

Bainbridge Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
December 18, 2014

SPECIAL MEETING

The special meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 6:00 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis; Mr. Jason Maglietta, Alternate and Mr. Mark Murphy. Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector was present.

The Bainbridge Township Board of Trustees consisting of Mrs. Lorrie Benza, Mr. Christopher Horn and Mr. Jeffrey Markley met with the Board of Zoning Appeals to review public hearing procedures.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING

Pursuant to notice by publication and certified mail, the public hearing was called to order at 7:10 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis; and Mr. Mark Murphy. Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector was present.

Mr. Lamanna welcomed everyone to the regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals. He then explained the hearing process and swore in all persons who intended to testify.

Application 2014-24 by The Wembley Club (David Barr) for property at 8345 Woodberry Boulevard - Continuance

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit *and area variances* for the purpose of constructing an addition including indoor tennis courts and relocating outdoor tennis courts. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Mr. David Barr, Owner and Mr. Jon Novak, Architect were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna stated that it is his understanding that meetings/consultations have been held with the local residents. He asked Mr. Barr to bring the board up to date as well.

Mr. Barr testified by saying yes and thank you. He stated that since the last meeting many of the neighbors attended the meeting and many are here tonight and they expressed a concern about the location for the proposed indoor and outdoor facilities and the suggestion was made by the board for him to go back and speak with the folks in the neighborhood and try to come up with something that was more agreeable to everybody. He said he has done that and the plans have been revised from where it was originally which was the indoor courts being positioned closer to the front of the property at Woodberry Boulevard and now they have moved it as people have suggested to the back corner of the property and noted that Mr. Jon Novak, Architect is present. He said they also put in some Pine trees that will lessen the site lines coming in from the street and seeing the new proposed indoor court facilities so he believes he really listened to what everyone has asked for in multi meetings and everyone had the opportunity to give him their input and he believes personally that he has done a good job of revising the plan to accommodate them. He said he thinks the board will see with the Pine trees the site lines will be minimal but in the winter months you will be able to see it a little bit but it will be remedied with the Pine trees as shown on the drawings. He asked the board if there is any additional information he should be speaking to.

Mr. Lewis said the new structure is running parallel to the street and it looks like it is 152' off the street according to the site plan.

Mr. Barr said it is at least 150' and more than 150'.

Mr. Lewis said he was referring to the actual proposed building structure.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is 252'.

Mr. Barr said he thinks it is valid that the board knows that the plan is going to cost the club considerably more with the new revised plan. He said they have gone out of their way to accommodate the requests even though the cost is significantly more and the reason is because in the back of the property, the southeast portion of the property, there are existing clay courts that under the plan he presented earlier would have been able to stay but now that the neighbors have asked for us to move the indoor facility to the back of the property they are actually going to have to remove those courts from where they are now and reposition them into the front of the property and that is a significant extra expense being borne by the club to do that so hopefully everyone will understand that the revised plan is certainly a show of good faith by the club even to the point where it is more expensive but they are willing to do that to try to maintain a good relationship with the neighbors.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Barr if he was talking about the two outdoor courts.

Mr. Barr said right, they are being removed.

Mr. Lewis said and you are looking to replace those with four outdoor courts in front of the building there.

Mr. Barr said yes.

Mr. Lewis said one of those is in the side yard area.

Mr. Lamanna said compare that to what is being asked for.

Mr. Lewis said so the original proposal is for one building running perpendicular towards the street and now there is a two-building shaped like an L.

Mr. Barr said he would say that is a fair description.

Mr. Gutoskey said on the original proposal it looks like you have five indoor courts that were added and asked how many are on this one.

Mr. Barr said this proposal has six.

Mr. Gutoskey said this has an extra court on it versus the original.

Mr. Lewis said in the original presentation part of the conversation was the use of all of this interior space and with this new layout it looks like you no longer are having an activity room, it looks like it is purely indoor tennis courts at this particular point.

Mr. Barr said that is correct.

Mr. Lewis said he is looking at all of the notes from one of the previous visits. He said one of the things the board noted was that it looks like it is still an all metal building, sides and roof because he can't tell from the renderings what the building materials are, it is just a white building.

Mr. Barr said that is correct.

Mr. Lewis asked what it is made of.

Mr. Jon Novak testified that it is a metal building.

Mr. Lewis said and one of the other things in his notes the board had asked Mr. Barr to look into was, as the board pointed out, the architect of this building and style, in no way matches the existing clubhouse and is inconsistent with the existing architecture on the property. He asked if there has been a revision to accomplish that.

Mr. Barr replied no.

Mr. Lewis said one of the other things was, and he realizes that the rendering shows some evergreen trees separating the proposed front yard outdoor courts from the street and it looks like they are at the 100' line. He asked if it is a flat elevation from the proposed building all the way to the street and there was no provision for mounding and setting trees on top of the mounding as a permanent buffer beyond that and he wants it confirmed to him that what they are proposing now is flat with a row of trees.

Mr. Barr said yes.

Mr. Lewis asked about the rendering of the site plan with the trees etc. on it, on the part of the building that is going towards the back running parallel to the property line, this section looks like it is proposed as 32' off the property line and on that section there isn't any permanent screening.

Mr. Novak stated that is in the forest and they will have to remove some trees.

Mr. Lewis asked if those are mature trees there and it is going back to the lower right so part of it you have got outdoor courts on.

Mr. Lamanna asked what effort was made to stay within the 40% lot coverage requirement, it is 3.4% over and the zoning code provides for a maximum of 40% lot coverage and generally the board likes to hold people close to the 40% as possible especially since this is a 10 acre property, this is not some small lot in a commercial district on E. Washington Street where people have been given some relief because of the size of the lot with the difficulty of putting a commercial enterprise on it. He said in this case this is a residential district and he thinks the board needs a pretty strong showing as to why any variance should be granted here.

Mr. Barr said we are talking about the economics of having a tennis club, a tennis club is different than having a sandwich shop, space is required. He said the economics of having a tennis club, there is another tennis club close by that has three times the acreage than Wembley so 10 acres might sound like a lot but in terms of tennis clubs it is not a lot, there are a good number of tennis clubs that have larger acreage than that, it requires space. He said having a club with five indoor courts is economically unsustainable, you would just not have enough courts to sustain the kind of membership that you need for a club to be successful. He said the Wembley Club has struggled and does not currently have an economically viable business. He said more courts are needed to compete and sustain the kind of membership that you need to have a successful club so that would be the reason for the expansion of their facility.

