

MINUTES
Zoning Board of Appeals
July 22, 2026, 5:30 PM
Hillsdale City Hall – Council Chambers

I. Call to Order at 5:30 PM

- a. Pledge of Allegiance was recited by those present.
- b. Roll Call:
 - i. Members Present: Daniel LaRue – Chair, Tammie Henderson – Vice Chair, John Kast, Matthew Bentley, and Matthew Kniffin
 - ii. Others Present: Luke Robson (Hillsdale Renaissance LLC), Elias McConnell (the Hillsdale Handyman), and Olivia Smith (Zoning Administrator)
 - iii. Members Absent: Amber Yoder – Secretary (excused), Jordan Adams (late notification)

II. Public Comment on Agenda Items

- a. None

III. Consent Agenda

- a. Motion by Henderson to approve the consent agenda as presented. Second by Kniffin. 5-0. Motion carried.

IV. Old Business

- a. None

V. New Business

- a. VV26-0002 – 16 Hillsdale St
 - i. Chair LaRue opened the public hearing at 5:32 PM
 - ii. Zoning Administrator Smith presented background on the appeal.
 - iii. Luke Robson and Elias McConnell presented information on their understanding of the situation.
 - 1. Listed a similar wall-mounted sign/billboard located at 81 W Carleton Rd
 - 2. Stated that the variance could be a request from the requirements found in Sec. 26-6 and/or the setback found in Sec. 26-9(5).
 - 3. McConnell – The mounting process was a frame affixed to the building. The sign is then attached to the frame and can be removed at any time.
 - iv. Member reports of site visits and conversations with Applicant
 - 1. Kniffin reported that he had contacted the Applicant regarding the rendering and the number of signs proposed. Verified in the meeting if the subject sign was all that will be erected on the building. Robson confirmed.
 - 2. LaRue and Henderson stated that they had driven by the sign.
 - v. Members of the Public in support of the Petitioner
 - 1. McConnell – The messaging is not offensive. The elders at Hillsdale Orthodox Presbyterian Church stated that they were neutral to the situation.

- vi. Members of the Public in opposition to the Petitioner
 - 1. None Present
- vii. Rebuttals
 - 1. None
- viii. Chair LaRue closed the public hearing at 5:53 PM
- ix. Discussion regarding Finding of Fact
 - 1. Board deliberated if completing the questionnaire was important for this appeal. Determined that it would be for the sake of consistency.
 - a. Smith – Current Finding of Fact documents created by the previous Zoning Administrator and Legal. She will work on creating more user-friendly Finding of Fact sheets for future appeals that still aligns with statute and court precedents.
 - 2. Robson pointed out that the Finding of Fact sheet states that if the Board answers “No” that it is a recommendation that the appeal be denied per the word “should” and not “shall.”
 - 3. Board discussed their confusion and displeasure with Question 10.
- x. Motion Proposed on Finding of Fact
 - 1. Motion by Henderson to approve the dimensional variance. Second by Kast.
- xi. Discussion regarding the motion
 - a. Robson – Sign will be moved for renovations at the building that will hopefully occur next year.
- xii. Vote on the motion
 - 1. Roll call vote taken by Zoning Administrator Smith:
 - a. Adams – N/A
 - b. Bentley – Yes
 - c. Kniffin – Yes
 - d. Henderson – Yes
 - e. Yoder – N/A
 - f. LaRue – Yes
 - g. Kast – Yes
 - 5-0. Motion passed.
 - 2. *Completed Finding of Fact sheet enclosed as part of these minutes.*

VI. General Public Comment

- a. LaRue stated that the sign was attractive.
- b. McConnell apologized to the Board for his unusual attire.
- c. Kniffin commented on the dissonance between the concepts of “wall-mounted” and “temporary.”

