

Bainbridge Township, Ohio  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
June 21, 2007

Pursuant to notice by publication and certified mail, a public hearing was called to order at 7:40 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Todd Lewis, Mr. Mark Murphy, Mr. Mark Olivier and Mr. Donald Takacs. The following matters were then heard:

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 2007-18 by James B. and Diane S. Thomas for property at 7945 Country Lane – Continuance

The applicant is requesting an area variance for the purpose of installing a propane tank. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Secretary's note: The applicant has requested that this be postponed to the next meeting to be held in July.

Motion BZA 2007-18 – 7945 Country Lane

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to postpone this application to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held July 19, 2007 at the request of the applicant.

Mr. Takacs seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mr. Takacs, aye.

Application 2007-22 by Aurora Co-op Preschool for property at 8558 Crackel Road (Centerville Mills Park)

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit for the purpose of establishing a co-op preschool. The property is located in a R-3A District.

The zoning inspector's letter dated June 13, 2007 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Ms. Kim Sinclair and Ms. Von Stanley of the Aurora Co-op Preschool were present to represent this application and Ms. Linda W. White, Bainbridge Township Trustee was also present to represent the township.

Ms. Sinclair testified that they are here to get a conditional use certificate and would like to operate the Aurora Co-op Preschool in the daycare building and they were told that the board would like them to address the arrival and departure procedures.

Mr. Lamanna said yes.

Ms. Sinclair said the director, Ms. Mary Ann Aardema spoke with the property manager at Centerville Mills and they went over what people have done in the past that have used the building and what they thought would work and what would be safe. She said there are 24 parking spaces that are closest to the building and the parents would and must escort their children into the building, they would not be allowed to randomly run into the building and they would walk in front of the parked cars and the property manager suggested that as the parents back up, they would back up and head down towards the dining hall and turn around to alleviate any congestion in the driveway. She said he also suggested that they put out a sign or cone each morning and take it down each night so they can indicate where the parking is. She showed the board a sample of the type of sign he suggested that would say Aurora Co-op Preschool drop off.

Mr. Lamanna asked where they are currently operating.

Ms. Sinclair said they are currently operating out of Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church in Aurora.

Mr. Lamanna asked if they are currently licensed, State license etc.

Ms. Sinclair said yes, they have been in existence for over 30 years and they have arrangements with the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services and will need to re-apply for that license after they move to the new location and they need the conditional use permit to go further with the process.

Mr. Lamanna asked how many students are involved and how many they will have at any one time.

Ms. Von Stanley testified there will be 92 people maximum and they have 43 enrolled.

Mr. Lamanna asked if they will be there everyday.

Ms. Sinclair said the four year old class will be on Monday, Wednesday and Friday and the morning class will be from 9:00 – 11:30 A.M. and the afternoon class will be from 12:30 – 3:00 P.M. and there is a maximum of 20 children in the four year old class so there will be 20 in the morning and usually the afternoon class has only one-half that amount or about 10 children. She said on Tuesdays and Thursdays they have a three year old class just in the morning and that time is 9:00 – 11:30 A.M.

Mr. Lamanna asked what the maximum number of people will be at any one time.

Ms. Sinclair said they also have a parent and me class with a maximum of ten students on Wednesday morning so on Wednesday, there would be a total of 30 children with the parent and me class and the four year old class at one time. She added that there will be three teachers and for each class there are two parent helpers.

Mr. Lamanna said the maximum number of people coming and going would be about 30.

Ms. Sinclair said not even because Wednesdays would be the most but the four year olds would be dropped off before the parent and me class begins so it is staggered.

Mr. Lamanna said 25 might be the most at one time.

Ms. Sinclair said maybe 18 would be the most.

Mr. Takacs asked about the ages of the children.

Ms. Sinclair said the parent and me class has two year olds with the parents, the parents stay, and they will have three year olds, four year olds and five year olds.

Mr. Olivier asked if they plan to make any changes to the interior or exterior or will it be used as is without physical modifications.

