked how the security cameras would be monitored, and Mr. Reed said that they would be monitored by volunteers, specifically male volunteers. Mr. Duffee asked if they had social workers and counselors on-staff. Mr. Reed said that they did not have any on-staff but had connections to local resources they worked with. When asked to expand, Mr. Reed said that they were local licensed counselors and social workers that had already agreed to work with the ministry, and that the ministry would cover any costs. Mr. Duffee asked if he meant Dayton when he said "local," and Mr. Reed said that he meant the greater Dayton area. Mr. Duffee asked if the ministry mostly operated in Dayton, and Mr. Reed said yes.

Mr. Duffee asked if there was a comparable model that he could cite, especially with the tiny homes on trailers. Mr. Reed said that there was not, and the reason they were using this model was because of the recidivism and failures they had seen from typical models. He added that he was a licensed counselor who had directed group homes before, and that the ministry wanted to offer something distinctly spiritual and Biblical. Mr. Duffee clarified that this was something they had "dreamed up" without a model, and Mr. Reed said yes, and that everything had to start somewhere.

Mr. Duffee asked if he had decided a permanent home was not desirable, and why they would be on trailers. Mr. Reed said yes, and that the trailers were for ease and for lowered cost of access, and that there were no zoning options in general that fit tiny homes. He said that the campground would be the simplest route to using the tiny home structure given that the tiny homes were acceptable at campgrounds. Mr. Duffee asked what his source was that tiny homes would be acceptable at campgrounds, and Mr. Reed said that was per Clark County Zoning.

Mr. Duffee asked if rent would be required. Mr. Reed said that the details were not ironed out, but if there was rent, it would be low cost and so they could give the rent back after the women's stay to help them start their new lives. There would be a rental contract, however. Mr. Duffee asked if each unit would have its own electric service. Mr. Reed said no, because Dear Dinah would pay for all of the electricity. Mr. Duffee then asked if new lines would be run or if they would use his house's junction box, and Mr. Reed said the intent was to run new lines. Mr. Duffee asked if they had been in contact with electric providers, and Mr. Reed said that he had, and that they had other contractor partners willing to assist. Mr. Duffee then asked what the plan for the septic, and whether it would be one system per house or a system for the whole parcel. Mr. Reed said that a study for the septic had not been done as they were looking for

initial approval, but that they were intending “less than ten but probably more than one.” Mr. Duffee noted that usually the Health Department required testing before approval and asked if this was different because it was through the state. Mrs. Dunlap said that it was not uncommon for applicants to not yet have septic approval before they came to the Board, as the Health Department often listed such approval as a condition to the Board’s approval, and that this applicant would have to go through the State instead of through local jurisdiction.

Ms. Parcels noted that anything more than two buildings would require ODH approval to connect to any septic and would require a Permit To Install from the EPA. Mrs. Dunlap said that representatives from Dear Dinah had been to Tech Review meetings and had been given the state-level contacts by the local health department there. She added that she didn’t know if all of the considerations had been ironed out but that it had been well-communicated that they would need to talk to the state. Ms. Parcels asked Mr. Reed if he had investigated the cost of a Permit To Install for ten structures, and he said that he had not, as the health department had stated they would need approval here before they moved forward with the State of Ohio.

Mr. Duffee asked about whether each trailer would have permanent plumbing. Mr. Reed said that each site would have permanent water access but that it would not be permanently installed. Mr. Duffee asked if he meant something like a rubber hose to a spigot, and Mr. Reed said that was essentially correct as the tiny homes connected just like a camper would Ms. Parcels asked if Dear Dinah was prepared to pay for public water system inspections, and Mr. Reed said yes.

Mr. Duffee asked if Dear Dinah thought there were residents ready to move into the housing, and Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee then asked whether he had five people ready to move in. Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee then asked whether the residents would be expected to have cars, and Mr. Reed said yes. He added that there were potential concerns as to whether they would require that but there would be other transportation if they did not. Mr. Duffee asked where the cars would be parked, and Mr. Reed said there would be a small drive next to each site. Mr. Duffee then asked about postal delivery, whether each unit would have its own address, and whether the postal service would be expected to go onto the property. Mr. Reed said that the expectation was that there would be one box out at the road for all of the units, and that the residents could get their mail there. Mr. Duffee asked about lighting. Mr. Reed said that had not been considered, and Mr. Duffee then asked if he thought exterior lighting would be appropriate. Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee then asked if he had thought about how the lighting would be provided or what the “candle-wattage” of the lighting would be. After clarifying if Mr. Duffee meant for street or communal use, Mr. Reed said that every tiny home would have a porch light just like a normal home, but if a condition was made that streetlights be provided, that could be done. Chairperson Hazlett noted that he was thinking more along the lines of safety and security, and asked whether fencing would be installed regarding security. Mr. Reed said that they were not anticipating that fences would be required outside gated access, but that if there was concern from the community that fencing could be installed. Chairperson Hazlett asked if there was “anything in play at this time,” and Mr. Reed said no.