Mr. Novak referred to the Bocce ball, volley ball court and shuffleboard and said those are things they can remove.

Mr. Barr said he wants to make a correction in that he doesn't think they are removing the volleyball court, it is shuffleboard and Bocce ball.

Mr. Novak said the removal of those will give them coverage back, however for where they are at, it came out to be what it is which is 3% over.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if they currently have 10 courts.

Mr. Barr said there are currently 10 courts in total, they have five in the winter.

Mr. Gutoskey said you will end up with 15 total.

Mr. Barr said that is correct, with 11 in the winter. He said it is just as important to have the additional courts in the winter and in addition to that having permanent indoor courts will allow people to play in the summer on rainy days. He said right now when it rains you are out of luck at Wembley because in the summer all of the courts are outside. He said when you build indoor courts and have a rainy day the league teams can still play inside so that is very important and he can't stress the importance of that enough when you are selling memberships and when people have different choices they want to be able to know they are playing their league match that night as opposed to having a constant threat of being rained out.

Mr. Lamanna said there are courts going one way and courts going the other way. He asked how many are in the larger part of the building.

Mr. Barr said four in the rectangle that emanates from the clubhouse and two to the south of that.

Mr. Lamanna said it is the depth of the court that is driving the depth of that building because things are turned the other way.

Mr. Novak said yes 120' plus.

Mr. Lamanna asked if it is feasible to have the courts the same orientation, why was it decided to turn it.

Mr. Barr said he agrees with the board, it should be oriented the same way.

Mr. Novak said with two courts next to each other it is 120 x 120 and it won't change that shape.

Mr. Lamanna said it seems like that the piece of the building is a little bit larger proportionately for the two than for the four.

Mr. Barr said there is going to be a small, modest little viewing area between the courts where someone can stand and watch their teammates play.

Mr. Novak said that is what drives the southern part.

Mr. DeWater referred to the south court pushed to the east and asked if that can't slide over and still maintain the five courts and give the neighbors some relief there.

Mr. Barr explained that the bubble goes up in the winter.

Mr. Murphy asked about the height of the proposed building.

Mr. Barr said 38'.

Mr. Lamanna stated that the board will give everyone else a chance to give comments or ask questions.

Mr. Richard Seif of 8245 Woodberry Boulevard testified that he lives three houses down from the club. He asked how the courts are laid out and what is the critical math on the number of courts.

Mr. Barr said there will be six indoor courts.

Mr. Seif said there are five showing as indoor courts there already.

Mr. Barr said those five are under bubble in the winter and outside in the summer and under the new construction there will be six indoor courts in that space, that is the proposal.

Mr. Seif said six indoor in the permanent structure.

Mr. Barr said correct and the five courts that were discussed before will be unchanged, it will be outside in the summer and under bubble in the winter so there won't be any change there. He said you must have at least five in the summer for the USTA teams so when it rains they can go in and still play their match.

Mr. Seif said so it will remain open in the summer and a bubble in the winter and asked if the pool is staying.

Mr. Barr said the pool is staying.

Mr. Seif asked if it will be bubbled in the winter.

Mr. Barr said correct.

Mr. Seif said the new structure will be a major change.

Mr. Barr said correct.

Mr. Lewis said that coincides with the removal of two of the outdoor courts in the rear of the property which would now become basically two outdoor becomes two indoors on the L and covering the same proximity.

Mr. Barr said right.

Mr. Seif said the original objection was the aesthetics and it didn't match the clubhouse or the neighborhood so now we have another structure, a metal building, so the question is, is that aesthetically reasonable to the changes made.

Mr. Barr said he does not know but from a cost standpoint he doesn't think you are going to see many tennis facilities that beautiful at all and the cost of the project is such that they don't have billions of dollars to make it beautiful but hopefully they will protect the view.

Mr. Seif said he has fake dormers on his house and if you put a fake façade on the front to blend in with the clubhouse and the neighborhood is it cost prohibitive.

Mr. Barr said it is cost prohibitive.

Mr. Lewis asked what the roof pitch is on these buildings because the side walls were pretty tall. He said 20' on the sidewalls and 18' on the roof with a 4/12 pitch which is not much. He said the reason he brought this up is when he is looking at the elevation, although the building is 38' tall when you have a low pitched roof part of this elevation is not showing a huge roof to the street, it is a smaller view.

Mr. Novak said that was one of the comments when we turned it in.

Mr. Lewis said you had mentioned that you have met with residents.

Mr. Barr replied yes.

Mr. Lewis said his question on that was, he thinks that Wembley has a homeowner's association so was this a formal homeowner's association meeting or was this the adjacent residents.

Mr. Barr said it was adjacent residents and more, they sent an invitation to everybody in the neighborhood, it wasn't a formal homeowner's association meeting, it was just an invitation to the club one night to see what the new plan looked like and also to share their comments.

Mr. Lewis said so there was no formal representation by a homeowner's association.

Mr. Barr said correct.

Mr. Nick Yuhás of 8320 Woodberry Boulevard asked the board when the construction will be done and is there a limitation as far as time when it has to be completed. He said he doesn't want to see this become a couple year project and he wants to make sure there is something written in there that states once construction starts that it is done within a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. Murphy stated that once he starts construction, he would think he would want it to happen as quickly as possible.

Mr. Yuhás said he understands but people lose financing.

Mr. Murphy said he doesn't know if it has ever been part of this board's responsibility to be involved with that.

Mr. Lamanna said there are limitations on starting but the variance runs with the land unlike a conditional use permit that is personal to the owner. He said the board could establish limitations that you would have to commence construction in a certain amount of time or the variance would lapse and that is to prevent people from getting a variance and not acting on it and coming back years later and wanting to do it when conditions have changed etc. so it is an encouragement for people not to come in and bank away a variance and not actually do anything with it. He said if he is half-way through the project and financial tragedy befalls him there is no way the board could prevent a fallout from that and at that point in time there is not much that anybody can do unfortunately.

Mr. Yuhás stated that if the variance is with the property and construction isn't started in a matter of two years what about a potential new owner.

