

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

(WHEREAS, THE LORDSTOWN VILLAGE PLANNING COMMISSION MET ON MONDAY, MARCH 8, 2021, AT 6:30 P.M., VIA ZOOM CONFERENCE. DUE TO SOCIAL DISTANCING MANDATES, NO MORE THAN TEN (10) PEOPLE WERE PERMITTED IN THE VILLAGE ADMINISTRATION MEETING ROOM. DIAL-IN INSTRUCTIONS WERE GIVEN TO CALL IN AND ASK QUESTIONS OR SPEAK IN REGARD TO THE SITE PLAN REVIEWS OR TO MAKE OTHER PUBLIC COMMENTS. THOSE IN ATTENDANCE SPOKE WEARING MASKS, AND THE TRANSCRIPT WAS PRODUCED TO THE BEST OF THE COURT REPORTER'S PROFESSIONAL ABILITY WITH REMOTE AUDIO TESTIMONY AND SOCIAL DISTANCING GUIDELINES FOLLOWED. PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

The Lordstown Planning Commission met on March 8, 2021 at 6:30 p.m. at the Lordstown Administration Building. The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Tim Rech, followed by the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag. Roll call was taken.

In Attendance: Tim Rech, Chairperson
 Richard Rook, Vice Chairperson
 Arno Hill, Mayor
 Don Reider, Council Member
 Bob Shaffer, Member

 Paul Dutton, Solicitor
 Kellie D. Bordner, Planning & Zoning Administrator
 Denise L. Dugan, Assistant Planning & Zoning Administrator

Also Present: Phil Bailey, Chicago & Midwest Regional Joint Board

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MR. RECH: Can we have a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. REIDER: So moved, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RECH: Mr. Reider -- is there a second?

MR. ROOK: Second.

MR. RECH: Mr. Rook -- all in favor say "aye."

MR. SHAFFER: Aye.

MR. REIDER: Aye.

MR. ROOK: Aye.

MAYOR HILL: Aye.

MR. RECH: Aye.

(VOICE VOTE: 5, AYE; 0, NAY; 0, ABSTAINED.)

ELECTION OF OFFICERS:

MR. RECH: Very good -- all right, our agenda is approved. So then the next item is Election of Officers.

MAYOR HILL: I move we keep the same officers.

MR. SHAFFER: I'll second that.

MR. RECH: Mr. Rook, are you okay with that?

MR. ROOK: Yes, sir.

MR. RECH: Alrighty -- and I'm okay with that if you're okay with having me. All right, all in favor of keeping the same officers for 2021 as we've had in the past year, signify by saying "aye."

MR. SHAFFER: Aye.

March 8, 2021

MR. REIDER: Aye.

MR. ROOK: Aye.

MAYOR HILL: Aye.

MR. RECH: Aye -- anybody opposed?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

(VOICE VOTE: 5, AYE; 0, NAY; 0, ABSTAINED.)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES of November 9, 2020:

MR. RECH: All right, hearing not, we'll move on to approval of the minutes for the last meeting we had, which was November 9th, 2020 -- any comments or corrections?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

MR. RECH: If not, is there a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting?

MAYOR HILL: I'll make that motion.

MR. RECH: Mayor Hill -- is there a second?

MR. SHAFFER: I'll second.

MR. RECH: Mr. Shaffer -- all in favor, "aye".

MR. SHAFFER: Aye.

MR. REIDER: Aye.

MR. ROOK: Aye.

MAYOR HILL: Aye.

MR. RECH: Aye.

(VOICE VOTE: 5, AYE; 0, NAY; 0, ABSTAINED.)

PLANNING AND ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT:

MR. RECH: All right, that's approved. Now we'll move on to Planning and Zoning Administrator's Report -- or wait a minute. We're going to do things different, here, a little bit.

We're going to move on to New Business tonight to get this gentleman through and not hold him up for everything else we're going to go through.

MS. BORDNER: Yes, sir.

MR. RECH: So at this time, we'll move on to New Business.

NEW BUSINESS: 1. Site Plan Review Not Involving New Construction for Chicago & Midwest Regional Joint Board, Workers United, 6100 Tod Avenue, Lordstown, Ohio.

The Planning Commission followed this form that follows Section 1116.03 of The Planning & Zoning Code:

NAME: Chicago & Midwest Regional Joint Board, Workers United

ADDRESS: 6100 Tod Avenue – owned by Your Mortgage Center, LLC (Landlord)

1. Existing zoning of the property: B-2 Commercial Highway Business

2. The floor plan of intended building for specific use: Applicant's proposed space consists of 2,560 square feet and includes Suite 3 and Suite 4 of the Lordstown Plaza, which will remain as separate units with separate entrances/exits. Suite 3 has two existing offices as well as a rest room and a closet. Suite 4 has an open floor area, along with a rest room and a closet. The offices in Suite 3 will have desks for traditional computer work. The open area in Suite 4 will have a small table and chairs for use in meetings with workers. The rest rooms in both suites will be for employee use only, not for the general public. Applicant has submitted a general floor plan.

March 8, 2021

3. **Location and dimension of all off-street parking and loading areas including the number of spaces:** Applicant states that there is a shared parking lot for all tenants of the Lordstown Plaza complex with a total of 75 spaces, being 10' x 20' or larger, and having two ADA compliant spaces.
4. **Location, size, height and orientation of all signs, both existing and proposed:** Applicant states Landlord's representative has advised that the existing Lordstown Plaza sign cannot be easily read by passing cars. Therefore, Applicant will create a 2'x3' posterboard/placard sign to be placed in the front window. Applicant has been informed of the code requirements under Lordstown Codified Ordinance 1165 and that an application for zoning permit, along with a plot plan, must be completed and submitted to the Lordstown Planning & Zoning Office before placement of any signage.
5. **Location of all streets project is fronting on:** Tod Avenue (State Route 45)
6. **Other information required by the Planning Commission:** Applicant, the Chicago & Midwest Joint Board, Workers United, is an active labor union in the United States. Its mission is to make sure members get union representation at work, while educating members about their rights in an unfair economic system.