Mr. Duffee asked about pets. Mr. Reed said there would be no pets.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if there would be children, and Mr. Reed said that there would not be; there would be a single occupant per tiny home. Mr. Duffee asked staff whether a restriction could be made for a single occupant in a structure. Mrs. Dunlap said that the private organization could put down restrictions, but per legal counsel, the Board could not stipulate any requirements with regards to men or women or children. Mr. Duffee then clarified that a

woman who already had a child could not come to this location, which Mr. Reed agreed with. Mr. Duffee then asked if this could change in the future, and Mr. Reed said that he didn't want to give a solid answer, but the tiny homes as designed only had room for a single bed with no separate bedroom, so there were no plans to allow children in the future. He noted that one of the letters had recommended no children, and that they were fine with that.

Mr. Duffee asked about expansion. Mr. Reed said that there was no plan for expansion because that would allow more people to slip through the cracks.

Mr. Duffee asked if he was aware of stormwater plan requirements, and Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee asked if he was aware that there were two nationally registered wetlands on the property, and Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee asked if he had any plans to affect the wetlands, and Mr. Reed said no.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if the property was wooded. Mr. Reed said it was heavily wooded on the north side. Chairperson Hazlett asked if the location planned for the campground was elevated, and Mr. Reed said that it was significantly elevated above the wetlands. Chairperson Hazlett then asked about fencing requirements, and Mrs. Dunlap said that the parcel would have to follow zoning requirements. Mr. Duffee asked if the Board could require fencing, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes.

Mr. Reed addressed the email sent that morning. With regards to the idea that the campground allowing multi-year residency is incompatible with the surrounding residential uses due to increased intensity and permanence of use, he said that he understood that the campground request was odd but that the residents would be staying in tiny homes and that two cities in Ohio already allowed tiny homes for multi-year stays, so this was something that was changing in Ohio. With regards to the campground being inconsistent with residential zoning, he said that the land is A-1 surrounding land was A-1 and industrial, that it wasn't surrounded by residential uses, and that there were several businesses between this parcel and the neighborhood to the south. With regards to the loss of neighborhood stability and predictability, he said that the presence of 10 single-occupant tiny homes would increase traffic by 12 cars. With regards to this being an improper expansion of the definition of campground and improper zoning precedent he said that the zoning precedent had already occurred in the cities that had tiny home communities, as far as creating a zoning in Ohio for tiny homes with multi-year stays. With regards to allowing residential occupancy without residential zoning safeguards, he said that this was the attempt to go the easiest route given current zoning in Clark County, and that they were willing to follow any conditions needed. Without this they would likely have to go through the planned development process. He said that there were not anticipated problems with security or with the septic capacity given the parcel's size. He reiterated that there was no plan to expand beyond 10 homes. With regards to increased monitoring, unplanned third-party contact attempts, and heightened emergency response frequency, he said that in the contract there would not be male visitors allowed, and with the gated access third party contacts were not anticipated. He said with regards to the variance requested being the minimum necessary, he reiterated that the time frame was to be comfortable for all residents. He said that with regards to the concern that this would not preserve the essential character of the neighborhood, that the neighborhood in direct contact with the parcel was industrial and agricultural.

Ms. Parcels asked why he claimed that the two cities that had passed tiny home ordinances were precedents when this property was not within a city. Mr. Reed said that they were two locations in Ohio that had allowed a similar tiny home usage and apologized if his language was inaccurate. Ms. Parcels asked which cities those were, and Mr. Reed said that they were

St. Paris and one other. Mrs. Dunlap said that St. Paris had a specific district for tiny home parks, similar to a mobile home park, but that Clark County zoning did not have that. If Clark County did, the applicant could go through a rezoning to the tiny home park district. Ms. Parcels stated that those tiny homes were on municipal utilities and Mrs. Dunlap said that with how Clark County zoning was they had to fall back to the campground zoning.

Mr. Duffee asked if the tiny homes would be on trailers, and Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee asked if the rubber tires would be maintained and if they would be jacked up like a mobile home, and Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee asked whether the residents would have free movement, and Mr. Reed said yes, and that the limitations would be on the property. Mr. Duffee asked if the front gate would be locked to them at any time, and Mr. Reed said no. Mr. Duffee then asked how they planned to police the no-male requirement, and Mr. Reed said that there would be a warning system similar to other contracts, though the specific warning time frames were not yet set in stone, and that responses could include eviction. Mr. Duffee then asked whether the women would be signing a contract saying they would need to attend church, and Mr. Reed said no.