Ms. Sinclair said no, they will just be putting up their stuff and per their lease, if there is another event they will have to pack their stuff up and move it out of the way. She submitted information to the board regarding the Aurora Co-op Preschool and the arrival and departure procedure for the school.

The board reviewed the information that was submitted.

Mr. Lewis referred to the license and said it expires in September of this year and asked if this is the license Ms. Sinclair was talking about and the group needs to get re-licensed.

Ms. Sinclair said yes and they cannot operate without that license so before the start of the school year, they will need to have that license.

Mr. Lewis referred to the previous license and asked if part of the criteria for the license is related to the head count.

Ms. Sinclair said right and the Department of Job and Family Services will come out and check the building to make sure it is up to their code.

Mr. Lewis said the facility needs to be established first regarding capacity etc. so the applicant can go to the state and asked if the new copy will be presented to the township to be on file (certificate from the state).

Ms. Sinclair said yes.

Mr. Olivier said it looks like it is in the lease agreement that you have to have a license to operate the facility.

Ms. Sinclair said right.

Mr. Lamanna said since the township is willing to enter into this lease agreement, he will presume that they are satisfied that the sanitary sewer and water supply available there are adequate for this intended use.

Ms. Linda White, Bainbridge Township Trustees testified that the township trustees are very pleased that they are willing to come in and take over the building.

Mr. Murphy asked if the township has spoken to them at all about their name.

Ms. White said no and she imagines it will be taken care of if they need to but it is on the border line of Aurora.

Mr. Murphy said he is reading through their literature and it states they are tax exempt; it is a business but a tax exempt business that is totally run by the parents. He asked Ms. Sinclair and Ms. Stanley if they are the parents.

Ms. Sinclair replied yes and they have an elected board each year and they are the new board members for the 2007 – 2008 school year.

Mr. Murphy asked if the children are mostly Aurora or Bainbridge kids or if they are from all over.

Ms. Stanley testified that they come from Streetsboro, Ravenna, Mantua, Bainbridge and all around.

Ms. Sinclair said it is not just exclusively for Aurora children.

Mr. Murphy said he just asked since Bainbridge Township is leasing this if it has any issues with the name.

Ms. White replied no.

Mr. Lewis asked how enrollment is handled and if it is a first come basis.

Ms. Sinclair said enrollment is offered first to existing members and previous members and then it is open to anybody and they have been advertising in the Bainbridge and Auburn area because there is no other co-op in the area.

Mr. Murphy said there are businesses that are privately run such as churches.

Ms. Sinclair said yes.

Ms. White said the parking issue is not an issue at all because during the time that they are going to be there, there will be no activities in that area during the school session whatsoever and added that she handles all the rentals down there so she would know and they are the busiest on the weekends.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there would be any reason for school buses dropping off children.

Ms. Sinclair said no, no buses.

Mr. Lamanna asked if everyone will be dropped off by a parent.

Ms. Sinclair said yes.

Mr. Olivier asked if this is a conditional use in a residential district.

Mr. McIntyre replied yes.

Ms. White said the YMCA had a preschool in that building years ago.

Mr. Lamanna said they already have a fenced in area attached to it.

Ms. White said right.

The board reviewed the zoning regulations for preschools and conditional uses.

Mr. Murphy asked if this is on the north side of Crackel Road.

Mr. McIntyre replied yes and referred to the aerial photograph.

Mr. Murphy said there should not be any sound problems because the closest neighbor is a long way off.

Mr. McIntyre said it is 250' from anyone.

Mr. Murphy asked if the neighboring properties were notified of the hearing.

Mr. McIntyre replied yes.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Ms. Venny Davidson, neighboring property owner.

Ms. Venny Davidson of 18981 Chillicothe Road testified that she lives in the first house on Chillicothe Road, to the north and asked if the kids will be allowed to go in the back because before when they had the school there, the kids always went to the back of her property to hike and to look for her salamanders and she wanted to be sure that they won't be back there.

