

Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
April 21, 2022

Pursuant to notice by publication and ordinary mail, the public hearing was called to order at 7:10 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Brent Barr, Alternate; Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis; Ms. Lori O'Neill, Alternate and Mr. Emeil Soryal. Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector was present.

Mr. Gutoskey departed the meeting and Mr. Brent Barr, Alternate joined the board for consideration of these applications.

Mr. Lamanna welcomed everyone to the regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals, explained the public hearing process and stated that individuals will be sworn in when the application is started. He said the board is going to change-up one thing tonight to take care of some unfinished business from the last meeting in the course of application 2020-35 and due to the complexity of this application the board reserves the opportunity to come back and polish up the motion for that application so we have done that, there has not been any substantive change to the tenor of the application, it will be available with the minutes so he is not going to read through the entire two pages of it in the interest of saving everybody's time here and the board members have all read it. He asked the board members if they had any further comments or questions or changes they think should be made to this.

The board members replied no.

Motion BZA 2020-35 – 16965 Park Circle Drive (Sapphire Creek Pavilion)

Mr. Lamanna moved with respect to application 2020-35 (Sapphire Creek Pavilion) that the board modify its decision into the form presently before the board and adopt that as the board's decision. The text of the prior decision will stay in the transcript record for record purposes but will be of no force and effect and this will substitute as the board's decision.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Barr, aye; Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Secretary's note: The aforementioned motion will be included in the minutes for March 17, 2022.

MINUTES

Mr. Lamanna moved to adopt the meeting minutes of March 17, 2022 as they have been prepared by the secretary with the exception of the modified motion for Case 2020-35 which will be added in as the action with respect to that application.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Barr, aye; Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Mr. Lamanna noted that the public hearing will start with Applications 2022-16 and 2022-17 and then move back to the board's regularly scheduled program at the top with BZA 2022-12 because the applicant happens to be a board member so he is recusing himself from consideration on these applications because of his interest in the properties as a business.

Application 2022-16 by ASZ, Inc. for property at 8454 E. Washington Street

The applicant is requesting a review and renewal of an existing conditional use. The property is located in a CB District.

Mr. Emeil Soryal recused himself for this application.

Mr. Emeil Soryal was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Emeil Soryal and he let the record reflect that Mr. Soryal was duly sworn.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector and he let the record reflect that Mr. Averill was duly sworn.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Averill if there are any outstanding issues or complaints.

Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector testified by saying no issues.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Soryal if the nature of his business changed from what was previously approved to its current state.

Mr. Soryal testified other than the tenant on the second floor.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there is anyone that has any questions or issues with this application.

There was no response and the board members replied no.

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

Motion BZA 2022-16 – 8454 E. Washington Street

Mr. Lamanna stated that since there are no changes since the original approval of this application, no outstanding issues or non-compliances and no public comments with respect to this application he moved to renew this application for a period of five years commencing on the date the board's decision becomes final.

Mr. Barr seconded the motion.

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

Application 2022-17 by TLC Pet Hospital LLC/Anna Leeb for property at 8452 E. Washington Street

The applicant is requesting a review and renewal of an existing conditional use. The property is located in a CB District.

Mr. Lamanna noted that this conditional use was originally approved in 2007-36.

Mr. Emeil Soryal recused himself for this application.

Ms. Anna Leeb was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Ms. Anna Leeb and he let the record reflect that Ms. Leeb was duly sworn.

Ms. Anna Leeb testified that she is the new owner of TLC Pet Hospital and operations have remained the same, the office is used for the same thing and she has the fully executed lease agreement and the Member Action appointed her as a member.

Mr. Lamanna asked Ms. Leeb if she purchased the hospital.

Ms. Leeb said she did not, her father owned it and he passed away.

Mr. Lamanna said so you have now taken ownership because you have become the sole member of the LLC.

Ms. Leeb said yes.

Mr. Lamanna said okay. He asked if there are any issues at this location.

Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector testified by saying all good.

Mr. Lamanna said all good and everything in compliance, okay. He asked if anybody has anything to say on this particular application.

Mr. Soryal said he has a question. He said he understands as a building owner or a strip center you have to come every five years for a conditional use certificate but why a tenant in a veterinary office would have to come every five years if nothing changes in their operation and in the building.

Mr. Lamanna said because that itself is a conditional use because that particular use is one of the listed conditional uses so no matter where a veterinary hospital is it would have to come back.

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

Motion BZA 2022 – 17 – 8452 E. Washington Street (TLC Pet Hospital)

Mr. Lamanna moved that the conditional use permit is the same entity but notes that there is a new owner of that entity so the board will treat that as a transfer of a new controlling interest and will approve that ownership transfer and renew the conditional use permit for the veterinary hospital for a period of five years from the date when the board's decision becomes final.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. The hospital has been operated without any complaints.
2. It is in compliance with its conditional use requirements.
3. There are no pending complaints or any zoning violations.

Mr. Barr seconded the motion.

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

Application 2022-12 by Chris Mick for property at 8065 Bainbridge Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing an accessory building. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Mr. Chris Mick was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Chris Mick and he let the record reflect that Mr. Mick was duly sworn.

Mr. Chris Mick testified that basically they are going to build a two-car detached garage so there is an area variance he guesses they would need for the square footage, it will probably be a 28 x 36. He said it would be possibly a variance for the height, he was trying to match the pitch direction of the house. He said you can see the gable from the existing garage, it is like a 10/12 pitch, the roof might not go that high but if we go 10/12 we would need to go to 23' so we would have a variance for over 15' he believes and then you can see where the existing driveway is relative to the west property line. He said the existing driveway is 12' from the property line and we are looking for a variance for that just to line the garage up with the driveway which would be inside the 15'.

Mr. Barr asked Mr. Mick if he is looking to extend the driveway to the garage.

Mr. Mick said yes he believes.

Mr. Lewis said our zoning code permits a 15' side yard setback.