Mr. Lamanna said a new owner would have to come in and meet all of the requirements.

Mr. Yuhás said and submit an application.

Mr. Lamanna said yes but they would have to get the conditional use permit transferred to them with all of the conditions associated with it and if there is non-completed construction they may be forced to submit to additional conditions to finish that or remove it etc. with a reasonable solution to deal with the situation in order to get the conditional use to continue on so we do have that mechanism to deal with it. He added that a successor would have to satisfy the board as to how they are going to undo whatever was done or finish whatever was unfinished so the board still has control over ongoing use.

Mr. Seif asked if there is a way to mock up a Google maps street view so we can get a feel of what it is going to look like completed.

Mr. Barr said that Mr. Novak could.

Mr. Murphy asked if Mr. Waldorff is here because he has already done something just like that and presented it to the board.

Mr. Charlie Waldorff testified that they live in a neighborhood where there are very specific rules on what you can do with your property including the mailboxes. He said he has been concerned about the neighborhood, quality of the homes, their look and appearance and while Mr. Barr may say that there were a couple of comments about this space, he believes, that was a larger point of the conversation they had. He said according to the drawings he has seen so far basically it hasn't got as much charm as a metal warehouse in a high residential neighborhood. He said his comments are "he hopes the trees will make it look better". He said quite frankly he does not think what we are concerned about here are the requirements for the homes in the neighborhood and make sure that whatever goes in and he is not trying to take a position on letting Mr. Barr build something new it is letting him build something that is going to fit into the neighborhood aesthetically. He said they talked about that and he sees nothing that would suggest that that building has been in any way modified to look more attractive. He said if you take a building that size made of white steel and drop it in the middle of our neighborhood it is not going to look good at all. He said how many trees will there be and how long will it take them to grow and added that he included in a photograph what the property looks like in the winter and the trees on the property provide no barrier at all and the Pine trees alone will not totally block it out. He said it is a reasonable request considering that the precedence that has been set by the homes across the street and you can look at the Fellowship Church and the Federated Church and the building across the street and look at the fire station here, people who build stuff make it look good and what is being proposed may be fine for an industrial park, let us keep in mind this is not an industrial park, it is our neighborhood, this is where we live. He said when he looks out his window everyday he sees the Wembley Club and there are no leaves on the trees right now and what gets built there he is going to look at every day for the rest of the time he lives here and he would like that building to fit in and he thinks there are ways to do that. He said they are saying it is too expensive but where is the backup that says it is too expensive, they did a quick assessment and said they don't want to go there so let's not worry about it. He said he would disagree with that and let's try to make this thing work within the community and not just drop something in it. He asked if what is on the paper has to be built and he would hate to see the project get started and then get changed and what we end up with is not what we thought was going to be built.

Mr. Lewis said he has an observation, he is looking at the original site plan which many have probably never seen depending on your meeting attendance or offering at the club to visit. He said the original building ran perpendicular to the street and it was only 100' off the street and created a very predominant front yard at the property presence, as close as you could possibly get it to the street with the setback. He said the current site plan has it way back in the rear corner, almost the entirety and the front of the building is not running perpendicular to the street and they have moved it from 100' off the street to 250', it was moved 2-1/2 times in depth.

Mr. Lewis continued by saying he likes your observations and it is disappointing to him that if the architectural standards of Wembley are that tough there is no homeowner's association board or representative of this mammoth high end wonderful development here to speak to these standards, that is probably a little disappointing because you are talking about how it affects property values and standards in your development, he does not understand that. He asked if the representatives will be speaking on behalf of the association.

Mr. Scott King of 16465 Majestic Oaks Drive testified that he is a board member. He stated that they have had many discussions amongst the board and frankly they thought that this hearing would be cancelled but he didn't know they had to come to the meeting as a board but he is here not so much as a board but as a homeowner. He said that he belongs to the club and they all want to see it succeed but it has to fit into the neighborhood and a warehouse structure, would you like it sitting next to your house. He said from his personal perspective they want it to succeed but the aesthetics are dead and you can see it from the road view and Mr. Waldorff has done a nice job of putting it together.

Mr. Lewis asked if they are okay with the site plan, yours is more architectural.

Mr. Jim Donahue of 16440 Crown Pointe testified that they are one of the ones adjacent, Crown Pointe backs up to the east and they actually walked the property today with Mr. Barr and prepped for the meeting and does he want this in his backyard in the woods, no he doesn't if he has his druthers but having said that they want the club to be very successful and he thinks Mr. Barr has done a great job with the exception of the aesthetics which everyone is worried about. He said he moved it back and shifted it around and has done a lot to address their concerns. He said he has one concern that he would like to have a few more Pines on the right so when they are looking at the woods they are not looking at the side of the building but again with the exception of the aesthetics, they are supportive and maybe the color could be changed, he does not know what the options are. He said the site plan, even though it is in his back yard, he is okay with it.

Mr. Lewis asked about the color of the main clubhouse now and if it is white. He said just because the rendering is showing white, metal buildings come in almost any color you could possibly want. He asked if this would be remedied with a color that would fit into a woodsy kind of setting as opposed to a bright white or yellow building. He said it sounds like the applicant is wide open and color is not the deal breaker.

Mr. Barr said correct.

Mr. Lewis said he is hearing that it is not economically feasible for you do this unless you put up a metal building. He said he hasn't heard any justification other than it is your desire.

Mr. DeWater asked if a non-functional dormer or decorative piece could be used to break up the roofline such as a fake window would be cost effective.

Mr. Novak said you are talking about a dormer that is already way bigger than a normal dormer and they are roughly \$10,000 a dormer and with a minimum of seven or eight it would cost approximately \$100,000.

Mr. Gutoskey said the problem is when these people moved in there and built their houses they were aware of what was there so now he thinks the building itself has to generate to meet with what is in there and they are not getting something that they did not buy into originally and that is what the architect has to try to figure out.