Mr. Murphy asked if the kids will ever go back there.

Ms. Sinclair said no, they will be restricted as to what area they will be able to go on the property and the kids will go outside to play and may take a walk but certainly the teachers would never delve into paths or go very far at all.

Ms. Davidson asked how old the kids are.

Ms. Sinclair said they are two, three, four and five year olds and no older than five.

Mr. Murphy said he does not think they will be tromping up to the north end of the property unattended and the zoning regulations are really strict about what is and what is not allowed for a preschool.

The board discussed preschool versus child daycare centers and private and parochial schools and locations where they are permitted.

Mr. McIntyre explained that by definition, if licensed by the state it is considered a school.

Ms. Sinclair said they have a license from the state and it is not a daycare.

Mr. Lamanna said it falls under private schools and not to say as a conditional use the board is not going to apply the same type of considerations as would apply to a child daycare center, but the board does not technically have to apply them, they are not mandatory as they would be for a daycare center. He referred to the fenced in area and the outdoor activities, but there is already a fenced in area to do that so it should not be an issue with outdoor activities and there is no issue with the traffic pattern because there is plenty of access road so there will not be cars backed up on the public highway and there is not any other businesses there that we have to worry about circulation around, so under the circumstances, given the distance from any other private dwelling or other business, he does not see that there are any issues.

Mr. Takacs said it is wooded on three of four sides also.

Mr. Lamanna said yes, they are well screened, so there will not be any screening issues.

Mr. Lewis said he cannot remember if the YMCA ran a preschool or a daycare and added that the building, playground and layout was already used by a previous occupant for housing and teaching etc. of a preschool use so he does not see any hurdles in that direction.

Mr. Lamanna said the board will ask the applicant to prepare a final traffic flow pattern and submit that to the zoning inspector for a final review and approval.

Ms. Sinclair said okay.

Mr. Lewis said that is a very light use of that area with no intrusion, no nighttime, no weekends and it is very managed with youths and adults and nobody is running loose.

Ms. Sinclair asked if the children have to stay in the fenced in area and if the pavilion that is there with the picnic tables can be used and any of the other areas that are close to the building.

Mr. Lewis referred to the lease agreement and noted that Ms. White, Township Trustee is present and asked if there are any definitions in the lease agreement as to what portions of the property they may use.

Ms. White said there is a pavilion that is very close to the building and the baseball field is there and there are trails and there is an open field called Center Field right below the dining hall so they can use that too and there would be absolutely no problem.

Mr. Lewis asked if that is outlined in the lease.

Ms. White said she knows the pavilion is and asked if the board has a copy of the lease.

Mr. Lewis said he was checking to see if he has a copy of the lease.

Ms. Davidson asked if people can walk through the park by the school.

Ms. White said yes.

Mr. Lewis said yes it is a public park.

Ms. Davidson said it is also a school now.

Ms. White said just the building is.

Mr. Lewis said the building use is for the school and the adjacent fence and playground area but the rest of the property is a public park.

Mr. Murphy said he does not think they will turn five year olds loose in the pavilion.

Ms. Sinclair said absolutely not.

Mr. Lamanna said the requirement was designed because some of these were in PO or CB Districts and that is a different issue, so the board should say if any of the other exterior areas are used, adequate supervision will be provided relative to the age of the children to assure the appropriate use of the other permitted outdoor areas.

Mr. McIntyre said Section 2 (a & b) on the lease spells out the areas to be used by the preschool.

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

Motion BZA 2007-22 – 8558 Crackel Road (Aurora Co-op Preschool at Centerville Mills Park)

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the applicant a conditional use permit for the purpose of operating a preschool.

1. This is specifically limited to a preschool and not a daycare center, because only a preschool is allowed in this zoning district.
2. The board will note that as a conditional use all of the general requirements in Section 117.13 (b) will apply.