Applicant executed a 3-year Lease with the Landlord for Suites 3 and 4 and is in the process of organizing workers at the local TJX/HomeGoods Distribution Center. Applicant has unionized the TJX workers at the distribution center in Evansville, Indiana. Applicant's longevity in the area is dependent upon whether TJX workers here decide to unionize with Applicant AND if so, how many members Applicant obtains as there must be enough to justify keeping the office open.

There will be two (2) full-time employees acting as Union Representatives at this location. Most of their work will be outside of the office, meeting with workers and potential workers to get them signed up with the union. In addition to communicating with members, potential members, employer representatives and union employees in other locations, the Union Representatives will do office work in the form of filing, copying and printing forms and other paperwork. They will also engage in any other administrative work that the union and/or Department of Labor might require. Once the organizing is done, the Union Representatives will service members, primarily by checking in at workplace locations, reaching out to members and addressing any issue members might be having with management. Member meetings may occasionally occur at the Lordstown Plaza in Suite 4; however, this will mostly be on a one-to-one basis by appointment only (no walk-ins).

Hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 6:00 pm, with an occasional Saturday as needed. Fire extinguishers and fire doors exist in both suites and both spaces are handicap accessible.

MS. BORDNER: I have a Site Plan Review Not Involving New Construction for Chicago & Midwest Regional Joint Board, Workers United. That will be located at 6100 Tod Avenue, which is owned by Your Mortgage Center, LLC, as the Landlord that's in the Lordstown Plaza.

The existing zoning of that property is B-2.

The applicant has proposed a space, which consists of 2,560 square feet and includes Suite 3 and Suite 4 of the Lordstown Plaza, which will remain as separate units with separate entrances and exits. Suite 3 has two existing offices as well as a restroom and a closet. Suite 4 has an open floor plan, along with a restroom and a closet. The offices in Suite 3 will have desks for traditional computer work. The open area in Suite 4 will have a small table and chairs for use in meetings with workers. The restroom in both suites will be for employee use only and not for the general public. The Applicant has submitted a general floor plan.

The Applicant states that there's a shared parking lot for all tenants of the Lordstown Plaza complex, with a total of 75 spaces being 10' x 20' feet or larger and having two ADA compliant spaces.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

The Applicant states that the Landlord's representative has advised that the existing Lordstown Plaza sign near the road right-of-way cannot easily be read by passing cars. Therefore, Applicant will create a 2' x 3' poster board/placard type sign to be placed in the front window of the suite. Applicant has been advised of the code requirements under Lordstown Codified Ordinance 1165 and that an application for zoning permit, along with a plot plan, must be completed and submitted to the Lordstown Planning and Zoning Office before any placement of signage.

This project fronts on Tod Avenue, State Route 45.

The Applicant, Chicago & Midwest Joint Board, Workers United, is an active labor union in the United States. Its mission is to make sure that members get union representation at work, while educating members about their rights in an unfair economic system.

Applicant has executed a 3-year Lease with the Landlord, for both Suites 3 and 4 and is in the process of organizing workers at the local TJX/HomeGoods Distribution Center. Applicant has unionized the TJX workers at the Distribution Center in Evansville, Indiana. Applicant's longevity in the area is dependent upon whether TJX workers here decide to unionize with Applicant; and if so, how many members Applicant obtains as there must be enough to justify keeping the office open.

There will be two (2) full-time employees acting as Union Representatives at this location. Most of their work will be outside of the office, meeting with workers and potential workers to get them signed up with the union. In addition to communicating with members, potential members, employer representatives and union employees in other locations, the Union Representatives will do office work in the form of filing, copying and printing forms and other paperwork. They will also engage in any other administrative work that the union and/or Department of Labor might require. Once the organizing is done, the Union Representatives will service members, primarily by checking in at workplace locations, reaching out to members and addressing any issue members might be having with management. Member meetings may occasionally occur at the Lordstown Plaza in Suite 4; however, this will mostly be done on a one-to-one basis by appointment only -- no walk-ins.

Hours of operation are Monday through Friday, 9:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., with an occasional Saturday as needed. Fire extinguishers and fire doors exist in both suites and both spaces are handicap acceptable.

Mr. Phil Bailey is here on behalf of the Workers United and will be happy to answer any questions, I'm sure, if you have any.

MR. RECH: Any questions for Mr. Bailey?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

MR. RECH: Anything you would like to say, sir?

MR. BAILEY: No, just --

MS. BORDNER: They did a very good job of providing us with quite a bit of information for a Site Plan Not Involving New Construction.

MR. RECH: And you're already up and running for the most part or --

MR. BAILEY: Yeah.

MR. RECH: Okay.

MR. BAILEY: We moved furniture in there -- and hoping to get started soon.

MR. RECH: Okay, and how does -- just how does that work? I mean, once -- you're in the process of hiring now, so is this kind of like an all or none -- or are you guys -- I mean, it's got to be --

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

MR. BAILEY: Well, we're asking workers at the TJX Facility to join the Union since they opened on Monday. And we'll continue that process -- and hopefully, get to the point where we're recognized as the Union Facility in short order at the TJX Facility, HomeGoods Distribution Center -- so we'll be doing that, and then negotiating a contract in short order.

MR. RECH: I see, okay. All right, thank you, sir -- any other questions?

MR. ROOK: The one question I have is a concern -- about member meetings, occasionally, will be at the plaza. Well, if you're looking at roughly 1,000 people employed there -- you have a go-to place for meetings that big?

MR. BAILEY: No, they wouldn't be there. They would have to be at a convention center -- maybe at the Eastwood Mall or something. The biggest -- you know, they would be maybe small committee meetings or something --

MR. ROOK: Okay.

MR. BAILEY: -- that would occur there. Any serious membership meeting -- like contract ratification vote or anything like that would be a much larger space.

MR. RECH: All right -- any other questions?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

MR. RECH: Okay, thank you sir. So at this time, is there a motion to approve Site Plan Review Not Involving New Construction for Chicago & Midwest Regional Joint Board, Workers United, Lordstown Plaza?

MR. SHAFFER: I'll make the motion.

MR. RECH: Mr. Shaffer -- is there a second?

MR. REIDER: I'll second on it, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RECH: Mr. Reider, all right -- any other discussion?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

MR. RECH: Hearing none, could we have roll call on this matter, please?

MS. DUGAN: Yes, sir -- Arno Hill?

MAYOR HILL: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Tim Rech?

MR. RECH: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Don Reider?

MR. REIDER: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Richard Rook?

MR. ROOK: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Bob Shaffer?

MR. SHAFFER: Yes.

(ROLL CALL VOTE: 5, AYE; 0, NAY; 0, ABSTAINED.)

MR. RECH: All right, thank you. That passes. Mr. Bailey, you're welcome to stay or you're welcome to leave -- whatever you prefer, sir -- all right?

MS. BORDNER: Thank you, Mr. Bailey.

March 8, 2021

MR. BAILEY: Thank you.

PLANNING AND ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: 1. Fear Forest parking report.

MR. RECH: All right. Now we go back up to Planning and Zoning Administrator's Report.

MS. BORDNER: Yes, sir. I will start with a Fear Forest parking update -- if that's okay with you?

MR. RECH: Sure.

MS. BORDNER: So I'm just going to read my memo into the record so that we have something for recordation's sake.

On June 8, 2020, Planning Commission approved Fear Forest's site plan for a business expansion to include a new building with a parking lot. At this site plan review, Mr. Alan Tura, owner of Fear Forest, stated that there would be a total of 213 parking spaces, with eight (8) of those being ADA handicap compliant. He explained that during the hours of operation, his parking attendants would turn patrons away when the parking lot was full, and that he would return to the Village to propose additional parking if, in the future, it needs to be increased. Mr. Tura indicated that there would be room for approximately 58 additional parking spaces if the lot was expanded.

During the 2020 Halloween season, Fear Forest conducted business activities from its new location. The Planning and Zoning office, along with a couple Village Councilmen, received multiple calls and complaints about the Fear Forest parking capacity and patron behaviors. Reports were that car accidents occurred, fights broke out in the parking lot, resulting in at least one (1) ambulance transport to the hospital. Patrons repeatedly parked on adjacent or nearby business properties, and ticket lines created what they referred to as a human snake, throughout the parking lot, reaching almost to Tod Avenue -- that would be being from the building, heading east to the roadway. Several nearby businesses on Tod Avenue have stated that the above occurrences have created dangerous situations and safety concerns, and that they should not have to bear the cost, financial or otherwise, of solving a problem that they did not create.

One idea that we came up with was to send letters to all nearby business owners for the 2021 Fear Forest season, advising them that they have a right to close off their parking lots to Fear Forest patrons as their property is considered private property. While Lordstown Codified Ordinances normally require that permits be obtained for signs, given the extraordinary circumstances, the requirement could be waived during the temporary time for which Fear Forest is open, so that other business owners may put up signs that indicate -- for example, "No parking Fear Forest patrons. Violators will be towed" -- or "No parking, private property" -- something of this nature.

We have discussed this situation with the Mayor, Council President Radtka, Police Chief Milhoan and Fire Chief Eastham. They have all agreed that sending a letter such as this to other business owners was a good plan; however, the question then became who should be responsible for the cost of these signs? Businesses nearby Fear Forest do not believe that they should have to bear the cost when Fear Forest created the problem. One thing is certain -- the Lordstown Police Department cannot enforce a "no parking" directive on other properties without the signs being posted so that the general public is made aware of this rule.

We also recently had a conversation with Mr. Tura, of Fear Forest, about all these concerns, and he indicated that he was aware and would be coming back to Planning Commission to expand the newly created parking lot by at least another 58 spaces -- what he termed as soon. We have not had a projected date from him upon which this might occur.

So therefore, now, we would like some input and thoughts from Planning Commission on what to do about this situation so that all businesses are being treated fairly and equally. We thank you.

MR. RECH: Okay -- questions, comments, thoughts?

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

MR. ROOK: A question for the Solicitor. Can we force them to put in the other 58 parking passes?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: No -- but you can cite them for violating our zoning requirements, and that's another mountain to climb over in Newton Falls Municipal Court.

Also, the proposal to have Fear Forest pay for signs for adjoining property owners to display saying, "no trespassing" is a disconnect. If I own property, and I don't want people trespassing, I'm responsible for putting up the sign; and if I want to do more than signage -- have a gate or some fence, I pay for the fence. It's my property. I don't want anyone to trespass. I'm the one who must enforce it -- but if Fear Forest doesn't have sufficient parking, that's a Zoning Violation. They said that they would not attract more than the number of approved parking spaces; and that's what Site Plan Review and the approval was granted -- and if they're doing more than that, and people are parking on the streets or elsewhere -- they should be cited for it.

And the first letter that goes out is to Fear Forest -- and it should specifically say, this is what the Village is going to do if we detect a violation. And number one, there's going to be a Zoning Violation. Number two -- any cars parked in the street, will be towed away at the owner's expense.

And if there was violence there, that's another problem. In other words, if people engaged in fistfights out in the parking lot, someone could get hit by a vehicle. Someone could get injured, children. This is an attractive nuisance for children, right? Isn't that what this is about? I mean you have hayrides and spooky things like that.

MAYOR HILL: Quite a few young adults.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes, too -- and I would just let Mr. Tura know in advance what we're planning on doing, rather than after the fact, and have him say -- "Hey, I didn't realize that this was a serious problem."

And then if any abutting property owners indicate that they do not want overflow parking on their property, then we should advise them that they need to display some signage. If somebody parks a car on my property that's vacant, and I do not display a sign, "no parking" how does that patron know that I own it versus Tura? How does that person know that I haven't permitted Tura's patrons to park here? So that property owner must take affirmative action to display -- and if you're going to put up some of that crime scene tape -- or something like that, to keep people from parking, and let Tura know that we've polled the abutting property owners, and they're going to take steps to prevent this.

MR. RECH: So this would be -- them trying to park on the streets, and then like at the Warren --

MS. DUGAN: -- Fire Equipment, the Momentum Dance, the Dairy Queen, sometimes Dollar General. Sometimes they try to get into the closed grocery store, but that's usually blocked off.

MR. RECH: That's a disaster in itself.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Now in our Zoning Ordinances, where we have buildings and we have occupancy, the Fire Chief will say, "You can only have 50 people in here at a time" -- and the Fire Chief can cite them. So they need to take steps to prevent overflow.