Mr. Martin Tabone of 8340 Woodberry Boulevard testified that he lives directly across from the club and inasmuch as it is not economically feasible he really does not want to look at a 100' white wall or whatever and you are right when he bought in this neighborhood the club was there and it was an attractive quaint little club, it was great. He said he understands that he has to make money but he doesn't think he should have the privilege of making money at the expense of the property owners in the neighborhood and even for you guys to protect our interests, both our financial interests and the overall look of our neighborhood. He said they count on you to guard our interest and the idea that everybody who feels this way didn't show up tonight, he does not know why that is, it could be the weather but whatever, but he talked to a lot of people and they feel this way so we are counting on you (the board) as he said before to watch out for their interests not only today but ten years down the road or two years down the road and if his plan doesn't work out are we going to be stuck with this big white metal building and if it doesn't work out with a rusty building the banks aren't going to support it either so please protect our interests.

Mrs. Linda Nolan of 8505 Woodberry Boulevard testified that their home and a couple of other homes would be next to the new permanent structure and they are members of the club and they are involved with the club and want the club to be viable and they appreciate the repositioning pushing it back from the street and it is not in the far back corner, it is actually next to the existing clay facility.

Mr. Lewis said it is in the lower right quadrant.

Mrs. Nolan said the proposed structure is very much visible from the street and it is particularly visible from our yard who adjoins the property and right now looking out our window we can clearly see this time of year the outdoor courts so looking out she can see the green horizontal surface on the ground and that is how clear the visibility is it is not a real dense woods to the east of the proposed structure so with that being said when the structure goes up, from their standpoint, she would love to see it not white but looking out her window it is a very large metal structure where they used to see nothing and they don't want to look at a huge wall.

Mr. Lewis asked if she can see the dome when it is up over the outdoor courts.

Mrs. Nolan said yes and this is going to be even closer than the dome so they would like a color.

Mr. Lewis said the good news is if they did a tan wall and a brown roof and it was 38' tall you won't be able to see the dome anymore.

Mrs. Nolan said from a landscaping standpoint she appreciates the Pine trees there but she would like to ask for a staggering of the Pines.

Mr. Lewis said the board hasn't even gotten into the landscape plan yet but that is a great point.

Mr. Tom Nolan of 8405 Woodberry Boulevard testified that he likes the idea of the mounding to get the trees up a little higher.

Mr. Lewis said there may not be a whole lot of room on the side yard because they are looking at 30' and if you are going to take some trees that you want to see grow 15' to 25' tall and you want to stagger them you are going to need a pretty wide berth to plant those for the long term. He said where he was looking at mounding was in the front, all the way in front between the street and the outdoor courts and it sets it up so when those trees lose their leaves once again, you are just insulating the view of the front elevation of the building. He said it doesn't seem like it is going to be probable that they are going to be able to build a Western Reserve motif looking façade on the front and sides of these buildings. He said he is not an architect nor a builder but anything is possible if you throw money at it.

Mr. Murphy said not necessarily throw money at it, it is a big giant empty canvass at this point and he doesn't know if they need seven dormers, one dormer would certainly help, three might be something that would give it some sort of character whatsoever, fake window casings on the front for \$1.99 a foot might do a lot.

Mr. Lamanna said they could put a porch on the front for part of it or incorporate into the building to get some space in there and it would then start to look like the existing clubhouse, maybe add a dormer or two on it with some fake windows with trim and shutters.

Mr. Murphy said it is a giant structure and it looks like a warehouse.

Mr. Nolan said in all fairness the day they had the meeting the majority of the time taken that Mr. Waldorff alluded to is we had problems with the aesthetics and it still hasn't been addressed and in all fairness Mr. Barr has not addressed any of their concerns from the neighborhood as far as the aesthetics of the structure other than remove it.

Mr. Barr said he doesn't agree with that because of the trees that they are putting around and he would definitely disagree with the statement that there has been nothing done.

Mr. Seif said it needs to be more camouflaged.

Mr. Barr said it is not being seen from the street.

Mr. Seif said it could be painted or have a brick façade.

Mr. Lamanna said he doesn't think a brick façade is consistent with the existing structure that is there. He said people are worried about the front of the building, not the side of the building.

Mr. Seif said the homeowner's association wants it to succeed but put more trees in.

Mr. Gutoskey said they don't have a problem with the site plan.

Mr. Lewis said he doesn't think people will see a white wall, he thinks that Mr. Barr is saying if the general consensus is to favor earth tones so when the leaves are off the trees and we look at brown and tan and gray.

Mr. Nolan said in all fairness a brown wall will not satisfy the neighborhood either.

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. Barr and Mr. Novak if they did any specific investigation with regards to dormers or a porch-like structure and fake windows and shutters. He asked if somebody has come in and looked at it and actually found out what the cost is.

Mr. Novak said they had previously brought on a builder and that is how confident he is about the costs of the base building but for those items, no, would it be more yes, it is more than you would think it would be.

Mr. Lamanna said he is not thinking it would be a few thousand dollars, if it is \$25,000 it is not an unreasonable amount to dress up the building, if it is \$250,000 then it would be pretty clear that it would be ridiculous so there is a point at which it no longer becomes economically feasible to do that. He said that we don't have any real numbers where somebody has actually looked at this.

Mr. Barr said he can tell the board the cost of relocating the hard courts is easily in the six figures.

Mr. Lamanna said that he would not doubt.

Mr. Barr said the point being that from the original plan to the plan you are looking at today it is a lot more expensive and we are really at the brink of what we can feasibly do and he doesn't know how much anybody wants to hear about the whole financial challenges of the financing of the project but banks don't like to finance businesses that are losing money and so it is an unusual challenge at Wembley since Wembley has always lost money in recent years so it is a tough job to finance. He said he has had months and months of discussion with Huntington and they are willing to take on the project with a larger than usual down payment but they are just pushing every last dollar and the change that they made here has pushed him beyond the last dollar and he is trying to account for that but continuing to be pushed more and more and more puts the project in serious jeopardy of happening at all so that is the challenge coming from their side. He said he would love to have a building that looked gorgeous and everyone was thrilled with it and nothing makes him happier than to make people happy and that is why he bought Wembley to start with because he wanted to do a project having people in there having fun playing tennis and dining and doing fun things, that is what he likes, he likes people being happy and he would love to have the look of something that makes people happy and the question is simply how are they going to make that economically feasible and right now they are little bit past the brink and he is trying to make up that last gap but the gap widens.

Mr. Lamanna said we are looking to try to find some ways that maybe this could be done that would fall within what is viable and obviously you are not going to spend \$250,000.

Mrs. Nolan asked Mr. Barr if he would consider making permanent the five courts right behind the club and instead of building a new structure and doming the five courts behind the club putting the permanent structure up there she doesn't know if anyone would have an objection with the aesthetics but from a neighborhood standpoint it would be no different than Cleveland Racquet you can see the white metal building but it is behind the clubhouse and no one really ever noticed that unless you are looking for it.

Mr. Barr said if they did put the permanent structure there they would not have enough courts to have the kind of membership you need to sustain the club, people won't get courts and they won't join because they know they can't get courts. He said the whole discussion of doing something different he doesn't think is financially a good idea for this club. He said having five or six courts is not the same thing as ten or eleven and you would be enclosing the courts that people like to be on in the summer.

The neighbors discussed their preferences for the court locations with Mr. Barr.

Mr. Barr said part of what is good for the club here is that we don't need to change the five, they are outside with the bubble in the winter and it works good for them.

The neighbors continued discussing their ideas with Mr. Barr.

Mr. Lamanna said unfortunately trying to massively restructure the project is difficult. He said if you build another building back there that extends to the property line there will be the same problem, it is going to be a little farther back but you are still going to be looking at the side of the building, he doesn't think it is going to solve the problem. He said if you took that current bubble and extended it out to add three more courts to the building line you will still have almost exactly the same issue. He said there is a chunk of that dome that goes beyond the edge of the clubhouse so basically you would be taking the white dome and extending it out to the red line so you would have almost exactly the front face just 30' back so he is not sure what you would gain by doing that, you are not going to solve the issue.

Mr. Murphy said one of the main problems is this is a conditional use (117.13) and anything that is there "will be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity and that such use will not change the essential character of the same area". He said that paragraph is more or less saying that we love the fact that you have a conditional use and we want to keep it going, all of the neighbors are even members and want to be there but appearance is important and perhaps there could be something that is not going to be cost prohibitive and break the bank that could be done to improve the appearance of that structure and he does not know if the homework has been done.

Mr. Novak stated that he knows how to build dormers and the scale of them and he knows how many should go on there and roughly what their size is but they did not fit the budget and he knows what is required to make it harmoniously fit into the neighborhood however he has to respect his financial position so as his architect he kind of has to listen to him regarding that, however, could we dig deeper, yes.

Mr. Lewis said you could make an effort to satisfy this very, very heavily weighted conditional use piece of criteria. He said he thinks the overall site plan criteria has been achieved but you have not achieved this element.

Mr. Murphy said you almost have it shown as two pieces of steel to get to the face wall and could that lower piece of steel be a Georgian red brick color.

Mr. Novak asked actual red brick.

Mr. Murphy said not actual red brick, many of the homes in Wembley are that brick and brick wainscoting.

Mr. Novak said in thinking of a color painting a 1,000 lineal foot every ten years.

Mr. Murphy said the neighborhood seems to want to know what they are going to be looking at, that seems to be a very important thing to the neighbors.

Mr. Novak said they priced it out a couple of years ago and it looks like a big white building, it probably will be done in metal and painted.

Mr. Murphy said a rendering like this with an intended color may be appropriate as well and what Mr. Waldorff did he is not sure where the camera was on that particular view (he referred to the photos Mr. Waldorff submitted).

Mr. Waldorff said that is him standing at the entrance to the Wembley Club a week or so ago when it snowed and it is the driveway looking straight at the clubhouse and you can see to the left a little bit of the dome and you can see where all of the leaves are off the trees and basically what the property looks like. He said he took the architectural drawings and put it in there and scaled it so the drawing that was made of the existing clubhouse was the same size as the building behind it. He took, on the next one down, the architectural features of the clubhouse and he laid them onto the building to show what it looks like when you make the building gray and put something on it. He said if you go to the final picture he put some landscaping in.

Mr. Murphy said that would be nice.

Mr. Lamanna asked what the color options are for the roof.

Mr. Novak said if it is a metal roof they can match that.

Mr. Lamanna said if it matches it, it will make it less obtrusive.

Mr. Murphy said in the picture, it is a giant roof and it doesn't look any bigger than the clubhouse roof because of the pitch.

Mr. Lamanna said the darker color makes a big difference on the roof and asked if the plans include an actual landscape plan.

Ms. Endres said she does not have a landscape plan.

Mr. Lamanna said we would like to really look hard at what we can do to put some ornamental features on the front of this building, and we are not asking you (Mr. Barr) to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars but maybe you can come up with a better rendering of what it will look like and get the color of the roof and figure out some ornaments that you can put on it that are financially feasible. He said he thinks if you look at some specific plantings, some bigger trees and some smaller things also grouped in front of it, something else to look at such as some crabapple trees 14' to 15' tall and break up the expanse of the building. He said it doesn't have to be one thing, you could look at a combination of different things and that in itself may help and you can find creative ways with the mix of things such as using the landscaping for a modest cost in one area. He said he thinks visually there could be something pleasing.

Mr. Seif said he still goes back to some creativity, there have got to be some ways.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks there may be some painting options that make it look like some features of the existing clubhouse, windows, doors etc. He said this is something you will be looking at from a distance of 200' away. He asked the applicant to take a look at that and supply the board with some renderings.

Mr. Lewis said when he excavates the front tennis area, the outdoor courts and where the buildings are you can end up with some soil, push it up to the front and create your mound barricading the front courts and set your trees on there. He said there will be some materials on site that can be rearranged.

Mr. Lamanna said again look at specific details on the landscaping, exactly where, how many, size etc. He asked Mr. Barr if he can get this done for next month.

Mr. Barr said yes, they should be able to get it done for next month.

Mr. Scott King stated that all of us are saying the same thing, we want the club to survive but at the same time we don't really want it to survive if it is going to be detrimental to our property values, we have to find a solution. He said from his perspective he doesn't want it to deteriorate his property value and the building is very important because the landscaping is oftentimes temporary but he likes the idea of the mounds because they are not temporary but when you get into Pine trees one year they are good and the next year they are bad and that scares him.

Mr. Lamanna said that is the nice thing about mounds.

Since there was no further testimony, this application was concluded.