With the following specific conditions:

1. The applicant will provide a final traffic pattern, signage design to the zoning inspector for his approval prior to the final issuance of a zoning certificate.
2. The applicant will maintain all of the appropriate state licensing for a preschool.
3. All of the outdoor activities will take place in the securely fenced play lot and outdoor activity shall not occur after 6:00 P.M. or before 7:30 A.M., however if any of the other exterior areas are used, adequate supervision will be provided relative to the age of the children to assure the appropriate use of the other permitted outdoor areas.

Motion BZA 2007-22 – 8558 Crackel Road (Aurora Co-op Preschool at Centerville Mills Park) - Continued

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. The board finds in granting this conditional use that this location is such that it will not adversely impact any of the neighboring properties or other uses of Centerville Mills.
2. The township, as owner of this property, is satisfied with the sanitary sewer and water that is provided at the location as being sufficient and appropriate for this use.

Mr. Takacs seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mr. Takacs, aye.

Application 2007-23 by TMC Terraplan Management Corp. for property at 8327 E. Washington Street

The applicant is requesting a renewal of a conditional use permit for the purpose of the continuation of a full service carwash. The property is located in a CB District.

The zoning inspector's letter dated June 13, 2007 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mr. Andrew Spicer was present to represent this application.

The board reviewed the application.

Mr. Lewis asked if this is a renewal.

Mr. Lamanna replied yes and asked Mr. McIntyre if he has any issues with this particular location and if they are in compliance with all current requirements.

Mr. McIntyre testified that he has no issues and they are the same as the last time they were here.

Mr. Olivier asked if they are the same operators.

Mr. McIntyre said yes and the last time they were here it was a change in ownership and they came in just when we amended our zoning resolution so it has to be renewed after three years now and this one will be good for five years.

Mr. Takacs said it is well maintained.



Mr. Lewis said there are no barrels of junk or broken down cars and no clutter nor outdoor storage.

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

Motion BZA-2007-23 – 8327 E. Washington Street

Mr. Lamanna made motion to renew the conditional use certificate.

With the following conditions:

1. As provided, any conditions that had been originally set forth.
2. All general conditions not otherwise modified in the original grant will continue to apply.

Mr. Takacs seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mr. Takacs, aye.

Application 2007-24 by Todd Kirkpatrick for property at 8575 Apple Hill Road

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of constructing a shed. The property is located in a R-3A District.

The zoning inspector's letter dated June 13, 2007 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mr. Todd Kirkpatrick was present to represent this application.

Mr. Kirkpatrick testified that he wants to construct a 16' x 16' garden type storage shed and the variance he is requesting is for setbacks from the property line and going back to the original setbacks when the house was built allowed for 20' off the side and 30' off the back and that is where he is proposing to build the shed.

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. Kirkpatrick what his lot width is.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said it is 150'.

The board reviewed the application and variance request.

Mr. Olivier asked if the physical address is Apple Hill but the house faces another drive.

Mr. Kirkpatrick explained that his house faces a private drive, a continuation of Alden Drive.

Mr. Lewis said with the width of the lot why not put the shed on the other side of the lot and we would not be having a conversation on the side yard setback.

Mr. Kirkpatrick asked what he meant by the other side of the lot.

Mr. Lewis said rather than facing off of Apple Hill it is positioned on the left rear 20' off and if it is moved to the right side, there seems to be ample space.

The board reviewed the setbacks and the location of the neighbor's homes.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said if it was put there, his neighbor's front door would be facing the shed and he would still need a variance and also with the grade of his property, that is one of the lowest spots on the property and the shed would be in water there.

Mr. Olivier said the property is pretty well screened by trees all around.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said there are really only two neighbors that will be able to see it.

Mr. Lamanna asked if everything along the property line is vegetation, trees etc.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said there is vegetation along the back property line and along the property line between himself and the neighbors to the east, there are just two telephone poles and that is where the service comes into his house.

The board discussed the location of the proposed shed.

Mr. Lamanna said the proposed shed is 16' x 16' and asked what the height will be.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said the height will be 12'.