Mr. Mick said correct.

Mr. Lewis said so let's talk about that if we could please for a minute. He said he is looking at your drawing and it looks like you've got your building set at 28' wide.

Mr. Mick said sure.

Mr. Lewis said okay so you are looking at the corner of the 28' at 15' or less than that.

Mr. Mick said what they are asking for is 12' where the driveway is.

Mr. Lewis said so it is not really 28' because your eaves are beyond your foundation.

Mr. Mick said sure.

Mr. Lewis said so that could be the index point so before we get into whether or not you do or do not have a practical difficulty and this is just a convenience request. He said the other thing that we need to consider is that it doesn't look like there are any gutters or downspouts on your building.

Mr. Mick said there would be gutters, correct.

Mr. Lewis asked where the water is going to go that you collect.

Mr. Mick said it would be up to the engineers to tell him where it needs to go. He said currently the gutters and downspouts on the house go to the curb.

Mr. Lewis asked do they go to the street.

Mr. Mick said yes.

Mr. Lewis said he is not looking at the topos on this for the grading to see what direction the water would really flow.

Mr. Mick said it wants to go to the back.

Mr. Lamanna said yes, it wants to go to the back.

Mr. Mick said but the house does flow to the street.

Mr. Lamanna said you have a slight bit of drop to the street.

Mr. Soryal said but you have pipes now so you can tie into that.

Mr. Lamanna said given that there is not a lot of fall in the back. He asked if there is a vacant lot in-between there.

Mr. Mick said there used to be.

Mr. Lamanna said somebody owns that now.

Mr. Mick said there was a house built there a few years back and they lost a big chunk of trees there.

Mr. Lewis said this will be behind the stand of trees into the open space between the look through.

Mr. Mick said the angle we are looking at here is fairly close to where the first of that back chunk of trees.

Mr. Soryal said it looks like the neighbor put a bunch of Pine trees there.

Mr. Mick said yes.

Mr. Lamanna asked did he plant those.

Mr. Mick said they lost a bunch of them so we went together to replant them.

Mr. Soryal said so your garage will be hidden behind the trees.

Mr. Mick said he is not sure from this picture where 20' exactly falls, it is pretty close to that area.

Mr. DeWater asked Mr. Mick if he applied for his sediment control permit.

Mr. Mick said no.

Mr. DeWater said in looking at the picture, your septic leach fields, your drawing may be still 40' – 50' away from where your proposed side of your drive is.

Mr. Mick said he just learned this from watching them build the house next door there, they were supposed to have a replacement leach field area available, that was just his thinking that if they ever have to replace that leach field.

Mr. Lewis said that would have been designated by the county, you don't necessarily get to choose.

Mr. Mick said where the location would be, he needs to somewhat be able to put it.

Mr. DeWater asked Mr. Mick where his water well is.

Mr. Soryal said it is right next to the driveway.

Mr. Mick said it is just about between where the trailer and the car are, right beside the driveway.

Mr. Soryal asked if this garage is going to be an addition to your existing garage or are you turning the garage into something else.

Mr. Lamanna said the house has a garage there now.

Mr. Mick said it would be another garage, we would maintain both.

Mr. DeWater asked Mr. Mick if he is using it for a business.

Mr. Mick said no, just for him, workshop and storing toys.

Mr. Lamanna asked what kind of construction this is going to be.

Mr. Mick said he would like to do a foundation but it is all going to depend on the bids he gets for it.

Mr. Lamanna asked about the exterior.

Mr. Mick said it would match the house.

Mr. Lewis said so other than the convenience, because you are going to go 20' back from your current pad to the garage door of the extension of your driveway, there is nothing in the way, the code says 15', he is not seeing anything demonstrated on any kind of a practical difficulty to say, okay, why is there a variance needed to place it closer to the property line.

Mr. Mick said basically they are just trying to keep it away from the patio and less in the middle of their backyard.

Mr. Lewis said for 3'.

Mr. Mick said and also it keeps an angle off the driveway. He said the driveway is at 12'.

Mr. Lewis said you specified some lights, some lanterns on this and you were kind enough to submit some spec sheets on the product you were going with.

Mr. Mick said his wife is an interior designer.

Mr. Lewis asked if these are full cut-offs.

Mr. Mick said they are LEDs.

Mr. Lewis asked can you see the bulb if you are looking straight at it or is it a shine-down only.

Mr. Mick said he believes they are LEDs.

Mr. Lewis said that is the type of bulb. He said he thinks our code wants full cut-offs where you can't see the bulb other than maybe your lantern at the street, he was just thinking out loud on that.

Mr. Soryal said you definitely see the bulb in that.

Mr. Lewis said we are getting even closer with the requested variance to the neighbor's property and we've got light that although it suggests that it shines down it also shines out.

Mr. Soryal said correct.

Mr. Lamanna asked if this is the whole fixture.

Mr. Soryal said the light bulb is inside of it, he has seen that many times.

Mr. Lamanna said 690 lumens, that is like a 60 watt bulb.

Mr. Mick said that is just the style.

Mr. Lamanna said we are talking about a light that is at 690 lumens it is not really.

Mr. Lewis said it is one step above a night light.

Mr. Lamanna said it is like a 60 watt bulb. He said if you are putting 3,000 in then that is a different story. He said this is decorative light, this is not some kind of security light that shines to illuminate.

Mr. Lewis said we just wanted to have the discussion on this part of what you were saying.

Mr. Averill said if it shines into the neighbor's yard we will hear about it.

Mr. Soryal said we are trying to save you from that.

Mr. Averill said he appreciates it.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there are any windows on the side of this at all.

Mr. Mick said not on the side.

Mr. Lamanna said okay.

Mr. Barr said you say it will be sided.

Mr. Mick said it will match the house.

Mr. Lewis said with your overhangs and gutters you are really asking not for 12' but you are asking for 1-1/2' or so less than that.

Mr. Mick said yes, they are 12" overhangs.