Also, do we have in our Ordinance, Kellie, where you must have police personnel? In other words, if you've got a wedding reception up here -- I don't know, do we serve alcohol up here for weddings?

MS. BORDNER: If there is --

MR. RECH: -- if there's an officer.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: A one-day permit.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

MS. BORDNER: Yes.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And then they need an officer, right?

MS. BORDNER: Correct.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: So there's alcohol over here?

MS. DUGAN: It's not permitted.

MS. BORDNER: No, it's not permitted -- but I will tell you that they did increase their police force. Mr. Tura hires our Lordstown police officers independently for the season --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- off duty?

MS. BORDNER: Yes -- off duty and -- for the season, and they did increase it. My understanding was from three (3), to at times, six (6) officers.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Are those officers, who are our employees -- are they directing overflow traffic onto the abutting lots?

MS. BORDNER: They are not.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Okay, this is confusing.

MS. BORDNER: It is -- but as Chief Milhoan explained to me because of Dollar General's request to them, they did not have to, but they did protect the Dollar General parking lot. It was the one immediately adjacent.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Our police?

MS. BORDNER: Our police did and kind of blocked that off with their cars, and it also gave them --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- well, we should share with our police officers, who may be working overtime there, which abutting property owners do not want to have overflow parking and are going to display "no parking" signs -- and that people should be discouraged, if not redirected, not to park there.

MS. BORDNER: Yes. Chief Milhoan said that it was imperative that if they choose not to have this overflow parking, there was one (1) adjacent property that was charging to have people park there. So he obviously --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Well, then they consented to it.

MS. BORDNER: Yes, he certainly did.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes.

MS. BORDNER: But Chief Milhoan indicated that, without a sign, they will not enforce --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: You can't read someone's mind --

MS. BORDNER: Correct.

MR. RECH: If Mr. Tura put up an additional 58 spaces, would that solve his problem, basically?

MS. BORDNER: If you're asking me, I'm going to tell you no.

MR. RECH: Okay.

MS. BORDNER: I mean, they were quite busy even during the Covid season, so I think that's wonderful for them.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: This is a two (2) week --

MS. DUGAN: -- about four (4) weekends.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- four (4) weekends, okay -- so it's not during the week?

MS. BORDNER: No.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: It's the weekends.

MR. SHAFFER: So if you're going to cite Tura and Fear Forest for this, would it be every day that there's a problem or --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yeah.

MR. SHAFFER: So in four (4) weeks' time, you could have multiple citations.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: This is like any other Zoning Violation where you exceed the parking requirements.

MS. BORDNER: \$150 a day for each day that the violation exists. I suppose we could be very fair and say they're only open on Fridays, Saturdays, Sundays -- so three (3) days a week.

MR. REIDER: How many hours, Kellie, about?

MS. DUGAN: He's kind of vague about that.

MS. BORDNER: He is kind of vague, and I will have to tell you that I believe that it runs anywhere from four (4) to five (5) approximately a night.

MS. DUGAN: They don't seem to turn people away.

MR. REIDER: Okay.

MS. DUGAN: So if you were in line, you probably get to pay and go through.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And to cite him for a Zoning Violation, you need the Zoning Inspector to give up her weekends to go out there and stand there with binoculars or a camera --

MR. RECH: -- taking pictures.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- and taking a picture of the overflow parking in the streets and in the lanes of the parking lot, so it --

MR. ROOK: Maybe Mr. Tura should approach the other people -- the other parking areas and see if he can buy some of their spaces off them -- for at night. It may make it go down a little easier for those people.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: I'll give you a better idea -- have the high school students, the senior class, go to the Dollar General and the other ones and say, "We want to raise money. Can we have access to your parking lot, and we're going to charge \$5.00 a car."

MS. DUGAN: One of the concerns about them using the other parking lots, is the fact that they're crossing Route 45 sometimes or they're walking along Route 45.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: These are across the street. And there's no one monitoring traffic or stopping traffic. They're just running across.

MS. DUGAN: Exactly.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And it's probably dusk?

MS. DUGAN: Oh, yes -- it's mostly in the dark.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: We're going to have someone slaughtered on the road.

MS. DUGAN: Yes, we are.

MAYOR HILL: And you know they only wear dark clothes.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yeah, yeah.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

MR. RECH: What about running a shuttle -- not us -- but him running a shuttle, possibly, from like the high school -- running a bus or something back and forth?

MR. SHAFFER: Well, the whole thing was -- he stated in the meeting that he would turn people away. So that's the bottom line.

MR. RECH: Yeah.

MR. SHAFFER: He should not be allowing his property to overflow with people to begin with. We shouldn't have to be making special accommodations for him. He's the one that needs to comply to the Zoning rules and regulations -- and not us making exceptions.

MS. BORDNER: I don't know if it was simply a matter that he was unaware of how many people in previous years were parked in the Dairy Queen and in the grass and in Old Dewey's Candy Factory parking lot. I don't know if he just didn't have a concept of that -- or if he underestimated the draw that his new facility was going to have. I'm thrilled for him that he's doing so well, of course.

MAYOR HILL: Yeah, he's doing so well that fining him won't mean a thing.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yeah.

MS. BORDNER: I believe you're right.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: \$150 bucks is not a lot of money.

MR. REIDER: I'm surprised that he isn't here tonight to try to address this. I am surprised about that.

MS. BORDNER: I'll be honest with you, I absolutely let him know that I would be bringing this up.

MR. REIDER: I'm sure. I'm sure you did. I wouldn't -- I mean, if I owned the Dairy Queen, I wouldn't want to tape it off because that's my business.

MS. DUGAN: Right.

MR. REIDER: You want these people to come in, but I can understand what you say, Paul, you want their patrons only, not Fear Forest patrons at times. If they must put the signs up, they must, but --

MAYOR HILL: He has his own refreshments. (INAUDIBLE)

(WHEREAS, THE BOARD MEMBERS WERE SPEAKING OVER EACH OTHER AT THE SAME TIME, INAUDIBLE TO THE COURT REPORTER, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

MAYOR HILL: That's why he put the big building up. He (INAUDIBLE) --

MS. BORDNER: He has his own refreshments, now.