Chairperson Hazlett asked how the land was deeded, and Mr. Reed said it was deeded to the nonprofit.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if there was anyone else in favor, and Mr. Coppess came back to the podium. He said he wasn't sure when he should speak as he was neither for nor against, and said that he was only speaking for himself. He asked if the Fair Housing Act restricted the Board and County's ability to put restrictions on the number of occupants and who could stay. Mrs. Dunlap said that the restrictions were regarding the women and families. Mr. Coppess noted that "only ten houses" was still a concern and that sewer and water had been discussed. He also noted that the applicant and himself had an in-depth conversation when Mr. Coppess had run for office in fall of 2025, and noted that things may have changed since September because the applicant had expressed the possibility of up to 40 houses at that time. He also said that at a recent trustees' meeting, the applicant had made a presentation that stated that due to costs involved, the houses other than the one already made would be built on site. He asked if the houses would be built on a trailer with wheels or on a foundation, and that this gave a different picture of what was going on.

Mr. Coppess also said that he was concerned about the campground zoning, and asked if tiny homes could only go on the campground zoning. Mrs. Dunlap said that as defined tiny homes could only be parked on a campground. Mr. Coppess asked if in the future he would have to go for another kind of zoning, and Mrs. Dunlap said that was if the homes were to be permanently sited. Mr. Coppess thanked her and said that needed to be clarified, and Mrs. Dunlap said that he would be asked about that during the rebuttal. Mr. Coppess also noted that the Dayton Daily News said that tiny homes would be built in Dayton, and noted that much of the funding would be taken care of by city, state and federal entities. Mr. Reed had said that that Dear Dinah would be footing the bill without tax dollars. Mr. Coppess said that this was another instance of a city hopping on the bandwagon, and that other locations were taking care of this zoning with either foresight in zoning code or that the zoning was already there. He asked if the county shouldn't take care of tiny home zoning ahead of time. He also asked if other zoning had not been applied for because in the present zoning code the campground was the only zoning that the proposed use fit, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes. Mr. Coppess then reiterated that his largest concern was that he had been told that the houses would be built on-site and would take years, while today he was hearing that they would be on wheels, and Mrs. Dunlap said that she would ask about that during rebuttal. He finally asked if the body was allowed to put restrictions and

conditions on, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes; all of the Engineer, GIS, and Health Department conditions would be placed on the use if approved, and the board could impose other conditions. Mr. Coppess said that he wasn't sure if the Board could do that or if it had to wait for the county commissioners, and Mrs. Dunlap said that this was the board that made the final decision.

Mr. Reale, of 2000 Persimmon Way, was sworn in. He was with the engineering firm working with the applicant. Chairperson Hazlett asked what they would need for septic and drainage. Mr. Reale said that it depended on the soil, the soil testing and what the soil could sustain. He also noted that the wetlands were located both to the rear of the site and near the road, and also noted that the location of the driveway was to avoid the wetlands. Chairperson Hazlett asked if the health department would make an allowance and Mr. Reale said that it was reasonable to assume that the land could handle the septic. Chairperson Hazlett asked about stormwater, and Mr. Reale said that he was aware that the Engineer's office wanted a stormwater report but that they had not yet gone in-depth on what will be required. They said their standard procedure was to get zoning and site approval before they did the report. Chairperson Hazlett asked if they were anticipating any issues with stormwater. Mr. Reale said no, and that everything would be flowing northeast, away from the site, so it would be easy to add water detention if needed.

Ms. Parcels asked how much impervious surface was being added. Mr. Reale said it would be less than 15,000 square feet.

Mr. Duffee asked whether the driveway would be paved. Mr. Reale said that the intention was gravel, which technically counted as impervious. Mr. Duffee then asked whether the houses would be on cement, and Mr. Reale said that the houses would be on approximately 10 ft. by 30 ft. pads, and that there would also be a pole barn on a cement pad. Mr. Duffee said that he had forgotten the pole barn, and asked if the pole barn would have a cement pad. Mr. Reale said that he wasn't sure, but that he thought it would just be "a structure" without utilities for storage and that he would otherwise defer to the applicant.

Mr. Shaw asked if there was any structure on the property. Mr. Reale said that he thought there was a fenced field but no actual structure. Mr. Shaw asked if there were no tiny homes, and Mr. Reale said that he believed that they had one that was a demo, but no-one was living in it and it was currently in storage.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if the homes were a park model and not storage container conversions, and Mr. Reale said they were a park model.

Mike White, of 301 Quick Road, was sworn in. He said that he had lived in the area for five years and that there was a great need in the area and that he was aware that there had been significant changes in the area. He had also met Josh on his walks and had seen improvement on the property. He said he had three questions. First, he didn't know if the board could limit the number of trailers, but that doing so would be appreciated. Second, he didn't know if the New Carlisle police had been contacted to find out if more police would be needed. Third, he wanted to know if there would be a new tax assessment on this or other properties, though he knew the applicant was a non-profit. He said that he supported the project, though he had some concerns. Chairperson Hazlett asked if he had any concerns about the cars. Mr. White said that some days there were no cars and some days there were many cars depending on the time.