Mr. Lewis said which would put it with the gutter so we are down almost to 10', 12' – 15' that code has.

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. Mick how wide his driveway is at the end.

Mr. Mick said about 20'

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. Mick how much he is actually going to extend the driveway before you hit the garage, it looks like it could be 4' or something like that.

Mr. Mick said not very much.

Mr. Lamanna said because the driveway extends beyond the garage now.

Mr. Mick said the existing garage, right.

Mr. Lamanna said right, exactly, just so he is looking at this correctly, it almost goes to the back of the house it looks like because the house goes across and keeps getting farther back. He said so you are going to move this back so, you really cannot deflect it very much.

Mr. Lewis said not even 4'.

Mr. Lamanna asked if anybody else has an interest in this application, no neighbors here.

Mr. Barr said just to clarify, you are going 4' from the existing driveway then starting your drive.

Mr. Mick said correct.

Mr. Barr said originally he heard 20' and then the one picture that came in had a red box sitting way back there, it was a gross misrepresentation, the little box, he doesn't know where the red box came from.

Mr. Soryal said it does say 20' from the house, the garage does but not from the driveway.

Mr. Lamanna said not from the driveway, the driveway already sits back beyond because the garage is kind of pulled forward.

Mr. DeWater said on his drawing he says he is going to move his garage back 6' from the existing driveway, it is 20' wide here and then he's got a 4' extension for a sidewalk coming down the side of the garage which would further come towards that property line on this drawing right here.

Mr. Lewis said if we are 12' off the property line less another 1-1/2' for gutters and overhang.

Mr. Lamanna said with the side door shown here.

Mr. Lewis asked if that is on the house side.

Mr. DeWater said no, it is on the property line side, that brings him down to 8' not 12' because it is a hard surface. He said with the door to the other side of the garage there is a sidewalk out the other side. He said you understand what we are saying, if there are sidewalks there that is actually 8' off the property line not 12', the building is 12' but the sidewalk isn't.

Mr. Mick said they were looking at probably a 36" sidewalk, he was told that that wouldn't count.

Mr. Lewis said it still cuts it to 9'.

Mr. Mick said he understands.

Mr. Soryal said the driveway can get closer to the property line, not the building.

Mr. Mick said something like that, yes, something about a walkway.

Mr. Lamanna said yes except in this case while it is true that a walkway by itself, it doesn't apply to the walkway itself, in this case the walkway is attached to a building which is seeking a variance into the space so if somebody just had a walkway in that space and no building then yes it is true that the walkway isn't covered but once you come in and are asking for a variance for the building then we are looking at all of what the building does so it is not just the building anymore, there is going to be a walkway on the building so it changes the impact some, it is another thing that we have to question, why do we need to have that door there, you could put it on the other side.

Mr. Mick said since his wife is not here he will tell you that he does not have an issue with it on the front, she does not want to see it.

Mr. Barr said on another note for safety purposes you want the door where you can see it from your house versus the door where you cannot see it.

Mr. Mick said as far as putting it on the opposite side with the concrete patio that will kind of get cluttered up but as far as being on the front of the building that would just go right into the driveway.

Mr. Lewis said that would eliminate the sidewalk on the side, that access sidewalk.

Mr. Mick said yes.

Mr. DeWater said you are also asking for a 23' building height. He asked what the existing maximum height is on your house.

Mr. Mick said the house is 30'.

Mr. Lamanna said and the garage is 20'.

Mr. Mick said the existing garage is 20' and the only reason they went with that was the house and the garage both have a 10/12 pitch right now so it is just a matter of matching the look of it, he is not dead set on that, he thinks probably an 8/12 would not look out of place, that was just the maximum.

Mr. Barr asked if there is enough room on the front of your garage if you wanted to put the door in the front, is there enough room for a man-door.

Mr. Mick said yes because he has a 20' door on this but decided to go with a 16', he talked to his garage door guy and he did not recommend the 20' door. He said his wife had a special order door put on the existing garage which of course has to match and it has got windows which adds into the difficulty of the door, the weight of it.

Mr. Soryal said so if you have the man-door to the garage in the front and if your garage door is no longer centered in the garage.

Mr. Lamanna said he would still have 6' on either side.

Mr. Soryal said one of the reasons, if he understands, is you wanted that garage pushed over toward your neighbor because you want to line up your driveway, is that to make it easy to get in and out or just for looks, it would still be easy to back in, your driveway is 20', your garage door is 16' you still are going to be able to go straight back you are not going to have to do any bends or anything.

Mr. Mick said right and then at 20' it would become the sidewalk, it would cover the man-door.

Mr. Lewis said with his overhang and the gutters his request goes from 12' off the side yard to close to 10' so from 15' that is a 30% variance which is pretty substantial however by moving the man-door to the front of the building and getting rid of the side sidewalk it appears that the applicant is okay with that so that would also mean then on the neighbor's side, the adjacent property, there is no man-door there, there is no access, there is no traffic, there is no light fixture on that side of the building crossing over so it significantly lessens the impact on the adjacent property.

Mr. Barr said he doesn't have a problem with the man-door being on the front either side or on the side closest to your house, it gives you three options for your interior designer to take a look at.

Mr. Mick said to him it should be closest to the house.

Mr. Barr said and even in the other case with it on the neighbor's side, opening and closing, slamming the door, whatever, that is just something else, the next neighbor that moves in, obviously you have a good relationship with splitting the trees but you don't know who the next neighbor is.

Mr. Mick said true.

Mr. Lewis said we've talked about the light fixture, we've talked about the garage door going to 16', we've talked about moving the man-door, we've talked about dumping the sidewalk on the neighbor's side, we've talked about gutters, collecting rainwater from it and tying it into your house's piping and sending it to the street.

Mr. DeWater said he has to get a sediment erosion plan.

Mr. Barr said he doesn't have any problem with the size, with the size of his lot.

Mr. Lewis said it is a 2-1/2 acre lot and we are already seeing that there is existing buffer and there has been more buffer with evergreens planted which will continue to grow so that buffer in-between the two houses is going to get more and more intense as time goes on which is good.

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

Motion BZA 2022-12 – 8065 Bainbridge Road

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variances for the purposes of constructing an accessory building.

1. A variance to the minimum side yard setback to the west from 15' from 10'.
2. A variance to the maximum accessory building size from 300 sq. ft. to 1,008 sq. ft.
3. A variance to the maximum height for an accessory building from 15' to 23'.
4. With respect to the structure the applicant has agreed to the following:
 - a. The exterior will match the house as shown on the drawing.
 - b. Gutters will be provided and they will be piped as the house is to the front of the property.
 - c. The garage door is going to be reduced from 20' to 16' .
 - d. The man-door will be moved from its location on the side to a location on the front which will eliminate the additional walkway that was shown on the drawings so that will no longer be applicable.
 - e. The lighting proposed for the building will be of the decorative type only, not any kind of security or bright light for that purpose.
5. The board also notes that the applicant's neighbors have already planted a double row of evergreen trees between the property lines to provide an existing buffer between the properties as well.

Motion BZA 2022-12 – 8065 Bainbridge Road- Continued

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. A practical difficulty exists with respect to the location because of the existing location of the house and driveway are already located approximately 12' from the property line and the only feasible location to add an additional accessory structure that has access to the driveway would be at the end of the existing driveway.
2. With respect to the size, given that this is an approximately 2.5 acre lot, the size of this accessory structure is not unreasonable given the size of the lot and the size of the buildings that are already existing.
3. Likewise the 23' additional height, because of the size given, the height of the existing garage at 20' and the existing house at over 30' will not be out of place or inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood.
4. Because of the existing buffer that has been planted there it should not have any unreasonable impact on the adjacent property owners or be inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood.
5. The board will note that the sediment control plan will be required in this case for issuance of the zoning certificate.
6. The board notes that with large structures of this size and the assurance that the applicant has given the board that this structure will not be used for any business activities that is not otherwise properly permitted and consistent with zoning as well.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Barr, aye; Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Application 2022-13 by Scott Friedman, as Manager of SDC III – OH, LLC for property at 7135 Aurora Road

The applicant is requesting zoning approval to split a 1.6563 acre lot into two lots. The property is located in the MUP District.

Mr. Scott Friedman and Mr. John Maynard were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Scott Friedman and Mr. John Maynard and he let the record reflect that Mr. Friedman and Mr. Maynard were duly sworn.

Mr. Scott Friedman testified that in their lease with Starbucks there is a requirement for them to pursue them having their own lot, it does give them a separate tax bill and makes it a clear division of costs between the other lot and then further trying to find a tenant for the second lot having the ability to have that entity being able to purchase the lot separately widens the net of the quality tenants they can attract.

Mr. Lewis said there are some attributes of what this lot split will do and what the remaining lots are and their size and their access and setbacks and feasibility to put a structure up on the new lot so let's dig right in on that.

Mr. John Maynard testified that the things they are finding as they are searching for the tenants are that a very similar setback to the Starbucks that they have to the side right now in terms of about 20' to the drive-thru pick-up window that they would be able to still fit the future tenant's needs on the new lot, the new lot A to the west there.

Mr. Lewis said they are going to share the front parking with access across the front. He asked if that connects on through to the next lot.

Mr. Maynard said yes.

Mr. Friedman said you may recall as a request from the board, previously there was an open median.

Mr. Lewis said yes, we closed that up which is great.

Mr. Friedman said that still connects through to the front.

Mr. Lamanna said there is a frontage road basically here, it goes down all the way to McDonald's and connects into the other area.

The board viewed an aerial photo of the area.

Mr. Lewis said that alleviated substantial traffic issues and with Starbucks having a drive-thru, if people were coming in off Aurora and trying to make a left and then traffic stacking out onto Aurora and exiting traffic, this traffic pattern worked really well.

Mr. Barr asked are you insinuating that people in Bainbridge would wait in line dangerously in the flow of traffic to get a cup of coffee.

Mr. DeWater said only if it is Dunkin Donuts.

Mr. Lewis said that turned out to be an outstanding site plan the way the whole Starbucks property was developed and what was adjacent so with your proposed tenant here it looks like the lot is, is it close to the same width.

Mr. Friedman said with a month earlier conversation with Ms. Endres, that was the best way to do it was to split it exactly in half so neither side was too far from the standard, but yes, they are identical.

Mr. Soryal said the split is going to be in the drive-thru right.

Mr. Maynard said it will be right through where the green dot is really.

Mr. DeWater said the middle drive.

Mr. Marynard said it goes into the middle drive a little bit yes.

Mr. Soryal asked if that is going to present a problem though for Starbucks.

Mr. Friedman said no they have in place declarations that talk about shared access, shared parking, shared maintenance responsibilities.

Mr. Lamanna asked what size building do we have left for this property now.

Mr. Friedman said they have an area of land and depending on the tenant somehow, larger buildings, smaller buildings, patios.

Mr. Maynard said there is 17,000 sq. ft. left.

Mr. Lamanna said there was a building there before and that building was probably the maximum size.

Mr. Friedman said they would be under that.

Mr. Maynard said Ruby Tuesday was allowed 46,957 sq. ft. of lot coverage, Starbucks has taken some of that up with their plan for their side of the lot and then the frontage along the main road, 17,162 which would be inclusive of the building and any additional parking for the new building.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks that is sort of the key to understanding here is that most of the center itself, these are the out-lots so, but even that, the whole thing has been under this provision that we have allowed subdividing of the lots on the basis and it is recorded that everybody understands there is this much lot coverage and it has been effectively allocated out except there is a few cases where there is still an amount left that can be assigned out but you have got a fixed amount and as long as you understand that any lot division that is created has to have in it a restriction identifying the fact that there is notwithstanding what the zoning is, because of the way this agreement this was developed under there is this amount of lot coverage left period, end of discussion, there is no coming back and seeking variances and things like that.

Mr. Friedman said they will comply with it.

Mr. Lamanna said he assumes there is enough room so they are not going to run into any other setback issues.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Averill, there is a footnote here, is Starbucks already requesting variances.

Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector testified for signage.

Mr. Lewis said it didn't say it was for signage.

Mr. Averill said obviously that lot is not that big but his concern would be more like parking so when Ms. Endres calculated this lot split, the parking was considered to be sufficient for Starbucks with the lot split so whatever size building they put up, that lot would have to have its own parking.

Mr. Friedman said each parcel will be able to stand on its own with the parking.

Mr. Lamanna said that is the other part of this, in addition to the lot coverage, within that you've got to have sufficient parking.

Mr. Averill said aiseways.

Mr. Friedman said he believes they are.

Mr. Lewis said based on your future tenant recruiting it would be up to you guys to fit it in with the building and parking requirements and traffic flow.

Mr. Lamanna said for Starbucks you are not counting the spots over on the other lot there.

Mr. Friedman said correct.

Mr. Lewis said we'll see that new tenant application here at some point.

Mr. Lamanna asked how many spots does Starbucks need, or how many are required, how many they need may be a different question entirely.

Mr. Lewis said only six people go in.

Mr. Lamanna said most people don't go in.

Mr. Friedman said it is trending more towards the drive-thru.

Mr. Lamanna said given the size of that building.

Mr. Friedman said there is 32 total.

Mr. Soryal said how many employees are there too that take parking spaces.

Mr. Lamanna said yes, they will take some of those parking spaces. He said he supposes there might be times like on a Saturday or something like that where if it is nice people might stop and spend a little time. He said the other advantage here is there is a rather large parking lot across the street, it is not like the only other place to park is along the road somewhere.

Mr. Friedman said there is compliance parking and there is a REA in place which allows cross parking between the two users.

Mr. Lewis said he just looks at the whole commercial development as one big thing, you are limited on this with lot coverage, you need X amount of parking spots, all the lots are shared.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks it is mainly the lot coverage that has to be divided, the rest of the stuff that is already there is just going to be carried over anyway because it is goes with the land, the existing covenants.

Mr. Averill said he was on site last week and he measured it and it appears that everything is good.

Mr. Lamanna said that is the only thing we would need is another covenant on this so that the buyer of the property clearly understands and he thinks there is a model for that in the existing covenants that can be used so we would like that so when you are preparing the deed to submit that to the township so we can review it and make sure that it meets the standards. He said he thinks if you look there should be some similar language you can track onto from when this was divided out in the first place and if not he is sure we can find some for you to use as a model. He asked if there is anybody else here on this application and are there any other questions or issues.

Mr. Lewis said it is interesting, he doesn't think he ever split a road before.

Mr. Lamanna said it has to deal with the splitting of the road.

Mr. Lewis said the next application is you guys.

Mr. Friedman said that is, he believes, is from the tenant directly on their side.

Mr. Lamanna said just so we are clear there is already some existing lot coverage that has been used up or will be used up.

Mr. Maynard said a portion of the road.

Mr. Lamanna said it is already baked into that lot so again we will make sure that that again is included as a covenant and deed that they know that this already is in there unless, he supposes in the future it is always possible that the owner of the other parcel could release that or reconfigure or do something different.

Mr. Friedman said if they were to redevelop he believes they would have to come before you.

Mr. Lamanna said right but it could be if somebody decides that we would figure out a better pattern for dealing with the traffic coming around and based on what happened.

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

Motion BZA 2022-13 – 7135 Aurora Road (Lot Split)

Mr. Lamanna moved to approve the lot split of Permanent Parcel Number 02-420752 into two lots as set forth on the Certificate of Survey by Bradley Dean Otten dated April 5, 2022, the lot and size to be as shown on there.

1. Parcel A

A variance from the required lot size of one acre to 36,129.21 sq. ft. for a variance of 7,430.79 sq. ft.

A variance from the required minimum lot width of 150' to 114.74' for a variance of 35.26'.

A variance from the required minimum road frontage of 150' to 114.74' for a variance of 35.26'.

2. Parcel B

A variance from the required lot size of one acre to 35,982.14 sq. ft. for a variance of 7,577.86 sq. ft.

A variance from the required minimum lot width of 150' to 112.68' for a variance of 37.32'.

A variance from the required minimum road frontage of 150' to 112.68' for a variance of 37.32'.

3. A variance with respect to Chapter 161.11(11) on setbacks for driveways from side and rear lot lines to allow a drive-thru aisle that crosses over and has a 0' setback into the other adjacent lot.

Motion BZA 2022-13 – 7135 Aurora Road (Lot Split)- Continued

4. The applicant will also include a covenant, the deed for the lot splits showing that and understanding that these two lots are subject to a limitation upon the total square footage of lot coverage and the actual allocation of that lot coverage to the lots and a notation that it is not subject to further increase.
5. The parties will also assure that they have appropriate cross access agreements and easement agreements necessary with respect to the bisected driveway. Those will be submitted to the Zoning Department for review of the provisions prior to the filing of the deeds.
6. The applicant will take all steps to assure that this was approved by the county planning commission and any actions taken with respect to the subdivision nature of this and any replatting of it will be completed in accordance with the planning commission requirements.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. This represents a typical development pattern of this shopping center area which has been a subdivision of two individual lots for the purposes of accommodating individual tenants and dividing up the costs with respect to those individual tenant properties without compromising the overall development plan that has been previously agreed to and applies to the property.
2. There have been provisions that have been included here in the requirements.
3. This will continue to be maintained and the character and nature of the center will not be altered and the intent of the zoning provisions will be maintained.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Barr, aye; Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Application 2022-14 by Gabriel Bartlett for property at 7135 Aurora Road

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of installing signage for the proposed new Starbucks. The property is located in the MUP District.