Motion BZA 2014-24 – 8435 Woodberry Boulevard (The Wembley Club)

Mr. Gutoskey made a motion to table this application to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held January 15, 2015 pending further information for the board to review.

Mr. Murphy seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye.

Application 2014-34 by Gino Oppedisano for property at 8575 E. Washington Street

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit with area variance(s) for the purpose of adding a pergola and canopy at the front of a restaurant/party center. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Mr. Mark Murphy recused himself from this application and departed the meeting at 8:55 P.M.

Mr. Steve Ciciretto was present to represent this application.

Mr. Ciciretto testified that he is representing of Mr. Gino Oppedisano. He said he is here on two items, this property is seeking a renewal of a conditional use and secondly it is for some exterior alterations that were done to the building. He said they were started prior to the owner's understanding of the process and what has happened is Ms. Endres has outlined the sorted past of this property. He said the process started about 1978 when Mr. Sam DiBlasi filed for an expansion of the property where Luciano's Restaurant is currently so he came in with a party center adjacent to it and somehow in the process that conditional use was approved and it apparently didn't get built immediately, some conditions were put on that in November 1978 and ultimately it looked like about 1980 when they actually were ready to start the project, getting some conditions set and then not really getting started. He said in 1980 it looked like the project was going in earnest and there were some conditions also set on making the building a party center. He said he is not sure of the exact history because DiBlasi's owned the corner property that we call the green monster and a lot of things have happened over there but at some point in 2007 Mr. Oppedisano came back when it was the Eastside Grille and Masserias were involved and left and went out and started Gates Mills Grille, came back and took over basically a business that was floundering and on top of that, the worst part, it opened up some questions about the whole process. He said in 2007, Mr. Frank McIntyre asked for a ruling from the prosecutor's office and they basically said it was a pre-existing, non-conforming use and was given a conditional use status. He said apparently it should have been back after five years to renew this conditional use but did not do that and did not know about it actually and to be honest he was just running a business and did not understand that process. He showed the board some photos of what the building looked like, the canopy was in disrepair, the building was starting to look aged. He said Mr. Oppedisano approached him and asked him to put some dormers on the building and make it look like something but they looked like pimples stuck on a face, they didn't do anything, so he suggested adding some interest such as pergolas which were technically exempt from zoning as Ms. Endres has aptly pointed out in her review but we did talk about replacing the canopy. He said they had canopy areas that were about 210 sq. ft. under cover currently and they reduced those down with the new canopy to about 130 sq. ft. so it is actually a reduction in the canopy structure area and is a hard structure that was deliberately designed to break up the scale of the building.

Mr. Ciciretto continued by saying it did not come out any further to the street, the awnings and canopy are over this section right now (he referred to a site plan) and there is a sidewalk in front of the building and the parking stays the same and the majority of the parking is behind the building and he can demonstrate that in an Access Geauga shot. He said the dash line is what he considers is the setback of the building. He said with Luciano's building to the house it is still in line, it doesn't project in front of those or break the plane at all. He showed the board before and after pictures and said the point is when Mr. Oppedisano realized that this should have been permitted he stopped the additional elements that will finish this off. He said the point is that Mr. Oppedisano saw that his building was not a pretty building, was in a state of disrepair, adding no square footage for dining, no expansion of the use, it is strictly a cover and an entrance and a pergola that he believes is permitted under the zoning ordinance Chapter 165.11.

Ms. Endres said they are permitted encroachments and added that this is an expansion of a non-conforming use.

Mr. Ciciretto said the physical footprint is slightly altered, there is no additional dining, there is no additional use, what Mr. Oppedisano thought he was doing was giving back to the community something that would make the building look a little better and make the neighborhood look a little nicer, it doesn't reduce parking it just covers the sidewalk. He said when he was reviewing the conditional use permit it was how can you make this building look prettier than the elevations they gave, whether it was windows on the side and they have done some of that over the years so there has been some continued maintenance and recognition that this is a building that is just not conforming. He said they considered that it should be presented as a use variance but he thinks everyone feels more comfortable with leaving it under the conditional use because it has been in place for some 35 years now and it has been run as a restaurant for at least 25 years and Mr. Oppedisano bought it out and that is how it all came about.

Mr. Luciano Scalera testified that he is upset because of the variance and it is built already.

Mr. Ciciretto said it is not this board that did that, it was Mr. Oppedisano's mistake, he should have come in and asked permission before and he realizes it now.

Mr. Scalera said he was the first one to compliment but he is upset because it was built before getting a permit.

Mr. Ciciretto explained that Mr. Oppedisano didn't understand the process and they come for advice too late.

Mr. Scalera said one time he built a shed for tools and they made him knock it down but he is upset about two months later he received a letter and it wastes time and money.

Mr. Lewis explained that the township did not give Mr. Oppedisano any preapproval, he did this on his own and he got the cart before the horse and shame on him but we are trying to deal with that right now and the good news is at least he is improving the property and that is good for all of us.

Mr. Scalera said it bothers him that two months later he is notified and he was the first one to compliment him and the building was in need of improvements.

Mr. Ciciretto said it is not a done deal that this board won't say that he doesn't have to tear it down. He said it is a dangerous thing when you build without a permit.

Mr. Lamanna said the board does not look kindly on people doing this.

Mr. Scalera said this doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Lewis asked if there are any outstanding violations.

Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector testified that she has had no complaints from residents, it came to her attention through the Geauga County Building Department, they called her to find out what zoning certificates she issued for the project and she said she didn't know there was a project going on so she met with Mr. Oppedisano and he was very cordial and gave her a set of plans to look at and he said he didn't realize that the permits weren't in place and she told him they would get them where they need to be so in researching the file she found the colorful history.

Mr. Ciciretto said for the property in the back he has approached zoning so Mr. Oppedisano assumed it was done through him but it really wasn't and he thought he made it clear to him what the process would be but it is what it is.

Ms. Endres said her opinion as the zoning inspector is this probably needs permits but if the board thinks she is wrong that is okay too but she is thinking it needs approval through the board for a number of different reasons.

Mr. Lamanna said when he went through the history there is a letter from Mr. Frank McIntyre to the prosecutor and then there was a letter from Mr. McIntyre to the building owner but he never saw a letter from the prosecutor to Mr. McIntyre.

Ms. Endres said when they went through the original hearing on the property that the restaurant is on represents the commercial property and nobody ever figured out that the actual property for the restaurant is on residential and she thinks that is what the former zoning inspectors were trying to work out as to how to handle this. She said it was permitted as a conditional use and everyone assumed it was in a commercial zoning district but it wasn't, it was contiguous to land owned by the same property owner.

Mr. Ciciretto said it didn't have an address originally.

Mr. Lamanna said they should have made them tear the building down, knowing that it was not a commercial lot.

Mr. DeWater said there was a house owned by a family named the Parkers and they had a house on there and there was a junk yard there so this was a blessing.

Ms. Endres said it was permitted as a conditional use so she sent this to the board for a renewal with alterations to the conditional use with some variances thrown in.

Mr. Lamanna said this is, from a legal standpoint, a nightmare that they have created here.

Ms. Endres said she didn't want to send it to the board as a use variance because it was already an established conditional use.

Mr. Lamanna said it probably is but you have a non-conforming use created after the zoning district actually changed because somebody didn't do their homework right. He said he also thinks that since the original owner got this on the basis that it was a conditional use because that is what he applied for and that is the way he obtained it but he is now stuck with that forever.

Mr. Scalera said it doesn't bother him.

Mr. Lamanna said it is subject to being a non-conforming use and a conditional use because that is part of the non-conformance that carries over.

Mr. Ciciretto said it seems like that over the many years that the conditional uses are very rarely brought back up, this was established in 1980 and he is sure it was never renewed.

Mr. Lamanna asked what is happening to the former outdoor area with the awning and if it is going away.

Mr. Ciciretto said it is still there and it was actually reduced a little bit because of the covered entrance. He said the covering on the patio is gone they just replaced it with a pergola, they took the awning, all of the covered areas that were currently there because they wanted this to pop out to create a sense of entrance.

Mr. Lamanna said the outside seating bothers him.

Mr. Lewis said we are not supposed to increase the intensity of what the property is being used for.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks it snuck in along the line here somewhere.

Mr. Lewis said café style eating was never a part of it.

Mr. Lamanna said it crept in there without ever being approved either and this is the price you pay for not keeping up and some things you get and some things you don't get.

Mr. Ciciretto said he thinks that anytime you can make a business in these economic times more feasible but he personally doesn't like sitting in a parking lot.

Mr. Lamanna said he doesn't think that is an appropriate extension of the restaurant to have a seating area in front of the restaurant.

Mr. Scalera said you can smell the fumes from the cars.

Mr. Lamanna asked how they are on parking spots.

Ms. Endres said it was existing and they haven't really increased the intensity so she didn't get into the parking calculations. She said she and her husband ate there recently and the night she was there, there was plenty of parking and they drove around the building to access the situation back there.

Mr. DeWater said the driveway on the east side of the building is not supposed to be there it is supposed to be a landscaped area.

Ms. Endres said if a party is going on they may have some parking challenges.

Mr. Ciciretto said they actually approached the zoning commission because the woman to the east had expressed an interest to Mr. Oppedisano at one time in selling her house and lot and one of the questions was if he bought that and maintained the house as a rental and then he could control some sort of transitional zoning between this non-conforming residential part so he would have some ownership risk in a transitional zone and he could build a barn structure as part of the house that he could then have the employees park under the barn and relieve some of the parking issues at his building.

Mr. Lamanna said if he bought the property the sensible thing to do is extend the commercial district to some point beyond the property line so there is still a buffer.

Mr. Ciciretto said that is what we talked about, what could we do to get this rezoned and that is why we went to the zoning commission and not here. He said he thinks they said that something could be worked out and they would be interested. He said he expressed his concern.

Mr. Lamanna said they are probably not aware of the history on this property.

Mr. Ciciretto said the woman decided not to sell and they also approached the people behind because they have a 4-1/2 acre lot to the south in a residential district and we thought that maybe he could do something behind his parking area that would have been buried and no one would have seen but he doesn't know if it would have been a use variance for parking. He said somehow as Mr. Scalera was hinting that the parking behind the building was originally part of his lot and somehow when they transferred, Mr. DiBlasi kept that parking with the non-conforming building.

Ms. Endres said the zoning commission did say they would not consider any other zoning changes while they were still drafting the new code.

Mr. Ciciretto said he was hinting that they should take a look at that as part of the zoning ordinance because there is no transitional zone there, we worked really hard to create professional office as a transitional zone and there is nothing there so we could have done that much like we did with Highway Garage and Mr. Frank Lanza we created a permanent buffer strip and that is a guarantee for the people around W. Craig.

Mr. Lamanna said it could line up with the property across the street. He said the only feasible use for the neighboring property would be to add it to the adjacent property as commercial and then the balance would be buffered. He said it would be logical and he doesn't think that anybody could argue that it was some kind of weird zoning thing because all you would be doing is squaring it off.

Mr. Ciciretto said he agrees and that is why they approached the zoning commission but they were in the middle of the redraft.

Mr. Gutoskey said they are still in the middle and trying to get to the end.

Mr. Lamanna said it would be relatively simple.

Mr. Ciciretto said and it would clear up the problem. He said the point is the addition was not done with the intent of expanding services or expanding the dining area it was just a decoration and he was trying to make the community look a little better.

Mr. Lamanna said one of the conditions was discouraging parking in the front.

Mr. Ciciretto said they have occasions when they do have weddings there and instead of having one big party room there now they have a small banquet room for a private party. He said the problem with the building is there are occasions when they are really busy and they do have a party that parking is at a premium, so the right solution for this long-term is to create something and the reality is if we deny the conditional use on this building and say you can no longer use this as a restaurant this would become a blighted building.

Mr. Lamanna said maybe getting rid of some of the parking in the front of the building and putting in a landscaping strip along the front there.

Mr. Ciciretto said he thinks there is an opportunity to do that and explained that you can hang baskets on the pergola to soften it up.

Ms. Endres said actually their parking area is in better shape than the green monster parking.

Mr. Ciciretto said he has worked very hard at maintaining his parking lot. He said it is one thing to reduce the outside sign but he doesn't think you want to cut any parking spaces out of this.

Mr. Lewis asked if there are 20 parking spaces in the front.