Mr. Duffee asked where he lived on Quick Road. Mr. Wide said that he lived just north of Zeller Drive. Mr. Duffee then asked what was happening with the Eagle's Club. Mr. White didn't know, but Mrs. Dunlap said that it had been rezoned from I-1 to B-3 for an event center.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if he foresaw any issues with the neighborhood. Mr. Wide said no, but reiterated that he had concerns.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if there was anyone else in favor who wanted to speak. Hearing none, he asked if anyone against the project wanted to speak.

Julie Vaughn, of 11748 Zeller Court, was sworn in. She said that she was in support of the mission, but that she had kids and didn't want them to be in danger. She felt that her property was currently secure, and so couldn't support the project in this location. She said that the volunteers could not secure the premises, and that the security would have to be paid for. He asked how they would get around and how the people who would be picking them up would be vetted. She also asked how the men doing the surveillance would be vetted, and whether the women would be comfortable with that. She also asked if family would be allowed and vetted, and asked about substance abuse. Chairperson Hazlett asked where she lived, and she said she lived on Zeller Court.

Ms. Parcels asked if she had collected the signatures that the board had received, and Mrs. Vaughn said yes, and that the neighborhood supported the project but didn't want it so close. Ms. Parcels asked if she understood that the board had not made a decision and so the meeting was not an appeal despite what they had styled the documents as, and Mrs. Vaughn said yes, she did. Chairperson Hazlett asked if this was a conditional use. Mrs. Dunlap said that it was and that the variance for the length of stay up to two years, as the campground definition only allowed for a 60-day stay. Chairperson Hazlett then noted that the conditional use would give the Board the power to revoke the conditional use, and Mrs. Dunlap explained that if the use was approved with conditions, the board could revoke the use if the conditions were not met.

Robert A. Farrell, III, of 11740 Zeller Court, was sworn in. He said that it was dubious at best that there was zero residential area in proximity, as his house was maybe a half mile away. He moved into the area because it was remote, and he had been trying to get away from things like this. He did not want his children near something like this because of the risk involved. He also said that he was concerned about property values and whether this would devalue their properties.

Steven Phillips, of 11764 Zeller Court was sworn in. He said that the Board had answered his first question, which was "what is a conditional use?" He then said that this was a development and that this was subverting the residential developmental process. He felt the proper developmental process needed to be followed, applying all of the proper regulations from all of the departments with proper planning. He was against the plan because he felt this needed better planning. Ms. Parcels asked if a campground should be recreational rather than residential, in his opinion. Mr. Phillips said yes, that he had stayed at a lot of campgrounds, and that such stays were temporary. He felt that our current 60-day zoning was valid, and that after that you would be a permanent resident. This was why the rule was in the code.

Monica Lee, of 11557 Zeller Drive, was sworn in. She had been living in the area for a long time, and said that she hadn't known anything about this. She said that she remembered fighting a shooting range about ten years ago. She asked what the property had been donated

for and how it had been donated. She said after that she would have more questions, and Mrs. Dunlap said that this would be her only chance to testify. She said that she was not in favor.

Marlene Reed, of 224 Quick Road, was sworn in. She said that everyone who had spoken so far was in the housing development, and that she had lived on Quick Road for over 50 years. She said that she had seen many changes, including a church and the development. She said that she was comfortable with the church because she knew what the activities there were, and that the people in the housing development were nice and took care of their properties. She did not get a letter about the project because she did not abut the property; she had found out about it by word-of-mouth. She had attended a meeting at the church about it, and she believed there was a need for the project, but didn't think it was needed on Quick Road. She said that, regarding the gate, there would be a lot of fencing that would be needed and maintained to protect both the women and the community. She also asked if the unmanned gate would be monitored. She noted that the Clark County Sheriff's Department would be responsible for security. They did come up and down the road, but not constantly, and she asked if there would be a need for more security. She said that they would not be able to see the homes there from the road, and said that therefore they may not know what was going on. She said that she knew that it was a nonprofit and that the money for the project came from churches, and asked what would happen if the funding dried up. She also asked if the churches were funding it, why wouldn't the churches allow the homes on their land versus taking farmland for the homes. She asked if "we" would be their community.

Ed Harm, of 11728 Knight Court, was sworn in. He said that there were two sheriffs in the area at best. He said that the crime rate had gone down with the loss of the nursery. He noted that he had a military background, and that he was afraid that the location was unsecurable no matter how much fencing was put in. He was concerned that traffickers would retaliate against the women. He said there was a need but that this wasn't the place for it, and handed a copy of his questions to Chairperson Hazlett.