Mr. Gabriel Bartlett of Advanced Installation & Sign Service was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Gabriel Bartlett and he let the record reflect that Mr. Bartlett was duly sworn.

Mr. Lamanna said he is going to let our Zoning Inspector give us a synopsis of the issues here.

Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector testified that there are two signs and a canopy that are being proposed and they are all within the side and rear setbacks and there are no height or side issues. He said this is for the drive-thru.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there is an issue with total signage.

Mr. Averill said no, the other signs were approved, Ms. Endres issued all of those permits, the only ones are the drive-thru signs and the canopy.

Mr. Lamanna said this is just because of the location within the setback.

Mr. Averill said correct.

Mr. Bartlett testified that one of the issues with this specific one here so that bottom image is the actual one that is going there, the one up top is proposed, if you look at the top you know that it is five panels, it is three large panels that you won't see the construction of it, you take the faces of it off so that bottom image is a three panel that actually is going there not that top one. He said he does know that Ms. Endres talked about the issue with the clearance bar, with the location of where it was, he doesn't think she was aware that that drive-thru area, that is an exit only area, he thinks she may have thought it was pooling area.

Mr. Averill said she circled it on the site plan, he saw that.

Mr. Barr asked Mr. Averill to pull up the previous aerial that has the actual building under construction. He asked Mr. Averill if he knows when the board approved the variance for the three signs versus two signs.

Mr. Averill said no.

Mr. Barr asked was that pre lot split where he remembers being in the meeting when we had Starbucks and another sharing a building.

Mr. Averill said he could find out by going back and looking at the records.

Mr. Barr asked Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. Lewis said he is the sign vendor, he is not the property owner.

Mr. Lamanna asked where is the third sign.

Mr. Averill said the canopy is the third sign, the canopy is considered a sign.

Mr. Barr said the 60" circular sign, there is one on each side that would be the three primary signs he believes.

Mr. Bartlett said yes.

Mr. Barr said and the one is also on the canopy, correct.

Mr. Averill said correct so that would be the three.

Mr. Barr said he remembers there being a lengthy discussion on signage when we thought this was going to be a two-tenant building or three-tenant building when it was originally proposed before they tore down the Ruby Tuesday but he doesn't recall the discussion, if there was one where this was a single building.

Mr. Lamanna said the primary issue is this canopy. He said here is what the canopy looks like so the final ordering place is where the canopy is, the canopy sticks out over that.

Mr. Bartlett said if you refer to this up here, he referred to the site plan and said this is the clearance bar, this is your pre-menu, this is your order screen and the canopy and this is the actual pre-menu board.

Mr. Lamanna said so the idea is he can look ahead to that, as he is sitting at the ordering place he can still see the second board and the first board is for people driving up so that if he is waiting in line he can be looking.

Mr. Lewis said the purpose of the canopy is so that when you get up to order you put your window down, it is raining or snowing.

Mr. Bartlett said the canopy as well, the order screen is under it.

Mr. Lamanna said it is not exactly what he would call a massive structure.

Mr. DeWater said it is a face-to-face right.

Mr. Bartlett said yes and it protects the coffee.

Mr. Lamanna said that is a side of the restaurant there, it is a side of a building, the back end of the building. He said nobody is really looking at it.

Mr. Lewis said it is not very large.

Mr. Lamanna said it is a better system if you only have one then what happens is people spend longer trying to figure out what they are going to order and that is the last thing you want is to slow down the line, this way you have to be a little careful about being too specific on your requirements because you don't track with the technology sometimes and as long as we are keeping it down on the size basis.

Mr. DeWater said it is the same concept that is utilized at the McDonald's restaurant.

Mr. Barr said they are not advertising on that.

Mr. Lamanna said no.

Mr. Barr said if you are in the line you already know where you are at.

Mr. Lamanna said right.

Mr. Lewis said and if you don't they are going to ask you what you want.

Mr. Lamanna said the place where the rubber meets the road on these things is if you have a lot that abuts a residential district but this is interior of a shopping center facing the back of somebody else's building and not even interfering with the adjacent tenant here.

Mr. Averill said the height bar is considered informational.

Mr. Lamanna said okay.

Mr. Averill said the pre-menu, canopy and the menu board, the former variance was on the property for the whole building for three signs.

Mr. Lamanna said okay.

Mr. Barr said they put three signs on one building.

Mr. Averill said they put three signs on one building because they are allowed to and when they split the property technically that variance goes away because it runs with the land forever but the land is changing so now the variance is moot but those three signs are grandfathered so the variance will be no longer.

Mr. Barr said so you are saying the third sign would not be grandfathered.

Mr. Averill said the third sign was permitted when the property was one parcel.

Mr. Barr said but when you split it.

Mr. Averill said the variance goes away.

Mr. Soryal asked how that affects the new building in the new lot.

Mr. Averill said it will have to meet the current regs.

Mr. Lamanna said yes and no, when you talk about taking them back, actually we could take them back.

Mr. Averill said you could have taken them back with that last variance.

Mr. Lamanna said right if we had read this thing through, we could still take it back.

Mr. Barr said the minutes aren't approved.

Mr. Lamanna said we can say we now obtained additional information that we didn't have before. He said he doesn't have a problem with granting them the variance with respect to the three signs.

Mr. Averill said the three signs are not on the table right now because they didn't apply, the wall signs are not on the table.

Mr. Lamanna said so this has nothing to do with our discussion.

Mr. Averill said correct, he just brought it up.

Mr. Barr said he sees it at the bottom here, a maximum of two signs consisting of primary.

Mr. Averill said that is for the drive-thru correct.

Mr. Barr said okay.

Mr. Lamanna said so technically once they split the lot that is the end of the variance if they haven't actually put the signs up.

Mr. Averill said the signs are up so when they come in in three years with a logo change and new image and they want to put up three new signs they are going to have to come back in.