VII. Adjourned at 5:55 PM



**Zoning Board of Appeals
Finding of Fact Sheet**

Case #: VV26-0002
Property Address: 16 HILLSDALE ST
Parcel #: 006-227-236-06
Property Owner: HILLSDALE RENAISSANCE LLC
Zoning: B-3 (GENERAL BUSINESS)
Request Type: NON-USE
Variance From: SEC. 26-6

Question 1

Are there exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property that do not apply generally to other properties or classes of uses in the same district or zone?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 2**.

If your answer is NO, then the request for relief should be denied.

Question 2

Will compliance with the strict letter of the restrictions in the zoning ordinance governing area, setbacks, frontage, height, bulk, or density unreasonably prevent the applicant from using the property for a permitted purpose or render conformity with such restrictions unnecessarily burdensome?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 3**.

If your answer is NO, the request for relief should be denied.

Question 3

Is a grant of a variance necessary for the preservation and enjoyment by the applicant of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone and vicinity?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 4**.

If your answer is NO, then the request for relief should be denied.

Question 4

Can the relief requested be granted in such fashion that the spirit of the ordinance will be observed and it will not be materially detrimental to the public safety and welfare or otherwise impair the public health, comfort, or morals of the inhabitants of the city?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 5**.

If your answer is NO, then the request for relief should be denied.

Question 5

Can the relief requested be granted in such fashion that it will not cause material injury to the other property and improvements located in the same zone or district in which the property is located?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 6**.

If your answer is NO, then the request for relief should be denied.

Question 6

Can the relief requested be granted in such fashion that it will not adversely affect the purposes or objectives of the future land use plan of the City?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 7**.

If your answer is NO, then the request for relief should be denied.

Question 7

Can the relief requested be granted in such fashion that it will not impair an adequate supply of light and air to adjacent property, unreasonably increase the congestion in public streets, increase the danger of fire, or unreasonably diminish or impair established property values within the surrounding area?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 8**.

If your answer is NO, then the request for relief should be denied.

Question 8

Will granting the relief requested do substantial justice to the applicant as well as to other property owners in the district?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, proceed to **Question 10**.

If your answer is NO, proceed to **Question 9**.

Question 9

Would a lesser relaxation of the restrictions in the zoning ordinance than that applied for by the applicant give substantial relief to the applicant and be more consistent with justice to other property owners?

☒ Yes

☐ No

If your answer is YES, please state the lesser modification below and proceed to **Question 10**.

None

If your answer is NO, then the variance should be denied.

Question 10

Is the hardship for which the applicant seeks a variance the result of the applicant's own actions?

☐ Yes

☒ No

If your answer is YES, then the variance should be denied.

If your answer is NO, then the variance should be granted, either as requested or as modified in your response to Question 9, if any.

Zoning Board of Appeals
Finding of Fact
Vote Roll Call Sheet

VV26-0002
16 Hillsdale St
7/22/2026

Q1	Vote	Q2	Vote	Q3	Vote	Q4	Vote	Q5	Vote	Q6	Vote
Yoder	N/A	LaRue	Yes	Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A	Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	Yes
LaRue	Yes	Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A	Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	Yes
Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A	Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A
Adams	N/A	Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A	LaRue	Yes
Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A	LaRue	Yes	Kast	Yes
Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A	LaRue	Yes	Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A
Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A	LaRue	Yes	Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A	Bentley	Yes
Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 5 N: 0	

Q7	Vote	Q8	Vote	Q9	Vote	Q10	Vote
Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A	LaRue	Yes	Kast	No
Yoder	N/A	LaRue	Yes	Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A
LaRue	Yes	Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A	Bentley	No
Kast	Yes	Adams	N/A	Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	No
Adams	N/A	Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	No
Bentley	Yes	Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A
Kniffin	Yes	Henderson	Yes	Yoder	N/A	LaRue	No
Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 5 N: 0		Y: 0 N: 5	

Motion	Vote
Adams	N/A
Bentley	Yes
Kniffin	Yes
Henderson	Yes
Yoder	N/A
LaRue	Yes
Kast	Yes
Y: 5 N: 0	

Notes: