

Bainbridge Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
July 15, 2004

Pursuant to notice by publication and certified mail, a public hearing was called to order at 7:38 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Todd Lewis, Mr. Mark Olivier and Mrs. Ellen Stanton. Mr. Donald Takacs was absent. The following matters were then heard:

Mr. Lamanna swore in all persons who intended to testify.

Application 2004-16 by Geauga Habitat for Humanity for property at 7103 Rocker Street
- Continuance

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.

The zoning inspector's letter dated June 8, 2004 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mr. Bob Gibson of Geauga Habitat for Humanity was present to represent this application.

Mr. Gibson testified that they were able to arrange the placement of the house around the big trees so they don't have to take the trees down. He added that the proposed house has been approved by the people in Chagrin Falls Park and they are trying to improve the site by building a two story colonial home with an attached garage.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the number of lots they had for this site.

Mr. Gibson said there are five lots and added that the people will meet Habitat's criteria for good citizenship.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the house on the adjacent property.

Mr. Gibson said it is just south of this lot and this lot was used for a dumping ground and it cost Habitat \$1,500.00 to remove the garbage.

Mr. McIntyre said there is a concrete block structure next to it.

Mr. Lamanna asked why this house was positioned to the one side.

Mr. Gibson said they are trying to save the large tree.

Mr. Lamanna asked if this was as far over that they wanted to go to the line to preserve the tree.

Mr. Gibson said yes, they tried to build closer to the big tree, but when excavating, they could hit the tree's root system.

Mr. Olivier asked if the house fronts on Rocker and the drive is on Dayton.

Mr. Gibson replied yes.

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

Motion BZA 2004-16 – 7103 Rocker Street

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the following variances:

1. A variance from the maximum lot coverage of 10% to 20% for a variance of 10%.
2. A variance from the required minimum front yard setback on Rocker Street of 100' to 37' - 4" for a variance of 62' - 8".
3. A variance from the minimum front yard setback on Dayton Street of 100' to 43' for a variance of 57'.
4. A variance from the required minimum side yard setback of 50' to 15' for a variance of 35'.
5. A variance from the required minimum rear yard setback of 90' to 15' for a variance of 75'.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists because there are five pre-existing lots of record totaling 100' which is consistent with the other building lots in this area.
2. The front yard and side yard setbacks are also consistent with the other setbacks in the area and this would not adversely affect any of the neighboring properties.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mrs. Stanton, aye.

Application 2004-20 by Marsha A. Simon for property at 8648 Taylor May Road

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

The zoning inspector's letter dated July 8, 2004 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mrs. Marsha Simon was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna stated that a variance is requested for an addition from 50' to 38' for a variance of 12'.

Mrs. Simon testified that she wants to build a small sunroom with lots of windows because her husband has been in and out of nursing homes for the last 18 months and she needs a refuge for herself. She added that there are no neighbors near her and her house sits about 600' back from the road.

Mr. Lamanna asked who owns the neighboring property.

Mr. McIntyre said it is the driveway for Holy Angels Church.

Mr. Lamanna asked how far the driveway is off the property line.

Mr. McIntyre said the drive is off the property line by a couple of feet and the board of appeals made the church put in a board on board fence and an earthen mound.

Mr. Olivier said it shows a house on the property next door per the GIS photo so it must be a dated photo.

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

Motion BZA 2004-20 – 8648 Taylor May Road

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the following variance for the purpose of constructing an addition:

1. A variance from the required minimum side yard setback of 50' to 38' for a variance of 12'.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists.
2. The most practical location is to add onto the side of the existing house.
3. The applicant's house sits 600' back from the road.
4. The adjacent property is not a residential property, it actually contains a driveway leading to a parking lot so there would be no adverse effect on the adjacent property owners.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mrs. Stanton, aye.

Application 2004-21 by Jeffrey F. Wright for property at 8030 and 8048 Chagrin Road

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

The zoning inspector's letter dated July 8, 2004 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mr. Jeffrey Wright was present to represent this application.

Mr. Wright testified that he wants to reduce the non-conformity of an existing lot and he owns both properties. He said that because of the creek, the house was pushed to about 3' from the property line and he wants to adjust the line on the west side to make his lot more uniform.

Mr. Lamanna asked if he was taking .32 of an acre from one lot and moving it to another lot.

Mr. Wright said that is correct.

Mr. Lamanna asked if it will mean that he would be better off.

Mr. Wright said the property line now is at an angle to his house.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there are any setback issues.

Mr. Wright said no.

Mr. McIntyre said there will be a slight increase in lot coverage.

Mr. Lamanna said the lot coverage will be up to 15.3% on that lot and the only issue is that the lot is becoming smaller so the lot coverage increases.

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

Motion BZA 2004-21 – 8030 and 8048 Chagrin Road

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the applicant the following variances:

1. A variance with respect to 8030 Chagrin Road to reduce the size of the lot from its current 1.14 acres to .82 acres with the .32 acres to be added to the adjacent lot.
2. A variance with respect to this lot from the required 3 acres to the proposed .82 acres.
3. A variance from the maximum lot coverage of 10% to 15.3% for a variance of 5.3%.

Motion BZA 2004-21 – 8030 and 8048 Chagrin Road - Continued

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists.
2. By transferring this parcel of land to the adjacent parcel of land which is of a very peculiar shape, it will be modified so that it's side lot lines are parallel and will also additionally mean that the current dwelling which was built extremely close to the property line will now have an improved setback from the property line so there will be a trade-off of substantial increase in the conformity of the adjacent lot.
3. The lots as created will be substantially similar to the remainder of the lots along Chagrin Road in this area and will be more reasonable in shape and size.
4. There will be no adverse impact on any of the other adjacent neighbors.
5. There will be no other increase in any of the other non-conformities of that lot other than those to which the board has granted the variance.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mrs. Stanton, aye.

Application 2004-22 by Carl (Ed) Speck for property at 8440 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.

The zoning inspector's letter dated July 8, 2004 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mr. Dave Pazyniak, Architect from Mr. Steve Ciciretto's office and Mr. and Mrs. Ed Speck, applicants were present to represent this application.

Mr. Pazyniak testified that he is the architect on this project and the applicants are requesting a lot coverage variance and variances for side yard setbacks. He said that Dottie Grossman is Sue Speck's mother and she owned this lot for over 40 years and it is a pre-existing, non-conforming lot of record. He said that Mrs. Grossman paid for a sewer tie-in and has paid the assessment and the lot has a separate tax bill. He continued by saying that the applicant has received approval from the Lake Lucerne Architectural Review Board based on the conceptual drawing. He said the lot is 100' wide and with 50' side yard setbacks the lot is unbuildable. He said the front yard setback is consistent with the other houses on the street and the lot coverage variance is like other houses in Lake Lucerne. He added that Mr. Ciciretto has had discussions with Mr. Weiss, neighbor, regarding drainage and landscaping and that they agreed to work together and said they have the paperwork from Geauga County regarding the sanitary sewer.

Mrs. Stanton asked about the height of the proposed house.

Mr. Pazyniak said it will be a two story structure similar to the neighbor's.

The board reviewed the requested variances.

Mr. Pazyniak showed the board the front elevation of the home per the drawing submitted.

Mrs. Stanton asked if the height is less than 35'.

Mr. Pazyniak said that is right.

Mrs. Stanton said it is more forward than the Weiss house.

Mr. Pazyniak reviewed the proposed site plan with the board.

The board discussed the placement of the house on the lot.

Mr. Pazyniak said the garage will be under the house.

Mrs. Stanton asked if there is a retaining wall.

Mr. Pazyniak said yes.

Mrs. Stanton asked if they were going to work on the water run-off.

Mr. Pazyniak said yes but he is not sure an engineer will handle it but there are no streams or creek beds on the property, just water run-off from the lot.

Mrs. Stanton said the house will be up on a rise and asked if Mrs. Grossman's house is a split level.

Mrs. Sue Speck testified by saying yes.

Mr. David Weiss, neighbor, testified that his house is a story and one-half.

Mr. Lamanna said this proposed house will be a good 10' to 12' taller than the adjacent houses and asked if there is a reason for a side entrance garage.

Mr. Ed Speck testified by saying it was their choice.

Mr. Lamanna said he has a concern about having a house higher than the neighbor's house only 10' away.

The board reviewed the site plan and elevations.

Mr. Lamanna asked how much slope there is to the lot.

Mr. McIntyre stated that the township amended the zoning resolution to only measure from the front elevation for walk-out basements so the way the height calculations are done has been amended.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the lot has a slope.

Mr. Pazyniak stated that the lot is sloping and they worked with the contours as best as they could.

The board discussed the elevations and grade of the lot.

Mrs. Stanton said it looks like the one side will be 40' tall but it will be family on that side since Mrs. Grossman is Sue Speck's mother. She asked if there are landscaping plans between this house and the Weiss home.

Mr. Pazyniak said that Mr. Ciciretto and Mr. Weiss spoke about the landscaping between the two properties to be mutually satisfying to both parties and added that the applicant did go through the Lake Lucerne ARB.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the total width of the proposed house.

Mr. Pazyniak said it is 58' wide.

Mr. Lamanna asked how wide the lot is.

Mr. Pazyniak said the lot is pie-shaped and roughly 100' wide.

Mr. Lamanna said the proposed side yard setbacks are 10' on one side and 16' on the other side.

The board reviewed the proposed setbacks, lot width, etc.

Mrs. Stanton asked if the driveway will be 2' from the property line.

Mr. Pazyniak replied yes.

Mr. Weiss said the house is gorgeous and will be a great addition to Lake Lucerne but these properties are at the bottom of a hill where water comes from E. Washington Street and there are two culverts that catch the water. He said this house will create a dam for water coming across the property, but as long as the drainage is addressed, he does not have a problem. He added that a couple of weeks ago, the Hogan's driveway had three feet of water in it and he does have a basement window on that side of the property. He said the drainage does need to be addressed before the house is built and added that the water goes under the road and into the field across the road and then into the lake.

Mr. Lewis asked if the applicant can tie into the existing culverts.

Mr. Weiss said he has no idea where some of the existing pipes are.

Mr. Lewis said it would be nice if they could tie into them.

Mr. Lamanna said the pipes are probably old enough that they are not big enough now for what is going on.

Mr. Weiss said it would be best to address the drainage issue before the house is constructed.

Mr. Lamanna said it should be addressed now and during excavation and they should start off by putting the drainage in first before excavation is done.

Mr. Weiss said again, that per the blue prints, the house will be a great addition.

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. Weiss if he has a concern with the proposed house being so close to his property line.

Mr. Weiss said it is a buildable lot and his house was built in the 1930s per the county records.

Mr. Lamanna said the structure is not bad but he is concerned about it being a tall house without the elevation being built up.

Mr. Weiss said they had the same situation on the other side and he talked to Mr. Steve Ciciretto about the house placement and Mr. Ciciretto thought it was pretty good.

Mr. Pazyniak said he tried to place the house on the lot for a better view for everyone.

Mr. Weiss said it will improve his view and will make the road safer because they will be taking down the trees by the curve. He added that the side of the parcel that the driveway is on is not as steep.

Mr. Lewis said if this is approved, the first step is to work with the water run-off and the drainage.

Mr. Pazyniak said the preliminary application was approved by the Lake Lucerne ARB but the final one will be approved when they get the plans from the structural engineer.

Mr. Weiss said they will want their basement dry also.

Mr. Lamanna said this piece of property is a channel for all the water coming through there and it is always the last parcel that is usually subjected to more water and this is something that needs to be addressed.

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

Motion BZA 2004-22 – 8440 Lake Shore Drive

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

1. A variance from the minimum required side yard setback of 50' to 10' for a variance of 40' on the west side.
2. A variance from the minimum required side yard setback of 50' to 26' - 7" for a variance of 23' - 5" on the east side.
3. A variance from the maximum lot coverage of 10% to 26.6% for a variance of 16.6%.

With the following condition:

1. The applicant shall not raise the grade on the property, especially on the west side as a result of the construction.
2. The applicant will make provisions in the rear yard to collect any storm water run-off that is currently moving through the property and collect it and channel it to an appropriate discharge area at the lake or otherwise in that vicinity and to otherwise assure that the construction of the house does not divert the existing flow of water onto the adjacent properties.
3. This action shall be taken on a permanent basis and it also should be taken during the course of construction to prevent, again, the diversion of water onto adjacent properties during the course of construction and also to avoid any silt run-off from the construction onto the adjacent properties.

Motion BZA 2004-22 – 8440 Lake Shore Drive - Continued

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. This is a pre-existing lot of record.
2. The size of the structure being proposed is not unreasonable when given the total size of the lot.
3. The setbacks being provided are consistent with setbacks in Lake Lucerne.
4. The overall lot coverage, given the size of the lot and the size of the house, are reasonable and again consistent with the other properties in this area.
5. The conditions are applied to this variance in order to assure that the variances being granted do not create a situation which would unreasonably interfere with the neighboring properties and cause injury to neighboring properties and as such are part of the findings of fact for this variance and without which findings, the variance would not be granted.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mrs. Stanton, aye.

Application 2004-23 by Daniel and Amy Eibler for property at 17796 Kenston Lake Drive

The applicants are 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 July 8, 2004 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Mr. and Mrs. Daniel Eibler were present to represent this application.

Mr. Eibler testified that they were requesting a variance to build a shed and they have a garden and a large pond on the property that does not show on the site plan. He said if they place the shed where it should be, it would be on his garden and the septic tank lid is approximately where the shed would be also. He added that his garden is right in the middle of the yard and it is 40' wide x 100' long and noted that his neighbor to the north has a shed and there is a garage to the west of his property.

Mrs. Stanton asked about the neighbor's shed.

Mr. Eibler referred to the GIS aerial view and showed the board his neighbor's garage and where he would like to place the shed and the location of his garden.

Mr. Lamanna said he has a real hard time with the practical difficulty part.

Mr. Eibler said they are planning on adding onto their house and if they put the shed according to the zoning, it would be right in the middle of their garden. He said he took trees down to get sunlight there and added that he has a septic clean-out and a pond in his back yard.

Mr. Lamanna said there is 200' from the house to the back property line and it can be placed 40' over in line with the house and it could be brought up 50' to 60' from the rear property line.

Mr. Eibler said he has valid reasons for the location of the shed.

Mr. Lamanna explained that the reasons for granting a variance have to be ravines, small lots, physical limitations, etc. and those are the kinds of things the board can address but this is more for convenience. He added that the board tries to ameliorate the size of the variance and it usually tries to allow the applicant to use the side yard setbacks of their house for the location of an accessory building. He asked Mr. Eibler if he can live with 50' from the rear yard property line and 41' from the side yard property line.

Mr. Eibler said the neighbor's shed to the north is not within the setbacks of their home.

Mr. Lamanna said he is not familiar with that particular situation and added that the board tries to be consistent.

Mr. Lewis said because of the depth of the lot, he is still struggling with the proposed rear setback of the shed. He referred to the sun on the garden and said because the sun comes up in the east and sets in the west, the shed could be moved to another location on the property. He said he is in agreement that the shed should be placed at least 41' from the side yard and the applicant can make a choice within that block where to locate the shed. He told Mr. Eibler that should he find himself in a position to add onto his house, the shed could be relocated to accommodate the addition.