Mr. Bartlett said the third sign was granted to the previous restaurant, Starbucks wanted that fourth one so that one is actually the one that was going to go on the rear.

Mr. Lewis said it pretty much serves the local community and once you have been there once you know where to go, you don't have Geauga Lake or Sea World anymore so we are not getting a lot of tourist traffic.

Mr. Barr said for people like him, he knows where he is at, he just doesn't know what he is ordering, he doesn't need a sign to tell him where he is at, he can smell it.

Mr. Lewis said he doesn't have any questions on this.

Mr. Lamanna said the canopy itself is a separate structure that happens to have a sign on it.

Mr. Averill said yes.

Mr. Soryal said the drawing shows no sign on it. He asked if there is going to be a sign on the canopy.

Mr. Bartlett said no, there is a screen in the middle.

Mr. Lamanna said it is going to say here is what you've ordered.

Mr. Bartlett said it is sitting vertically in the canopy, the canopy is for the weather to protect the screen.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks she did count that as a sign. He said the canopy is an order station with digital signage.

Mr. Averill said the canopy has a built in television, built in screen.

Mr. Bartlett said it is split so, it is 55", it is sitting vertically then right in the middle there is a display area with a camera, the bottom half is where you are going to see.

Mr. Lamanna said the meal order is going to come up there.

Mr. Averill said that is the extra sign.

Mr. Lamanna said we are way under on the signage, they are way under the square footage here.

Mr. Bartlett explained the location of the signs.

Mr. Lamanna said he doesn't think anybody sees a problem with it, based on where this is located it is much less of an issue for us because it is in the middle of a shopping center, everything is in the back with the ideal location and like he said, sometimes the problem is the technology outruns the zoning ordinance and then we have to try to figure out is this really consistent with what the intent was.

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

Motion BZA 2022-14 – 7135 Aurora Road (Starbucks Signage)

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the following variances with respect to the directional signs and associated structures for this property.

1. With respect to the number of signs, the board will allow three signs, two of which are primary and secondary menu boards and the third is an order station that is placed where the order is actually displayed.
2. A variance for the pre-menu board to 20'11.25" from the side lot line versus 75' and 38'6.5" versus 75' from the rear lot line.
3. A variance for the menu board (primary sign) to 17.9' from the side lot line versus 75' and 57'+- versus 75' from the rear lot line, (within 1' +-).
4. A variance for the canopy 12'+- (1' +-) versus 20' from the side lot line and also the same will apply with respect to the signage on the canopy.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. The total of all of these signs is well under the maximum permitted.
2. Additionally there is a canopy on which one of these signs is mounted.
3. The canopy is there to protect the sign and shade the person making the order at that location from inclement weather. This sign is a small structure that does not adversely affect any of the adjacent property owners and they are primarily for weather protection.

Motion BZA 2022-14 – 7135 Aurora Road (Starbucks Signage) - Continued

4. With respect to the location of all of these items they do not meet the interior lot line requirements. These are interior lot lines on a shopping center that has been developed as a unitary item and these represent deviations from interior lot lines and in every case these signs and canopy are at the back end of the adjacent building thus will not adversely affect the use of that building.
5. Additionally there is a parking lot on the other side so no one will be adversely affected by the presence of these signs or the operation of the sign.
6. All of these variances, because of the fact that these are interior lot lines, do not adversely affect any of the adjacent commercial development.
7. In overall these variances are being approved because given the location these are reasonable signage that will be consistent with the purpose of efficient use of the drive-thru without creating undue stack-up.
8. It will also not adversely affect any of the neighboring properties or any of the traffic flow through the center.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Barr, aye; Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Application 2022-15 by Kevin Campopiano for property at 7558 Mystic Ridge

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of a pool patio extension. The property is located in a R-5A District.

Mr. Kevin Campopiano was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Kevin Campopiano and he let the record reflect that Mr. Campopiano was duly sworn.

Mr. Kevin Campopiano testified that he is looking for a variance to allow the current patio he has around the pool, the walkway around the pool. He said the pool contractor originally had submitted for a zoning permit which they had in place, the zoning permit that he submitted for was not in his purchased drawing, he reduced the size of the patio to get it pushed through in zoning and have Ms. Endres approve it and then we went to build it to his drawing that he thought and apparently it was not approved. He said with Covid there were not a lot of inspections going on at that time so he thinks it was inspected two months later after we actually built the project. He said it is 240 sq. ft. of concrete that is over the side setback adjacent to his neighbor, he has drawings and pictures that gives a gist of what is going on.

Mr. Lewis asked who messed up, the pool contractor and the set of prints that you gave us were approved.

Mr. Campopiano said yes.

Mr. Lewis asked where is he tonight.

Mr. Campopiano said he does not know.

Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector testified that we have been having a lot of problems with American Pools, they have new office staff and hopefully it will make a difference but we have not yet seen that.

Mr. Lewis said so the good news is the Canyon Woods HOA approved your requested revision so the HOA is okay with it.

Mr. Campopiano said correct.

Mr. Lewis said which relieves one potential conflict.

Mr. Campopiano said right.

Mr. Lamanna said the ultimate pie lot.

Mr. Lewis said it is symmetric.

Mr. Lamanna said it does make a little bit of a problem when you get to the back end of the lot with a 50' building line.

Mr. Lewis asked if Canyon is 15'.

Mr. Campopiano said 15', yes.

Mr. Lamanna said your corners are over.

Mr. Campopiano said the corners of the concrete.

Mr. Lamanna said that is a total of.

Mr. Campopiano said 240 sq. ft.

Mr. Lewis said there are only two options, HOA approved it so what are the options, saw cut them off or leave it as is and the HOA approved it and he has a ton of screening.

Mr. Soryal said there is nobody here complaining.

Mr. DeWater asked Mr. Averill if he received any complaints from any of the neighbors.

Mr. Averill said we have not, no, the neighbors all have pools or we are waiting for them to be put in.

Mr. Lamanna said it is less than 1%.

The board viewed the aerial of the subject property.

Mr. Campopiano said that is American Pools there and over there that is Highland at the top.

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

Motion BZA 2022-15 – 7558 Mystic Ridge

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variances for the purpose of maintaining uncovered swimming pool patio areas.

1. A variance to the minimum east side yard setback of 15' to 4' for a variance of 11'.
2. A variance to the minimum west side yard setback of 15' to 7'4" for a variance of 7'8".
3. A variance to the minimum rear yard setback of 50' to 46'5" for a variance of 3'7".

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. This is an as-built request due to an error in construction and an error in the plans submitted for approval.
2. The application has been approved by the Homeowner's Association.
3. The board notes that these are uncovered patios and the variances are limited to the patio being uncovered.
4. Because it is an uncovered patio it has minimum effects on the adjacent property owners and will not adversely affect the character of the neighborhood but if that area was to be covered this end conclusion would not necessarily be reached.

Mr. DeWater seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Barr, aye; Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Application 2022-18 by Jason Majewski for property at 18540 Geauga Lake Road

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

Mr. Jason Majewski was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Jason Majewski and he let the record reflect that Mr. Majewski was duly sworn.

Mr. Jason Majewski testified that he would love to construct a 36' x 48' pole barn building that will be in accordance to the 15' setback off the side of the property approximately 50' past the end of the driveway, pretty much the start of it where two large trees in the bare area would be the front garage area. He said this is for primarily storage and parking for vehicles, his and then children's in the future.

Mr. DeWater said there is no business out of it.

Mr. Majewski said no business whatsoever.

Mr. Barr asked what is the other building off there to the right.

Mr. Majewski said that is an elevated tree house for kids, it came with the property when we purchased it in 2015.

Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector testified that those structures did not have permits and we cleaned all of that up last week.

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. Averill to zoom out on this property. He asked what the adjacent property is over there that looks rather large.

Mr. Majewski said it is his neighbor of 10 acres and their house is toward the south end of that.

Mr. Lamanna said they are nowhere near you.

Mr. Majewski said the driveway will extend parallel to where the corner of the driveway currently ends, straight back, he will probably allow a little bit of taper to get to the center of the garage but it will all be based off of the 15'.

Mr. Lamanna asked what is the lot size.

Mr. Lewis said 2.8 acres.

Mr. Soryal said the garage door will be facing the street.

Mr. Majewski said correct, there will be one garage door facing the street and then there is a secondary small one for yard equipment towards the back and not come through where the vehicles will be parked.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the lot coverage is okay on this.

Mr. Barr asked if the siding will match the house.

Mr. Majewski said roof color as well as siding.

Mr. Lamanna asked if anybody had any issues.

The board responded no.

Mr. Barr asked if there is anyone else who wants to speak on this.

There was no response.

Mr. DeWater said he needs a sediment control plan.

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

Motion BZA 2022-18 – 18540 Geauga Lake Road

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variances for the purposes of constructing a 1,728 sq. ft. accessory building, 16'7" high as follows:

1. A variance to the maximum height from 15' to 16'7" for a variance of 1'5".
2. A variance to the maximum accessory size of 300 sq. ft. to 1,728 sq. ft. for a variance of 1,428 sq. ft. with a driveway extension necessary to get to the building and still be within the required lot coverage limitations.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. This is a 2.88 acre lot so the accessory structure is not an unusual size for the lot or with respect to other similar structures in the neighborhood.
2. The closest neighbor on the side where this building will be is far, far away on a very large lot from this property so it will not be affected.
3. In general there will be no adverse effect on any other neighbor or any adverse effect upon the character of the neighborhood.
4. The board does note that the applicant must require a sediment control plan prior to the issuing of the zoning certificate.
5. The applicant is going to match the house exterior siding and roofing.
6. The applicant will not be using this accessory building for any business not otherwise permitted and properly certificated by zoning.

Mr. DeWater seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. Barr, aye; Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Since there was no further testimony, the public hearing was closed at 9:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Brent Barr, Alternate
Ted DeWater
Joseph Gutoskey
Michael Lamanna, Chairman
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman
Lori O'Neill, Alternate
Emeil Soryal

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

Date: May 19, 2022

AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE

Bainbridge Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
April 21, 2022

The regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 9:10 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Brent Barr, Alternate; Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Todd Lewis; Ms. Lori O'Neill, Alternate and Mr. Emeil Soryal. Mr. Steven Averill, Assistant Zoning Inspector was present.

Secretary's Note: The minutes for March 17, 2022 were approved at the beginning of the public hearing.

Ms. Lori O'Neill, Alternate met with the board to discuss her concerns and the procedures of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

APPLICATIONS FOR NEXT MONTH

Application 2022-19 by Church of the Holy Angels for property at 18205 Chillicothe Road

The applicant is requesting a review and renewal of an existing conditional use permit. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Application 2022-20 by Constance Hecker for property at 16615 Wren Road and 8300 – 8326 East Washington Street

The applicant is requesting a review and renewal of an existing conditional use permit. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2022-21 by CF Golf Dome LLC for property at 8198 Washington Street

The applicant is requesting a transfer of a conditional use permit to a new owner. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2022-22 by Rod Ramsey for property at 8654 Taylor May Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing ground mounted solar panels. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Application 2022-23 by Justin Henry for property at 17896 Kingswood Drive

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing a deck. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Application 2022-24 by Tim McCaskey for Stephen and Cynthia Charles for property at 17310 Wood Acre Trail

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing a pool, patios and hardscaping. 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 May 19, 2022 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 9:58 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Brent Barr, Alternate
Ted DeWater
Joseph Gutoskey
Michael Lamanna, Chairman
Todd Lewis, Vice Chairman
Lori O'Neill, Alternate
Emeil Soryal

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

Date: May 19, 2022