Jo Newsad, of 11757 Zeller Court, was sworn in. She asked if the residents were survivors of labor trafficking or prostitution trafficking. She also asked if they would be residents of Clark County or if they would come from outside, and if they were from outside of Clark County why were they being brought into the county. She said that 24/7 security would make her feel better, but asked why it was necessary. She asked who the victims needed protected from and if all of the perpetrators would be incarcerated, and how long they would be incarcerated. She noted that she had only found out about the project two days ago and hadn't had long to educate herself about it, and that she didn't want it in her backyard but knew there was a need. She asked how the nearby residents would be protected from the outside influences. She also asked what money other than donations Dear Dinah Inc. had been given, and wanted to know what would happen when the funding was gone. She had read that grant money was available, but didn't know if the applicant had received any of it. She also noted that she had moved here from out-of-state and had specifically looked for a rural neighborhood to retire to.

Mike Workman, of 11673 Knight Court, was sworn in. He noted where he lived and asked what the two-year variance was for. He said that he thought that the trailers were not going to move despite people moving in and out of them. He said that the business plan was underdeveloped. He said that it would be rezoned, and Mrs. Dunlap said that this was not a rezoning, and that a campground was a conditional use of an agricultural district and were approved on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Workman then asked what would happen if this failed, and Mrs. Dunlap said that the zoning would not change but a future owner would have to meet the stipulations that the Board put into place. Mr. Workman asked if the next property owner would have to meet the

conditions, and Mrs. Dunlap said that yes, they would have to meet the conditions as approved. Mr. Workman asked if it would change under new ownership, and Mrs. Dunlap said no; for example, if the Board only said ten trailers could be on the parcel, then a new owner could only put ten trailers on the parcel as well. Mr. Workman then said that the security proposed was “past tense,” that it would only capture things that had already happened. He said that there was a need but that there were better locations.

Susan Harm, of 11728 Knight Court, was sworn in. She asked Ms. Parcels about whether the parcel would be regularly inspected if it were deemed a campground, and Ms. Parcels said that they would be licensed through the Ohio Department of Health, which would then assign it to the Clark County Department of Health for routine inspection. Mrs. Harm asked what the routine inspections were. Ms. Parcels said she didn't know because she didn't represent the health district, but that if they failed three consecutive inspections, the Board of Health could revoke their license. Mrs. Harm asked whether the inspections were once a year, and Ms. Parcels, Mrs. Dunlap, and Chairperson Hazlett said that they did not know. Ms. Parcels added that campground licenses did not transfer with ownership of the property and that a new owner would need a new license. Mrs. Harm asked if the new owner would need to come before the Board again. Mrs. Dunlap said that the conditional use would remain in place, but that the new license would be needed from the State.

Marlene Reed came back to the podium. She asked if the parcel would be rezoned. Mrs. Dunlap explained the difference between permitted uses and conditional uses. Ms. Reed then asked if the campground permit would go with a potential future sale of the property. Mrs. Dunlap said that there were several layers. Zoning was different from the license from the Board of Health. The conditional use of the land as a campground for ten tiny homes would transfer if it was approved, but the license from the Board of Health would not. Ms. Reed asked if the property could be used for agriculture with the conditional use still on it, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes, and that the use could expire after a period of time. Ms. Reed wanted to know what kind of campground might come in if this one failed, and Mrs. Dunlap said that it would have to meet the restrictions put forward by the Board.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if anyone new wished to speak. Hearing none, he invited Mr. Reed to the podium for the rebuttal.

Mrs. Dunlap asked about the differing number of trailers, what had changed since September, and the details of building on site. Mr. Reed said that the number change was from talking to Bethel Township about the number of time and care that would go into multiple spaces, and that after that the organization had decided that they wanted to limit themselves to ten homes to ensure residents were well-supported. The tiny homes would be built in the pole barns on trailers, and the pole barn would also have other equipment to care for the property. Chairperson Hazlett said that the plan was to build their own homes but that the pole barn was needed for the construction work, which Mr. Reed confirmed. Ms. Parcels then asked if they were not using “park models a.k.a. industrialized units that are to the Ohio Board of Building Standards specifications”. Mr. Reed said that there was no such thing for tiny homes, and Ms. Parcels said that there was, and that he had said earlier that he had been using 287 square foot “park models.” Mr. Reed apologized and said that he had misunderstood the term. Mr. Duffee asked if his website said that he had already built five tiny homes, and Mr. Reed said that there were five funded but that they only had one home, which they had purchased. They had the blueprints to make the additional homes.

Mr. Duffee asked if the pole barn would have electricity. Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee asked if it would have a cement pad, and Mr. Reed said yes. Mr. Duffee said it would be on the “additional property that [the applicant] had just bought,” and Mr. Reed clarified that it had been donated. Mr. Duffee then said that there was a requirement that a pole barn could not be built until a primary residence was on the property and asked Mrs. Dunlap to confirm. Mrs. Dunlap said that it would fall under the accessory structures needed for a campground. Mr. Duffee asked if he could build the pole barn before he built the tiny homes, and Mrs. Dunlap said yes because it was part of the campground use.