Mrs. Eibler testified that when she called the building department, she was told that anything over 160 sq. ft. needed a permanent foundation.

Mr. Lewis said it would be worth knowing that in advance and with that in mind, to be prudent about where the shed is placed.

Mr. Lamanna said that is all the more reason for deciding where to put the shed now if it is placed on a permanent foundation.

Mr. Eibler said he did not disagree with the board's suggested side yard placement, but 90' from the rear property line would be too close to their house.

Mr. Lamanna said it would be 100' away from the house and most people would be happy to have the shed 100' away and that is part of the price people pay to have an accessory structure in their back yard.

Mr. Lewis said some screening could be added also.

Mr. and Mrs. Eibler said they needed time to talk about their variance request.

The hearing was recessed so the applicants could discuss their application.

Application 2004-24 by Karen Bartlett for property at 18591 Geauga Lake Road

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of constructing a detached garage. The property is located in a R-5A District.

The zoning inspector's letter dated July 8, 2004 was read and photos of the site were submitted.

Ms. Karen Bartlett was present to represent this application.

Ms. Bartlett testified that the board approved a variance for her last month for a garage to be built behind her house, but she realized that with the kind of cost it will be, she will have a hard time living with it. She said she consulted a real estate agent and the agent told her that when a garage is put on a narrow lot and the view is blocked, it could affect the resale price of the property. She explained that her neighbors on Geauga Lake Road live in tiny, one bedroom cottages. She presented photos to the board of her surrounding neighbors' houses, barns etc. that are close to the property line and said her neighbor's house on the one side is pretty close to the property line and her septic system is on the other side. She said she wants to change the garage location to be 5-1/4' to the property line and she wants to angle the garage and is willing to work with the board and does not really have a side view because the neighbor dumps stuff and sheet metal behind his house that she can see. She said she has a very narrow lot and is willing to work with the board with what it will give her but she wanted to come back to see how close to the property line she can go with the garage. She added that she will do the nicest improvement and the neighbor behind her likes this idea also and that Mr. Barry wants complete privacy.

The board reviewed the variance request and the photos submitted.

Mrs. Stanton asked why the proposed garage is tilted.

Ms. Bartlett said there is a nice tree that blocks Mr. Barry's stuff in the back but if the board wants her to square the garage up, she will.

The board discussed squaring the proposed garage up.

Ms. Bartlett said she has a 12-sided turret on the back of her house with lots of windows and she has a deck, so there is not enough room for a good turn-around there.

Mr. Olivier referred to the letter the board received from Mr. Barry's daughter that requested the maximum distance away from his bedroom.

The board discussed an alternate placement of the proposed garage.

Ms. Bartlett told the board to tell her where they want it and she will move it.

Mr. Lewis referred to the letter from Mr. Barry's daughter and said it is a compelling letter.

Ms. Bartlett said that Mr. Barry has a concrete house and junk in his backyard.

Mr. Lamanna said that Mr. Barry will not be there forever.

Ms. Bartlett said she knows but her garage doors will not go up and down very much and she does not have a business and she will put up a fence. She added that his yard is only getting worse the older he gets.

Mr. Lewis said more importantly, if there are large trees, they should be kept.

Ms. Bartlett told the board to give her a number to work with.

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

Motion BZA 2004-24 - 18591 Geauga Lake Road

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the applicant the following variance for the purpose of installing a 24' x 24' detached garage:

1. A variance from the minimum required side yard setback of 50' to 20' for a variance of 30' to run parallel to the side lot line.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists because the applicant has a 130' wide yard with an existing gravel driveway and to be able to put the garage behind the house in a reasonable location, it is necessary to have the garage located closer to the side yard property line in order to make the approach from the driveway feasible.
2. It should not adversely affect the neighboring houses because the side yard setbacks in this area and the neighboring houses are consistent with this dimension.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mrs. Stanton, aye.