MAYOR HILL: He has his own refreshments down there now.

MS. BORDNER: Which, incidentally, should be very minimal -- because that wasn't part of the Site Plan Review. Let's not get into that.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And it has a roof.

MS. BORDNER: Yeah.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: It has a roof.

MS. BORDNER: So, I mean, I think he does have some minimal refreshments, but he also indicated that he was going to come back to create a concession building.

MAYOR HILL: Well, I thought he already had.

MS. BORDNER: You make -- listen, I tried not to look too hard -- let's just say it that way.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

SOLICITOR DUTTON: So you need to inform him, outlining what this Planning Commission has directed you to do.

MS. BORDNER: Yes.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Number two, you need to communicate with the abutting property owners and advise them if they do not want overflow parking randomly on their property, they need to display signage, and it's their responsibility to take steps -- whether that's a sign and crime scene tape -- or something of this nature.

MS. DUGAN: Could they just block their lots off without the expense of the sign? I mean, seriously, if they got two poles and some crime scene tape.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes, but putting up the crime scene tape, without a sign, someone may think -- well, someone got shot in here, if there's no sign. I mean, I would say, minimally, you put a sign up that says, "We don't want you to park here." And then to reinforce it, it's their property. They can do what they want to do.

MS. DUGAN: Okay.

MS. BORDNER: I'm just not sure and I would have to check with Chief Milhoan and confirm, but he seemed to indicate that the sign was imperative.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes.

MS. BORDNER: So then when we discussed with these adjacent business owners -- that was where it all fell apart because they said it just wasn't fair that they had to pay the expense of getting the sign.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: The term is -- if you have residential property, okay -- you're not conducting business. So you're telling the general public, "This is my property" -- and there are no business invitees, okay? So if someone randomly coming up, parking their car in my driveway, is obviously a violation -- not only a traffic violation, okay -- but if you're running a business, you're soliciting customers -- you, you, you. (INDICATING)

MR. REIDER: Right.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And you are called business invitees. So I'm inviting you to come here, frequent my business, spend some money, buy some of my products. So you need to distinguish between someone being invited to come there, versus parking -- so "no parking" -- you know -- "no trespassing from Fear Forest." You need to be specific for those businesses that are going to be open while he's open -- but some businesses are going to be closed. You just put up there, "no trespassing, no parking."

And there are people who violate those. I mean, they just -- how often have you parked in a no parking zone, you know?

MR. REIDER: (SHAKES HEAD NEGATIVELY)

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Never, okay -- anyway, so that's why putting the tape up or something like this sort of reinforces that signage.

MR. RECH: Okay -- any other thoughts?

MR. ROOK: Maybe the Village ought to be nice and buy a bunch of "no parking" signs and give it to them. What could it cost -- a couple of bucks a piece? It couldn't be that expensive -- just a thought.

MR. SHAFFER: Well, again, I don't think it should be up to the Village to pay for that. We didn't create the problem. I mean, if anything -- if Mr. Tura was really a good neighbor with the other businesses, he would supply it for them and take that upon himself -- but he's not required to, as Mr. Dutton said. That's on those individual property owners, but they can make a one-time purchase and use them over and over and over themselves instead of having to buy them every year so -- I don't think a Dollar General -- or anyone that's over there -- that that would be a huge sum of money for them to come up with themselves.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

MAYOR HILL: My guess is it probably would be \$30 bucks for a post and a sign.

MR. RECH: Yes.

MAYOR HILL: We had to get some up at the lake, and you get the sign made up and a post. It's probably \$30 bucks. I think we got two (2) of them, and I had to write a check for \$60 when I was a treasurer.

MS. DUGAN: I mean, can they be those plastic ones that you buy at a Dollar General?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes, it can be anything.

MS. DUGAN: Okay.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: It's not a regulated street sign, you know. Those are prescribed.

MR. RECH: Falls under temporary signs, I would think?

MS. BORDNER: That's what I would say, and I don't think it's fair for us to -- and I'm sure you will all agree with me -- I do not believe that it's fair that we make them permit them. They are very temporary in nature, and people have done far worse than that.

MR. RECH: Yes -- anything else on this?

MS. BORDNER: No, sir.

MR. RECH: All right -- anybody else?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

MR. RECH: Everybody is good -- all right, thank you.

PLANNING AND ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: 2. Request for recommendation to repeal Ordinance 98-10 (Zone change on Orr Property).

MS. BORDNER: Okay, my next item under my report is the Orr property. It's at the corner of Muth and Salt Springs Road. It's Parcel ID Number 45-093675.

On August 23rd, 2010, Planning Commission voted to recommend that Lordstown Village Council approve a request for zone change from Residential R-1 to Industrial I-1 at the corner of Muth and Salt Springs Road for a proposed 39.817 acre parcel identified as Parcel "B." This parcel was to be created from a larger 52.677 acre parcel owned by the Orr family, and would leave an approximate 13.263 acre parcel identified as Parcel "A," zoned as Residential R-1. There was, at that time, a draft boundary survey which was proposed. Following Planning Commission's vote, Lordstown Village Council formally approved the zone change to Industrial I-1 for Parcel "B" under Ordinance Number 94-10.

This zone change was originally requested to accommodate the construction of Anderson-DuBose, which ultimately chose to locate alternatively on Tod Avenue. As a result, the property owners never provided the final boundary survey and legal descriptions to the Planning and Zoning Office for approval, which would have then gone on to Trumbull County for approval. So Trumbull County records have consistently reflected a parcel with 52.677 acres as it originally existed and as shown in the Trumbull County Auditor's mapping system. A timeline relative to this parcel from August 23, 2010, to present was created so that you have an idea of the whole history with regards to this.