Mrs. Dunlap asked if there would be a higher need for police presence. Mr. Reed said no; the security was only brought up because of outside concerns. He had no concerns about security or about traffickers coming after the women; he had worked with women for several years and had not seen that occur. Mr. Duffee asked if there were studies available on the subject of traffickers coming after the women. Mr. Reed said that there were cases where this happened but that studies showed that traffickers did not usually come after women who escaped because they felt they could find another woman to traffic easily. Mr. Duffee said to call the place a safehouse and asked if safehouses had a higher incidence of attack. Mr. Reed said that he was not aware of any studies or prevalence of attacks on safehouses and was not aware of it being a problem.

Mrs. Dunlap asked what type of trafficking victims would be on the property. Mr. Reed said primarily sex trafficking victims.

Mrs. Dunlap noted that he had said that security would be done by volunteers and asked if there had been any thought to paid security, having security on-site, or the vetting that went into that role. She also asked if there were plans for proactive security. Mr. Reed said that they had no plans for this at this time because they were not anticipating problems with security. They had no concerns about the women because they were out of the life and sober, and not been tracked down at this point. The majority of the women also had not testified against traffickers. Mr. Duffee asked what the rules would be regarding being “out of the life and sober”, and Mr. Reed said that the rule would be one year from any known substance use or activity within sex trafficking. Mr. Duffee asked if they would interact with the agency during that year, and Mr. Reed said they might, because sometimes they interact with women while they are on the street or just off of it, and the agency tries to connect them with other supports. Mr. Duffee asked how the contact is made a year later. Mr. Reed said that they had outreach and had built relationships with the women. Mr. Duffee asked what happened during the year, and Mr. Reed said that the women are in drug or alcohol recovery or other short-term living facility. Mr. Duffee asked him to define short-term, and Mr. Reed said that one example was a three-month program for addiction recovery and then after that, depending on the agency, there would be six-to-twelve-month housing.

Mrs. Dunlap asked if they had any other notes on substance abuse. Mr. Reed said that would be another one of the conditions on the women staying that there would be no substances on the facility.

Mrs. Dunlap asked if he had any comments about the tax implications both to the subject property and to the surrounding properties and about how this would impact property values. He said that he had no comment about tax liability, and that the only comment he could make was that they had improved the curb appeal of the property. He said that the ministry did everything with excellence, including connections to counseling and doctors appointments, and transport to the appointments. Ms. Parcels asked when the parcel had been donated, and he

said that it had been donated in December. Ms. Parcels then asked if a tax exemption had been applied for, and Mr. Reed said that he was not involved with the financial side and did not know what the tax implications were. Ms. Parcels then asked if the parcel had been receiving Current Agricultural Use Value prior to the donation and whether the person who had donated it had paid the recoupment based on it not being agricultural use. Mr. Reed said he was not aware of any such use or recoupment.

Mrs. Dunlap asked if they would have their own transportation or if people would pick them up, and what the vetting for those would look like. Mr. Reed said that there would be a balance; some would have their own vehicles and some would not. The women there might provide rides, Ubers might be used, or volunteers might provide rides, and that all volunteers are background checked.

Mrs. Dunlap asked if family members would be allowed to visit and whether there were concerns about re trafficking, and Mr. Reed said that would be a case-by-case assessment when seeing who was suitable for the property. Mrs. Dunlap then asked what the assessment for rental suitability would look like. Mr. Reed said that it would depend on what the women had done beforehand to recover, including length of sobriety, time out of the life, and the resources that had been engaged with. The biggest verification would be whether the women had taken steps to provide themselves with resources to achieve sobriety and stay out of the life, but assessments of current struggles would also be made to ensure they would not have problems being somewhere rural.

Mrs. Dunlap asked how the land was acquired or donated. Mr. Reed said that it had come from a contact in a church who had felt that the land would be donated to help others. Mrs. Dunlap asked if it had been donated by the previous owner and Mr. Reed said yes.

Mrs. Dunlap asked him about thoughts about security of the property and how the gate would be monitored. Mr. Reed said that it would have a keypad and camera monitoring. With regards to the fence, he was aware that there were concerns from the community, and reiterated that the women that would be coming to the property had been free from the life and sober for a year or more and had not been tracked down.

Mrs. Dunlap asked what would happen if or when the ministry was done with the property. Mr. Reed said that there was not a plan for the end, and that they planned to make this long-standing.

Mrs. Dunlap asked about whether grants were in place or if they had applied for grants. Mr. Reed said that they did not have grant funding at this time and did not intend to apply for grants, and that the church and individual donors had supplied all of their needs. He added that he knew those donations could slow but did not foresee that happening.

Mrs. Dunlap asked if they had looked at other locations or if church property had been considered. Mr. Reed said that was not a thought because that would be non-standard use of church property that would require rezoning or additional variances. They had not tried to acquire other land and were pursuing this land due to the donation.

Mrs. Dunlap asked where residents would be from. Mr. Reed said that they could be from anywhere.

Mrs. Dunlap asked why they felt they needed security, from whom, if perpetrators had been incarcerated, and if so for how long. Mr. Reed said that there were some perpetrators had been incarcerated, but that the security was in place due to outside concerns, not due to the ministry's concern.

Mrs. Dunlap asked how residents would be protected in the event of a problem, and who they would call. Mr. Reed said that it would be handled by calling 911.

Mrs. Dunlap asked if the trailers would be moved. Mr. Reed said that between residents the home would be moved to be cleaned and repaired as needed.

Mr. Reed added that first that he was sorry because this was the first time they had gone through this process, and his unfamiliarity had led him to not canvass and alert local neighborhoods. He also added that there had been comments about "not here" and said that if "not here, where?" He asked if they should find property in downtown Dayton where they had been abused or if they should find property that was safe and away from the things they had dealt with. He said that he had two kids and had no concerns for their safety. Mr. Duffee asked if they had security at the location in Dayton. Mr. Reed said no. Mr. Duffee asked if it was known they helped women there. Mr. Reed said that they did not advertise it but that many women knew about it. Mr. Duffee said that some safehouses were secret and asked if they tried to hide the house. Mr. Reed said they did not and that the women were told they could tell anyone who needed the resources. Mr. Duffee asked if he thought the houses would change the character of the neighborhood, and Mr. Reed said that he did not. Mr. Duffee asked him to expand on that, and Mr. Reed said that for example one of the women that he worked with that would be perfect for this had been out of the life for a little over a year and was very positive while not being pursued and living in a short-term living facility. He saw the lives that had been changed by the ministry and felt that they deserved better and wanted better than they got. They did not want to trash a neighborhood but wanted to do better.

Public comment was closed at 4:25 p.m.

Chairperson Hazlett said that he was torn on the legality and felt that there were missing pieces. Ms. Parcels said that there were eight findings of facts that had to be made, and that to her it came down to that they were trying to put something where it didn't fit. She said that the property was donated and that she didn't know if there was a deed restriction on it for recreational but that this was not a recreational use. Campgrounds were supposed to be recreational and not residential per the ORC, and she felt this was a bridge too far, and Mr. Hazlett agreed. Ms. Parcels noted that the Board could put on a condition that everything had to be on a foundation so it had permanent utilities connections, as trailers were required to have detachable well and septic connections per the Administrative Code. At that point, though, it wouldn't be a trailer anymore and would fall under the building code because it was affixed and would be more than 200 square feet. Mr. Reed had also said that these would not be park models and that they would be building the homes themselves, and she felt there was a place for tiny homes that were permanently affixed. She also noted that the property had no municipal services for the units and that was one of the findings of facts that had to be looked at. There was testimony that it was a remote area, and that the response time could be in question despite the Sherrif substation in New Carlisle.

Mr. Duffee said that the findings of facts applied to the variance but not the conditional use. Ms. Parcels said that was correct. Mr. Duffee noted that the Board could use them as a guide for the restrictions on the conditional use, and Ms. Parcels continued that if the Board put a

condition that the homes be affixed to a foundation then the applicant would need a rezoning instead. Mr. Duffee then asked staff where the campground was that had been approved for the Evans Family Ranch. Mrs. Dunlap wasn't sure where it was as that had been before her time. Mr. Duffee then said it was north of the current parcel and noted that they had spent a lot of time considering that four years ago. He remembered that a fence was required, that the pond on the property had been discussed, and that occupancy had been discussed. Chairperson Hazlett recalled that the campers had only been allowed to stay six or seven days, and that there were no utilities on the parcel, and Mr. Duffee agreed and said that it was a moot point now. Mr. Duffee then noted that he was uncomfortable with the lack of a business plan, and that the Board was facing a question of whether the applicant should be approved by the Board or the state first. He noted that the state wanted it approved by the Board first, but that the Board would like state approval and guidance. He also said that he would prefer the homes to have permanent foundations but acknowledged that would require a rezoning which would be much more difficult. He was uncomfortable with them being on wheels. He also said that the security concerns were appreciated, but that they were opinions and that there wasn't a lot of fact brought up, and that he felt that there was a lot of substance abuse around and that there wouldn't be a large increase with ten more people. He also didn't think ten more people would increase traffic much, and agreed with the applicant that addressing the security concerns was a little overblown because he didn't see any concerns. He noted that this was opinion and that he would like to see comparables to understand how these concerns were addressed elsewhere with evidence. He added that there was much up in the air without the business plan, and that he wanted the Board's opinion, but said that "he might vote for it" unless someone could address the process.