Mr. Ciciretto said the issue is they primarily draw a local crowd, they are coming out of Auburn Lakes so it is not a real young crowd that goes there so he doesn't think you want to remove parking away from the front door.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks there can be some improvements of the green space in front, it is rather sad. He said maybe a little mound with landscaping.

Mr. Ciciretto said there is a lift station there but there is an opportunity to do something more than just the grass. He said he thinks Mr. Oppedisano would be agreeable to that and his goal is to make the building look attractive and nice for the neighborhood.

Mr. Lamanna asked if anything is being done with the sign.

Mr. Ciciretto said he does not think he has any plans for the ground sign.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks it is a pretty ugly sign and you want people to come into your restaurant.

Mr. Ciciretto said he thinks it is reasonable to think that after following up with what he has done, it is a significant improvement to the front of the building so he thinks he would definitely consider doing that. He said he didn't think there are any issues or violations he could find. He is going to hang a chandelier.

Mr. Lewis said that would look nice.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if he is going to bring stone in front of the building too.

Mr. Ciciretto said yes.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the outside trash containers. He said on the east side there is a 20' wide buffer.

Mr. Ciciretto said he doesn't know if that was intended to be screened, his understanding is historically that it was to screen the lady's house next door.

Mr. Lamanna said there is supposed to be one along the rear too, a 5' wide buffer.

The board reviewed the site plan.

Mr. Ciciretto said on the left side it used to be just a solid wall until he cut in some windows on that side. He said it was to screen the house.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there is any issue in the back there with any trash can issues.

Mr. Ciciretto said the back end of the residential lot is heavily wooded back there.

Mr. Lamanna asked what is in the back of the building, it looks like a dumpster.

Mr. Ciciretto said it looks like a temporary dumpster.

Mr. Lamanna asked Ms. Endres if they have a trash area at the back of the property, the southwest part of the property.

Ms. Endres said they probably do but she hasn't looked that closely.

Mr. Scalera said the garbage is outside and his customers see the dumpster out back.

Mr. Lamanna said he shouldn't be having his garbage facilities somewhere on the back end of his property and it doesn't belong back there, in the rear yard.

Mr. Scalera explained to the board the location of the trash dumpster.

Mr. Lamanna read from the zoning code the requirements for trash location. He said the zoning meant to have it next to the building.

Mr. Ciciretto said it is probably there so people won't have to walk next to it when entering the restaurant.

Mr. Lamanna said the trash should be moved to the back of the building.

Mr. Ciciretto said he doesn't think it is an issue.

Mr. Lamanna said it is off the edge of the property somewhere on the side lot and to him that is an issue.

Mr. Lewis said it is more of a housekeeping issue.

Mr. Lamanna said what was there before is it was intended for the trash to be next to the building.

Mr. Ciciretto said at least screened.

Mr. Scalera said the property owned by Mr. Bill Shaw west of him, when the wind blows it is all over.

Since there was no further testimony, this application was concluded.

Motion BZA 2014-34 – 8575 E. Washington Street

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the applicant a conditional use permit for the use of this property as restaurant/party center. The conditional use will be subject to the following conditions.

1. There will no longer be an outside eating area on the front of the building.
2. There will be no outside storage of material of any kind and any outside trash containers will be located next to the rear of the building and will be properly screened to match the architectural style of the building itself.
3. As part of the granting of this conditional use, the board will allow the modification of the front of the building with a gable area as well as the pergola structure along the rest of the front of the building.
4. Additional requirements as part of the conditional use is the applicant will landscape the green area in the front with shrubberies and with some mounding so as to partially hide the view into the parking lot and will submit a landscape plan to the Zoning Inspector within 60 days of the board's decision meeting the requirements as described herein.
5. With respect to this conditional use the period of time will be 3 years from when the minutes become final.
6. With respect to this application this property has a rather unusual history and it appears to have been built under a conditional use permit that did not actually apply to the property since it was not located in a commercial district, nevertheless since the applicant obtained an original zoning certificate for the building, it should still be held to be subject to the conditional use requirements of the zoning ordinance.
7. Notwithstanding that the property also is a non-conforming use under the current zoning so there is no doubt it remains subject to all of the restrictions on the substitution or increase or modification of non-conforming properties.

Motion BZA 2014-34 – 8575 E. Washington Street - Continued

8. It is the board's finding that the changes made will not constitute an expansion or change of a non-conforming use of the property.
9. The board will grant the conditional use because it is consistent with the present use of the property and there have been no complicity concerns that have been raised in the recent history of the use of this property which would indicate that the conditional use should not be granted.
10. In addition the board notes that all of the general standards in Chapter 117.13 for conditional uses other than those related to specific dimensional requirements will apply to this conditional use as well as the specific conditions that the board has set in this decision.
11. The reason for adding those conditions is to assure that the use satisfies the requirements for conditional uses and that it does not adversely affect the neighboring properties.

Mr. DeWater seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye.

Since there was no further testimony, the public hearing was closed at 9:53 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted DeWater
Joseph Gutoskey
Michael Lamanna, Chairman
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman
Mark Murphy

Attested to by: Linda L. Zimmerman, Secretary
Board of Zoning Appeals

Date: January 15, 2015

AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE

BZA PH 12/18/2014

-28-

Bainbridge Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
December 18, 2014

The regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 9:53 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey and Mr. Todd Lewis. Mr. Mark Murphy was absent. Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector was present.

Minutes

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to adopt the minutes of the November 20, 2014 meeting as written.

Mr. Gutoskey seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. DeWater; Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye.

Applications for Next Month

Application 2014-24 by The Wembley Club (David Barr) for property at 8345 Woodberry Boulevard - Continuance

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit *and area variances* for the purpose of constructing an addition including indoor tennis courts and relocating outdoor tennis courts. The property is located in a R-3A District.

The Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals set a public hearing on the above application for January 15, 2015 at 7:00 P.M. at the Bainbridge Township Community Hall, 17826 Chillicothe Road, Bainbridge Township, Ohio and unanimously resolved to request the Bainbridge Township Board of Trustees to issue a purchase order for legal advertising.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted DeWater
Joseph Gutoskey
Michael Lamanna, Chairman
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman
Mark Murphy

Attested to by: Linda L. Zimmerman, Secretary
Board of Zoning Appeals

Date: January 15, 2015