We recently contacted the property owners by letter to explain that inconsistencies between the records of Lordstown Village and Trumbull County must be clarified to reflect whether the property in question is Industrial I-1 on Parcel "B" per the approved zone change -- or whether it is all one (1) Residential R-1 parcel because of the failure to file the final boundary survey and legal descriptions and have those approved through Planning and Zoning and then Trumbull County. A telephone call was received from Robert L. Orr, who indicated that it is the family's intention to leave the original 52.677 acre parcel known as Parcel ID 45-093675 as one entire Residential R-1 property. This was confirmed in a letter sent on behalf of the Orr family.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

As a result of the property owner's lengthy inactivity since 2010 to complete the process required for the zone change, and in an effort to clarify the record, rectifying any inconsistencies between the records of Trumbull County and the Village of Lordstown, we would ask that the Lordstown Planning Commission make a motion to recommend to Lordstown Village Council that Ordinance 94-10 be repealed, thus fully and properly restoring the subject parcel to an R-1 zoning designation as was the case prior to the requested zone change in 2010.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And a certified copy be sent to the Trumbull County Auditor tax map.

MS. BORDNER: Yes, sir.

MR. RECH: Okay -- any comments?

MR. ROOK: From the one letter, here, it appears that there were five (5) owners of that property?

MS. BORDNER: Yes, sir -- they're siblings.

MR. ROOK: Yeah -- it is necessary to get something from each of them or is his letter sufficient?

MS. BORDNER: It is not. He speaks on behalf of the entire Estate. He was designated the Estate representative. Yes?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Is he the Executor of the Estate?

MS. BORDNER: Yes, sir.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Well, then he speaks for the entire --

MS. BORDNER: Yes, sir.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: So indicate in any legislation or appeal that it was requested by the Executor of the Estate for -- whoever this guy is.

MR. RECH: Other questions?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

MR. RECH: No -- okay, all right.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Kellie, will you mark up the Ordinance and send it to me, and then I'll clean it up and send it.

MS. BORDNER: Absolutely.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Thank you.

MR. RECH: Okay. So at this time, you're asking for a motion to recommend that we send to Council that Ordinance 94-10 be repealed -- properly restoring the subject parcel to Residential R-1 Zoning, which was the case prior to the zone change in 2010.

MR. REIDER: I'll make that motion, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RECH: All right, Mr. Reider is making that motion.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- with the consent of the representative of the property owners.

MR. RECH: -- with the consent of -- okay.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: That should go into the motion.

MR. RECH: All right, very good -- still good, Mr. Reider?

MR. REIDER: Yes.

MR. RECH: All right -- is there a second?

March 8, 2021

MR. SHAFFER: I'll second it.

MR. RECH: All right, Mr. Shaffer seconds. Okay -- roll call on this then, please?

MS. DUGAN: Yes -- Tim Rech?

MR. RECH: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Don Reider?

MR. REIDER: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Richard Rook?

MR. ROOK: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Bob Shaffer?

MR. SHAFFER: Yes.

MS. DUGAN: Arno Hill?

MAYOR HILL: Yes.

(ROLL CALL VOTE: 5, AYE; 0, NAY; 0, ABSTAINED.)

MR. RECH: All right, we have that taken care of -- so that will go back to Council, then. Okay, anything else on your side, Kellie?

PLANNING AND ZONING ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT: 3. Update on 6730 Tod Avenue.

MS. BORDNER: Yes, I just wanted to give you guys one (1) more item tonight. You don't have anything on it, but I just wanted to update you with regards to 6730 Tod Avenue, the Rovnak case at the old grocery store.

So we had a trial scheduled in Newton Falls Municipal Court, and the day before the trial, I was notified by the Prosecuting Attorney that it would be Mr. Rovnak's intention to plead "no contest" to the charge of Failure to Comply with our Zoning Codes; and that, in effect, is a guilty verdict; and he, therefore, will now go on to sentencing. At the time of sentencing, he will owe \$45,000 in fines. We have seen very little, if any, cleanup that has gone on at that location.

So, I had meeting with our Planning and Zoning Committee, and I asked them what their pleasure would be with regards to sentencing recommendations because the Prosecuting Attorney has requested that I prepare a sentencing recommendation, on behalf of the Village, as to what we would like to see happen.

After meeting with our committee, we concluded that they would like to see the fines stand, and he be given no more time to clean this up because he has had in excess, at the time of sentencing, of a year to try to clean it up. So they want the fines to stand, but they would be willing to hold them in abeyance while the Village take responsibility for cleaning up the site.

Our committee did not want to have our employees or our equipment on that site for liability reasons. So they have requested that I indicate that this be something that we bid out and try to get bids to clean up the property and remove the junk from the Village of Lordstown -- and that all costs associated with this endeavor be assessed against the defendant, Mr. Rovnak; and that once he receives an invoice from Village, if he fails to pay that invoice within thirty (30) days, then on the 31st day, we want the \$45,000 in fines to be activated --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- become a Judgment.

MS. BORDNER: Right -- and we would, therefore, be able to place a lien against the property --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- for \$45,000.

MS. BORDNER: -- for \$45,000 -- and then foreclose against the property.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yeah, we could initiate foreclosure proceedings.

MS. BORDNER: So that's where we're at because --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: You need a Judgment for the \$45,000.

MS. BORDNER: Right.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And it would work in reverse. We would get a Judgment for \$45,000, and enforcement would be suspended for 31 days to give him a chance to clean it up. At which time, the Judgment would then be released; and if he didn't, then we would be given permission to clean it up.

MS. DUGAN: That's not what our committee wanted. They don't want him to have one (1) more day -- they want it gone.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: All right.

MS. DUGAN: Now.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: But you need the Judgment Entry.

MR. RECH: Right.

MS. BORDNER: We need the Judgment of \$45,000 at the outset.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Right -- and the Court will probably give him some time to clean it up himself before we can foreclose on the Judgment.

MS. DUGAN: So you don't want us to get the bids like our committee wants?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: The Court is going to give us a Judgment for \$1.00 or for \$45,000 or somewhere in between. That's what Courts do and then they will also order him and give him time to clean it up, and it should be the shortest period -- two (2) weeks, thirty (30) days, whatever. We're asking for no time, but the Judge is going to give him some time.

And then let's assume he doesn't do it. At that point, we record the Judgment as a lien on the property; and then -- here is the problem -- unless the Court includes in its Judgment Entry, our ability to go in -- self-help with the contractor, we can't trespass on someone's property -- to clean up someone's property -- because this isn't abandoned property. This isn't mowing the lawn and assessing the cost on abandoned property.