Ms. Parcels said that she would not be in favor and that her concern came back to utilities. Putting ten extra people on a property without a soil test while it needed a permit to install to be a campground concerned her without a plan. She noted that the applicant had tried to persuade the Board with the other tiny home districts, then said that those had been in municipalities while the Board was a BZA for unincorporated areas. She then noted that some of those areas had public water and sewer. Mr. Duffee thanked her and noted that it was possible to have ten people in a single-family house, and that he thought the property could sustain a septic system for that many people. Ms. Parcels also noted that there had been discussion of what the legal definition of family was with respect to group homes. Mr. Duffee continued that the county had encountered that in the past year, and reiterated that he was considering that even if all ten houses were occupied, he thought a septic system could support that. He added that there could be issues with the other utilities, and that he was uncomfortable with the rubber tires.

Mr. Shaw said that he was uncomfortable with the buildings themselves because they weren't up to code and that they would not know what was in the electric or plumbing. Ms. Parcels noted that when Habitat for Humanity built a house they had code inspections. Mr. Duffee said that the Board could be uncomfortable with that because none of the structures were built yet. He said that he felt misled by the website because he thought it said they had built five, and that there had even been a picture of two women drilling through wood. He said the Board could stipulate the tiny homes met building code, and Mrs. Dunlap said that the building code did not address the trailers. Ms. Parcels said that she felt they had used the gap between the Ohio Revised Code and the Administrative Code on purpose. She continued that the Board was supposed to see if there was another method the applicant could use to not have a variance or conditional use, and that this was a situation of their own making because they didn't want to go through a rezoning. Mr. Duffee agreed that this was the easier path for the applicant to take, and noted that he thought that the applicant had said if the Board denied the conditional use, they would pursue rezoning. He thought that might be more desirable to the board. Ms. Parcels

said that if this was to be permanent supportive housing as the applicant wanted, then it needed to be on a permanent foundation. Mr. Duffee asked if the county had been discouraging “plats”, and when Mrs. Dunlap asked for clarification, he added that he wanted to know if the applicant would face unforeseen hurdles for such a development. Mrs. Dunlap said that there were layers to everything, but that the applicant would have to decide if they were going to rezone to a planned development or to a residential district and whether they would be going through the subdivision process, which would be an entire other process. She said there would definitely be a review in both of those processes, and that the applicant could come back to tech review and possibly speak with someone from the state if there was a connection that could be made. She said there had been others that had come in for somewhat similar uses where there had been back and forth as to whether even permanently sited structures fell under state or local jurisdiction, and that they might need to talk to the state.

Chairperson Hazlett asked if the Board should consider tabling this. Ms. Parcels said she was not in favor of tabling this because the applicant could remove the need for the conditional use by applying for rezoning. Mr. Duffee said that he would be more sympathetic to tabling this if there was a well-defined objective in mind with a well-defined time period. Mr. Shaw said that they were trying to subvert the true definition of a camp ground, and that he would vote against it. Chairperson Hazlett agreed. Mr. Frank said that he could not support the application.

Chairperson Hazlett asked for motions for both cases.

Action on Case #BZA-2026-02 ~ Property Owners/Applicants: Dear Dinah Inc~ Location: 500 Quick Road; Bethel Township ~ Request: Conditional Use under Chapter 7 Section 711 for a Campground

Motion by Ms. Parcels, seconded by Mr. Shaw to **Approve** the variance request.

VOTE: Yes: Mr. Duffee

No: Ms. Parcels, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Frank

Motion defeated

Action on Case #BZA-2026-03 ~ Property Owners/Applicants: Dear Dinah Inc~ Location: 500 Quick Road; Bethel Township ~ Request: Variance to Chapter 10 Section 1001 “Campground” to allow residents to stay on-site for up to two years, conditional on approval of the Conditional Use

Motion by Ms. Parcels, seconded by Mr. Frank to **Approve** the variance request. Ms. Parcels reiterated that with regards to the findings of facts it was too substantial a request, that there were no governmental services serving the property with respect to utilities, that there were concerns regarding law enforcement response times, that the zoning restrictions predated the donation of the property, that there were other ways for the applicant to accomplish their purposes other than the variance, and that the property may yield a reasonable economic return without the variance.

VOTE: Yes: None

No: Ms. Parcels, Mr. Shaw, Mr. Duffee, Mr. Frank

Motion defeated

Minutes

Clark County Board of Zoning Appeals

Staff Comments

The next meeting would be on February 26th 2026 and there were a few cases filed. Also, Mrs. Dunlap had spoken to Mr. Messaros, and the sale of the Pencils' property had gone through so they did not need a variance, but they may come back for additional approval. Ms. Parcels noted that she would not be there for the April meeting.

Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Duffee, seconded by Ms. Parcels to Adjourn.

VOTE: Motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Mr. Paul Hazlett, Chairperson