Mr. Murphy asked if there is something there now.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said there was a shed and trailer there and there is a small concrete pad for a dog kennel and it was there before he bought the property.

Mr. Olivier asked if that is where he is putting the shed.

Mr. Kirkpatrick replied yes and said per his application the shed will not go any closer to the lot line than the current pad that is there.

Mr. Murphy asked if there are any adjacent property owners present but no one responded.

Mr. Lamanna asked if he would plant a few trees along there such as a couple of 4' to 5' evergreens.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said his long term goal was to put a fence along there and added that because his house faces the private drive, the back of his house faces the other neighbor's back yard so he has no privacy back there, so eventually they were hoping to put some kind of privacy fence up.

Mr. Lamanna said he was not talking about trying to screen the shed off, just trying to soften it up and give it a landscaped feel around it, but not prevent it from being seen.

Mr. Olivier asked if this had to be approved by his homeowner's association.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said yes and three of the neighbors next to him had to sign off and approve it.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the acreage on this lot.

Mr. Kirkpatrick said it is 1.3 acres.

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

#### Motion BZA 2007-24 – 8575 Apple Hill Road

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the applicant the following variances for the purposes of constructing a 16' x 16' x 12' high garden shed.

1. A variance from the minimum required side yard setback of 50' to 20' for a variance of 30' on the east side of the property.
2. A variance from the minimum required rear yard setback of 90' to 30' for a variance of 60'.
3. A variance from the maximum lot coverage of 10% to a total of 14.4% for an increase of .78%.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists because it is a 150' wide lot.
2. It is only one acre.
3. The house is set back extremely deep into the lot and naturally it is oriented to face the side yard.
4. There is insufficient room behind the house to meet the setback requirements.
5. The location this far back would not adversely affect any of the property owners to the rear.
6. There are no nearby dwellings.
7. With respect to the side yard, this structure will be sufficiently far back that it should not affect the neighboring property on that side.
8. The applicant also has other areas on his property that is not suitable due to the low lying drop off nature on the other side and would also place the shed in view of the neighboring property to the west which is located a substantial distance back as well.

Motion BZA 2007-24 – 8575 Apple Hill Road - Continued

With the following condition:

1. The applicant will place some evergreens, bushes or small trees alongside the shed to soften the view from the adjacent property to the east.

Mr. Takacs seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mr. Takacs, aye.

Application 2007-25 by Robert W. Vaughan for property at 18549 Geauga Lake Road

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of replacing a single family dwelling. The property is located in a R-5A District.

The zoning inspector's letter dated June 13, 2007 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mr. Lamanna stated that the applicants are requesting area variances in order to replace a home completely destroyed by fire.

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Vaughan were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. and Mrs. Vaughan if they are rebuilding in the same location.

Mr. Vaughan testified by saying yes and the house is a little bit larger lengthwise not widthwise.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the existing foundation will be re-used.

Mr. Vaughan said three fourths of the foundation was destroyed also.

Mr. Lamanna said the house is going to be the same width and the lot is pretty narrow.

Mr. Vaughan said his lot is 1.66 acres and  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the land is a gully going down to the Chagrin River and he thinks the widest point is about 90' wide and the old house sat 7' from the property line on one side and 29' on the other side and the old house was 54' wide and this one will be 50' wide. He said he would basically like to stay in the same spot with the house because he wants to be able to keep and use the existing gravel driveway.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there is a garage.

Mr. Vaughan said yes, before they had a detached garage and this one will be an attached garage and with his existing driveway, he will be able to make a right hand turn into the garage. He showed the board, per a drawing, the proposed side entry garage and said the existing driveway is next to it.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the former house was a two-story.

Mr. Vaughan replied no and explained to the board the way the garage will be situated.

Mr. Lamanna said the side yard will stay 7'.

Mr. Vaughan said yes.

Mr. Olivier asked if the variance will be decreased on the north side of the property.