So the Judgment Entry has to be for the monetary damages and include any directions -- time that he has to clean it up; and thirdly, that we have the authority to go in and clean it up and assess that cost, in addition to the Judgment Entry against the property; and if he has a Judgment on this property, we can foreclose on it, and it would be sold at Sheriff's Sale; and the first dollars would go to taxes, if there's any -- and there's always some taxes outstanding.

Kellie says there's no mortgage on here -- because number two (2) would be a bank mortgage.

Number three (3) -- any other Judgments; and if she says there are no other Judgments, the first \$45,000, plus the taxes, comes to us. And I don't know what this is worth, but it's probably worth more than \$45,000.

MAYOR HILL: Not by much -- he has a lot of fire issues inside there, wires hanging everywhere.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: All right -- so it's not habitable.

MAYOR HILL: No, not really.

MR. REIDER: Dangerous.

MAYOR HILL: It's dangerous.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

MS. BORDNER: The only other thing I wanted to mention about that was that -- and it was brought up by my Committee as well, and they're not wrong -- and it is something that Denise and I have recognized, as well, in the past is that -- when Planning Commission gave him Site Plan approval, he had a very distinct directive as to what he was going to do at that location. He has never conducted business in accordance with the way that he was approved.

I don't know what Planning Commission can do about that, if anything, but -- because I could not really find anything in the Code that would, maybe, assist me in that.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Well, he really doesn't have a business, does he?

MS. BORDNER: Not really --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: It's just --

MS. BORDNER: It's simply storage in a sense.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yeah -- and it's not under roof.

MS. BORDNER: Well, not currently.

MAYOR HILL: It could be, but he has so much junk there that he has it set everywhere.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Like the guy who had the cars there, remember?

MS. BORDNER: Yes, once again, this is just a situation where -- I read the minutes -- maybe more questions could have been asked, but it's unfortunate because he never ever operated that location as the business for which he proposed. The use was never as granted by this Planning Commission.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes.

MR. ROOK: So if he goes in now and cleans it all up -- gets everything from outside to inside, so it looks good -- he doesn't have to pay anybody anything?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Well, if we get a Judgment, the Judgment is there, yes.

MR. ROOK: Okay.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: It's hanging over his head.

MR. ROOK: It's still there whether he cleans it up now or not?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Right.

MS. BORDNER: Our Committee has asked us to stand very strong on that \$45,000 worth of fines; but as Attorney Dutton has indicated, the Judge has every ability to do whatever it is that he thinks is best in his good judgment.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: You know, about 20 years ago we had the infamous One Day Garage case, who was that?

MAYOR HILL: Right across the street. It was a lady named June Martin Roberts. And what happened was she came and hired One Day Garage to come put it up. She had it laid out. Ron Barnhart went and checked it out.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes.

MAYOR HILL: And then they went and just moved the stakes.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yeah.

MAYOR HILL: And moved it too close to the one property line.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes -- so it was a violation, and the Board of Zoning Appeals wouldn't grant a waiver afterwards; and the Village Planning Commission and the Board of

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

Zoning Appeals was -- and Council was hell bent to enforce it, and I think she was within -- what, feet?

MAYOR HILL: She was within 5-foot, and where she put it, the next-door neighbor complained because where her garage was, it cut off the afternoon sun to come in where he had his tomato plants in the window in his garage.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And we enforced it, and the Court Ordered, "Move it or disassemble it." And we never had a One Day Garage problem in the Village since that time, and I don't think we've ever had a setback problem in the Village since that time.

MS. BORDNER: I mean, I think that if we could get some support on a particular case such as this --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- you'll never have them again because reputations are that, you know, the Village --

MAYOR HILL: -- enforces.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- yes, enforces its Zoning Ordinances.

MS. DUGAN: What did we ask for Dennis Wilson, and what did we get?

MS. BORDNER: So if my recollection is accurate, we calculated appropriately \$1,500 on the Dennis Wilson case -- \$1,500 in fines -- and we literally got \$100. It's very frustrating.

MR. RECH: Yeah.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes.

MR. REIDER: Uh-huh.

MS. BORDNER: It's very frustrating. It doesn't send enough of a message.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Right.

MR. ROOK: So the second part of the question is -- if he cleans it up. He pays his \$45,000. He still has a right to do business there, and he can start this whole thing all over again -- or could you nip it in the bud right away at that point?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: No. No, he -- as long as he comes into compliance and the Zoning is proper, and his Site Plan Review says that he can run whatever business he told us he was going to, he can run whatever business he was going to --

MR. ROOK: And do it again -- and take another year to get him out of business again?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Just because you have a violation, and then you cleanse that violation, you know, it doesn't mean that your business is destroyed.

MR. RECH: Right.

MR. ROOK: If you don't put the hammer down on him good, he's liable to clean it up, and do the same thing over again and over again.

MS. BORDNER: That is the problem. And I guess that if I understand our Codes correctly, I believe I could issue a Zoning Violation for him using it inappropriately. He's not using it in the use for which --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- same way with the Fear Forest. In other words, if you've been approved for "X" number of parking spaces and you know -- if you go over by two (2), no one cares; but if you double it -- or 50%, then you can; and at some point, you can issue a Cease-and-Desist Order.

MS. BORDNER: The problem is that once I do that, and once I issue the Zoning Violation and they don't comply, it then must go to Court intervention, and I must have the Court back me up. If they don't --

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

MAYOR HILL: -- we're dead in the water, again.

MR. REIDER: And am I'm right, Kellie, there -- Arno, you made a comment that I think our Fire Chief made that statement one time. There's so many violations inside of that building -- live 220 lines hanging down, just all bare wires, everything. So no one would want to -- I wouldn't want to walk through the place, you know. The electric company --

MAYOR HILL: The best thing they could do is have it go up.

MR. ROOK: Then you declare it unoccupiable and have it torn down, at that point, if it's that bad.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Well, that's a lengthy process.

MR. ROOK: Yep.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: That's more -- in our words, yes, if someone were occupying it, you know, and it didn't have plumbing, if it didn't -- if it had a -- not an intact roof, if it had windows broken, if you had electrical wires, if it was a fire hazard, HVAC system didn't work properly, if you had rodents in there -- any number of those things could be an order to condemn the property.