Application 2004-23 by Daniel and Amy Eibler for property at 17796 Kenston Lake Drive – CONTINUED

Mr. and Mrs. Eibler returned to the meeting.

Mr. Eibler testified that they want to amend their application to change the location of the shed to the other side of the yard and ask for a 50' rear yard setback and because of a treed area, it will be very inconspicuous for the neighbors.

Mr. Olivier asked if it will be between two of the large trees.

Mr. Lamanna said it will be in the center of the property in a location between the trees.

Mr. Lewis asked which group of trees.

Mr. Eibler explained that they are not bushes, but full grown Blue Spruces.

Mr. Lewis said it may not require a variance.

Mr. Lamanna said the board could give it a 20' variance.

Mrs. Eibler said there is a septic tank there and explained the location of the septic tank lid.

Mr. Eibler said if they have a leeway of 70', it would be great.

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

Motion BZA 2004-23 – 17796 Kenston Lake Drive

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to grant the applicant a variance from the minimum rear yard setback requirement of 90' to 70' for a variance of 20' for the purposes of constructing a shed to be located to the rear of the garage on this house between a couple of stands of trees.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists.
2. This is the most reasonable place to locate the shed and to try to move it forward would otherwise interfere with existing septic fields, and an existing stand of trees.
3. This is a location between some existing trees substantially distant from either of the neighbors' properties.
4. The property behind them at this point actually has a pond located on it so it will not adversely affect the property to the rear.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mrs. Stanton, aye.

Since there was no further testimony, the public hearing was closed at 9:19 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lamanna, Chairman
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman
Mark Olivier
Ellen Stanton
Donald Takacs

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

Date: August 19, 2004

Bainbridge Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
July 15, 2004

The regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 9:19 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were: Mr. Todd Lewis, Mr. Mark Olivier and Mrs. Ellen Stanton. Mr. Donald Takacs was absent.

Minutes

Mr. Lamanna made a motion to adopt the minutes of the June 17, 2004 meeting as written with the exception of Application 2004-7 by Arnold Leeb for property at 17787 Chillicothe Road. Because of further consideration reserved by the board at its last meeting and the absence of all of the board members who were present for that action, and not being in attendance tonight, that the business meeting be continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held August 19, 2004 where the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law and decision of the board will be further evaluated to determine whether any additional modifications are necessary and based on that fact, the minutes will be modified to delete all of the minutes from the June 17, 2004 meeting with respect to said application.

Mr. Olivier seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Olivier, aye; Mrs. Stanton, aye.

Other Business

Mrs. Ann Meyers met with the board regarding the Federated Church appeal and the Metroparks board relating to the proposed Judson Retirement Community.

Applications for next meeting

Application 2004-25 by C4 Polymers Inc. for property at 16625 Wren Road

The applicant is requesting an area variance for the purpose of maintaining a sign. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2004-26 by Robert Takatch for property at 8636 North Spring Valley Drive

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

Application 2004-27 by Signature Sign Company for Kay Jewelers for property at 7175 Aurora Road

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of installing signage. The property is located in a CR District.

Application 2004-28 by Richard Krause for property at 8388 E. Washington Street

The applicant is requesting a conditional use permit with variances for the purpose of establishing a laser tag arcade/game room. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2004-29 by Northcoast Cycles, LLC for property at 7315 Aurora Road

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of installing signage. The property is located in a CR District.

Application 2004-30 by Prestige Homes for property at 8125 Woodberry Boulevard

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

Application 2004-31 by Harry Edwards for property at 16449 S. Franklin Street

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of constructing a lean-to on an existing garden shed. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Since there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:55 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Lamanna, Chairman
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman
Mark Olivier
Ellen Stanton
Donald Takacs

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

Date: August 19, 2004