Mr. Vaughan said yes, it will be 50' wide and added that the former house was built in the 1940s and he would like to stay 7' from the property line to give him and his wife room to make the turn. He explained what happened the night of the fire that was December 1<sup>st</sup>. and stated that the power went out so they went to the Hampton Inn in Solon and before the fire department got there, the fire was through the roof.

Mr. Lamanna said he heard about the fire the next day and it is very unfortunate. He added that the neighbor on that side is already set back.

Mr. Vaughan said yes his house sits back further.

Mr. Lamanna said he is pretty close to the property line.

Mr. Vaughan said there is a row of trees that they planted and he would like to move the house forward just a few feet but he really can't go much forward because there is already an existing well.

Mr. Lamanna asked what the distance is to the street.

Mr. McIntyre said they are at 137' at the moment.

Mr. Vaughan said they are 140' – 150' off the road but that jog in the property is 16' and there are two sections of fence there.

Mr. Lamanna said there is no better spot to put the house because anywhere else would create more issues.

Mr. Lewis said the proposed setback is 137' so a few feet one way or the other would not impact the rear yard.

Mr. Vaughan said he would like to come as much as he can forward just to separate the two houses as much as he can.

The board discussed the proposed location of the house.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the Health Department has a 10' requirement from any water well.

Mr. Vaughan said if it turns out the house would be over the old well, he would dig a new well 10' away from the house.

Mr. Lamanna told Mr. Vaughan that the board will grant this variance and if he wants to move the house 100' from the road or 7' from the jog, whichever is first, he would be free to do that.

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

Motion BZA 2007-25 – 18549 Geauga Lake Road

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the applicant the following variances for the purpose of constructing a new house.

1. A variance from the minimum required side yard setback of 50' on the north side to 33' for a variance of 17'.
2. A variance from the minimum required side yard setback of 50' on the south side to 7' for a variance of 43'.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists in that this is a pre-existing lot of record.
2. With a width as such, the setbacks could not be met and still provide a reasonable house.
3. This is also a reconstruction of a previously existing house.
4. This reconstruction will not encroach on the setbacks anymore than the previously existing house.
5. On the 7' side, the adjacent property owner is well back of the location of this house and therefore would not be anymore adversely affected than previously was with the dwelling that existed there prior to the fire.
6. This location would appear to be the best available considering the location of all the neighboring properties and is consistent with the placement of the houses and is located in a spot that will minimize the impact on the adjacent properties in this neighborhood.

Mr. Takacs seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mr. Takacs, aye.

Since there was no further testimony, the public hearing was closed at 8:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lamanna, Chairman  
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman  
Mark Murphy  
Mark Olivier  
Donald Takacs

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

Date: July 19, 2007

AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE

BZA PH 6/21/2007

-15-

Bainbridge Township, Ohio  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
June 21, 2007

The regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 8:45 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Mark Murphy, Mr. Todd Lewis, Mr. Mark Olivier and Mr. Donald Takacs.

Minutes

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to adopt the minutes of the May 17, 2007 meeting as written.

Mr. Takacs seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Murphy, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mr. Takacs, aye.

Applications for July 19, 2007

Application 2007-18 by James B. and Diane S. Thomas for property at 7945 Country Lane – Continuance

The applicant is requesting an area variance for the purpose of installing a propane tank. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Application 2007-26 by William Edwards for property at 17800 Chillicothe Road

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit for the purpose of establishing a game room. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2007-27 by William A. Joyce (Joyce Building Company) for Jeff Weemhoff for property at 8460 Lake Shore Drive

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of constructing a new single family dwelling. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Application 2007-28 by Paul C. Hallisy for property at 18052 Harvest Drive

The applicant is requesting an area variance for the purpose of installing decorative concrete around a swimming pool. The property is located in a R-5A District.

The Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals set a public hearing on the above applications for July 19, 2007 at 7:30 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 8:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lamanna, Chairman  
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman  
Mark Murphy  
Mark Olivier  
Donald Takacs

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

Date: July 19, 2007