Then you go to the Fire Chief and the Board of Health, and you get an order to demolish the property; and then the property owner has a right to come in and challenge that, and it goes to the Common Pleas Court; and if we were to go and do it in advance -- in other words, you just do a quick demolition, suddenly these properties become worth millions.

MR. RECH: Yeah.

MS. BORDNER: It's some interesting issues we have.

MR. REIDER: Uh-huh.

MS. BORDNER: It's unfortunate, in all honesty, that a couple of bad apples spoil it for the whole bunch.

MR. RECH: Yeah.

MAYOR HILL: I guess I got a question, Kellie -- has Holton resolved -- and how about the one over there on Newton Falls-Bailey? And then I know there was another one, which I think you did take care of, which was over on Highland behind the fence -- but that's done, right?

MS. BORDNER: That one is done. The one on Highland Avenue is done. As to Holton, that made its way through the Court; and if you ask me of the assessment of what happened in Court, I guess I would have to say that without there being a Judgment Entry saying, "Lordstown you lose" -- that's exactly what happened.

They kept it going in the Court so very long that at the end, once again, he was charged with a minimal fine and smacked on the hand and sent on his way, so --

MAYOR HILL: Now does First Energy still have a lien on him?

MS. BORDNER: They still have a case pending. First Energy has a case against Mr. Holton still pending.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: For what?

MS. BORDNER: So, he had stored many vehicles --

MAYOR HILL: 80 or 90.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yeah, I know.

MS. BORDNER: -- on their property, and they took to task to having all of those brought out from the woods and removed from their property; and so it cost -- I want to tell you, if memory again serves me, about \$130,000.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

SOLICITOR DUTTON: They have a Judgment?

MS. BORDNER: They have a case pending.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Okay.

MS. BORDNER: And last I knew, he was representing himself on that so I think that the Court is struggling to try to get through that case; but as to the case that the Village had against him, it just died on the vine if you will.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: If you bring some people with you, a Council Member, maybe Ron Radtka -- maybe someone from the Planning Commission, who are residents of the area, who vote for judges -- and it's not just the Zoning Administrator versus a property owner, you might get a better result from the Court.

MS. DUGAN: I had the Mayor when I went for Dennis Wilson, and we got \$100.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Maybe you want someone stronger than the Mayor.

MAYOR HILL: Bodor is gone, though.

MS. BORDNER: And as for the property on Newton Falls-Bailey, that also went to Court, and the police were involved with that as well, and so it was a matter of them enforcing the inoperable and immovable issue of the vehicles; and the Court decided to take their case first -- and again, we were successful, but to a minimal degree because it was a very minimal fine; and as I understand it, Officer Metz was advised that if this didn't work, that he would have to continue to file these charges every month.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yes.

MS. BORDNER: And of course, Officer Metz has better things to do, and I don't blame him for that -- so he declined to continue in that vein.

When the Zoning Violations, that Denise had put together a beautiful packet on, then came into play on that particular property, the Prosecutor declined to move forward. So I'm sure that --

MS. DUGAN: -- so he gets to stay there.

MS. BORDNER: Right -- I'm sure that Mr. Reider can advise you that it does not look good over there, and that he has put up a 4 to 6-foot stockade-type fence, and just hides everything behind it --

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- to enclose the vehicles.

MS. DUGAN: He has them on both sides of the fence now.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Oh.

MR. REIDER: There's semi-trucks parked back there -- all kinds of stuff. It looks terrible.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Well, you know, you go into these Court proceedings, and no one got shot here, no one is getting a divorce and kid's custody. These are issues that a Judge looks at and says, "This is just a cat fight over the Village and a property owner."

MR. RECH: Uh-huh.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: And a truthful statement -- but usually we would say, "Your Honor, we're not here to punish this person. We just want this mess cleaned up" -- which is true.

MR. REIDER: Right.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: Yet unless the Court imposes a significant financial fine, it will never get cleaned up -- \$100 fines, \$150 fines aren't going to move these people.

MR. RECH: Yeah.

MS. BORDNER: No.

March 8, 2021

SOLICITOR DUTTON: But if you can get some people to go with you -- and maybe even offer to testify -- even though you don't need their testimony -- that might help because this is Phil Vigorito, right --

MS. BORDNER: Yes, sir.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: -- who lives here.

MR. RECH: Yeah.

MR. RECH: Yeah -- anything else, Kellie?

MS. BORDNER: No, sir.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT:

MR. RECH: All right -- anything from the Solicitor this evening?

SOLICITOR DUTTON: I have no report.

CORRESPONDENCE:

MR. RECH: All right -- any correspondence to talk about?

MS. DUGAN: I have nothing.

OLD BUSINESS:

MR. RECH: All right -- any Old Business that we haven't talked about?

MS. DUGAN: No, sir.

SOLICITOR DUTTON: That's all we've talked about is Old Business.

MEMBER COMMENTS:

MR. RECH: All right -- any other additional member comments?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE PLANNING COMMISSION, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

MR. RECH: Any public comments?

(WHEREAS, THERE WAS NO RESPONSE FROM THE BOARD NOR THE FLOOR OR ZOOM AUDIO, AND PROCEEDINGS WERE AS FOLLOWS:)

ADJOURNMENT:

MR. RECH: All right, motion for adjournment?

MAYOR HILL: So moved.

MR. RECH: Mayor Hill -- second?

MR. ROOK: Second.

MR. RECH: Okay, Mr. Rook. All in favor, "aye"?

MR. SHAFFER: Aye.

MR. REIDER: Aye.

MR. ROOK: Aye.

MAYOR HILL: Aye.

MR. RECH: Aye.

(VOICE VOTE: 5, AYE; 0, NAY; 0, ABSTAINED.)

MR. RECH: All right, we're adjourned. Thank you.

Village of Lordstown Planning Commission

March 8, 2021

(WHEREUPON, THE PUBLIC HEARING BEFORE THE LORDSTOWN VILLAGE PLANNING COMMISSION, IN THE ABOVE-CAPTIONED MATTERS, CONCLUDED AT 7:28 P.M.)

Submitted by:

Approved by:

Denise L. Dugan
Assistant Planning & Zoning Administrator

Tim Rech
Chairperson