

Bainbridge Township, Ohio  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
August 18, 2022

Pursuant to notice by publication and ordinary mail, the public hearing was called to order at 7:05 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis and Mr. Emeil Soryal. Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector was present.

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.

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

Application 2022-33 by Bogart L. McBride for property at 7823 S. Riverside Drive

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. Bogart McBride was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Bogart McBride and he let the record reflect that Mr. McBride was duly sworn.

Mr. McBride testified that he is looking to build a two-car garage which is 24' x 24', a pretty standard size for a garage and the main variance is the size and then they were also proposing that it was 16' from their existing attached garage and main building versus the 20' because they really didn't want it to be that much further if possible just because they would have to bring in more fill because where they are proposing it to be built is pretty much already level with the house, there is already an asphalt pad there that covers the majority of that area.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. McBride if that is basically a continuation of his driveway so he can pull straight into it.

Mr. McBride referred to the displayed aerial and said it is going to be right here.

Mr. Gutoskey said so the front of the garage is going to line up with the back of the house.

Mr. McBride said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey said and it is going to be more or less on your pad.

Mr. McBride said yes. He said it will go back a couple of feet, two or three feet and then over to the right two or three feet so obviously he is very far from the property line of his neighbor.

Mr. Gutoskey said no problem here, it is a standard two-car garage. He said we ran into this too with that Lost Trail shed if you remember, the 10' versus 20'. He said if it was a conforming lot it would have been 10' right.

Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector testified by saying right.

Mr. Lewis asked what is going to happen with the water, are there gutters and downspouts.

Mr. McBride said yes.

Mr. Lewis asked are you emptying those on your property or tying them in somewhere or running them to the front ditch.

Mr. McBride said behind and to the side of this there is actually a slope going down and about 30' back there is a little stream, a riparian so he assumes rainwater could drain from the gutters there.

Mr. Gutoskey said it will drain to a stream that is on your property.

Mr. McBride said yes.

Mr. Lewis said he was looking at the dimensional footprint of the foundation.

Mr. McBride said okay.

Mr. Lewis said but when we are talking about the setback we are looking at the overall structure so your soffit hangs out another foot.

Mr. McBride said okay.

Mr. Lewis said and you've got three or four inches for your gutters so when you are looking at the placement of this 16' would be from that point down, not your foundation footer.

Mr. McBride said we can do that.

Mr. Gutoskey said make it 15' and it would take care of the overhang.

Mr. Lewis said that is what he was thinking.

Mr. McBride said okay, whatever makes more sense.

Mr. Lewis said that way when you build it you get your measurements.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if there is anybody in the audience interested in this application.

Mr. McBride said on the appeal form it did ask, something like, would it fit in with the community or the character, there are at least four other houses on the street with garages of this size or in most cases larger.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is a standard garage size wise.

Mr. DeWater asked if the siding and roofing are going to match the house.

Mr. McBride said exactly. He said they just put a new roof on the house the end of last year shortly after they bought it so it will match that same architectural shingles and then the color will match the siding.

Mr. Soryal said you are not doing a breezeway or attaching it to the house in any way.

Mr. McBride said no.

Mr. Soryal said and the man-door is in the front, not on the side.

Mr. McBride said yes.

Mr. Soryal asked doesn't that put your cars, garage doors out of the driveway more.

Mr. McBride said it does, they were most likely going to only use one parking spot within and the rest will be storage for other things.

Mr. Gutoskey referred to the displayed aerial and said it shows the riparian and the other thing he is fighting with is the riparian setback.

Mr. Lewis said yes, he can't encroach that and we are good on the height, it is 14-1/2' so there are no issues on the height. He said we have sides and setback from the house.

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

Motion BZA 2022-33 – 7823 S. Riverside Drive

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variances for the purposes of constructing a 24' x 24' accessory building.

1. A variance for 576 sq. ft. versus the allowed 300 sq. ft. building on a non-conforming lot for a variance of 276 sq. ft.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. The size of the building is not unreasonable for the actual size of the lot being 1.73 acres.
2. It is not inconsistent with the neighborhood and will not adversely affect the neighboring properties.
3. For the requirement for 15' between the accessory building and the main building, the board grants a variance of 5' from the required 20' on the basis that if this was a conforming lot the requirement would only be 10' so there is no apparent reason that this 15' would conflict with the intent of the zoning law or otherwise adversely affect any neighboring properties or be inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood as well.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion

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

Application 2022-34 by Church of the Holy Angels for property at 18205 Chillicothe Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing a changeable copy/digital ground sign. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Mr. Lamanna recused himself from this application.

Mr. Lewis, Vice Chair assumed the duties of Chair for this application.

Ms. Kathy Clarke, representative of the sign company; Fr. Max Cole, of the Church of the Holy Angels and Mr. Len Scarl were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lewis swore in Ms. Kathy Clarke and he let the record reflect that Ms. Clarke was duly sworn.

Ms. Kathy Clarke testified that basically they will be replacing the current sign that is there with a double-sided digital reader board. She said each side of the reader board has 12” panels so the overall size of the digital size is 42 x 47 so she believes the actual sign is in conformity of the ordinance but the digital copy is above the ordinance so they are requesting an additional 5% to encase the whole digital board.

Mr. Gutoskey said this is going to be more like separate screens versus pixels.

Ms. Clarke said actually they are panels so it is one screen, they just go together.

Mr. Gutoskey said here is where he thinks we have a problem with the code. He asked if these panels are pretty much standard dimensions.

Ms. Clarke said yes, 12 x 12. She said this is the newer version of the ELC board, before you just got a big giant one, so each one is 12 x 12 x 12 x 12.

Mr. Soryal asked what is the advantage of that.

Mr. Gutoskey said you don't have to replace the whole screen if one goes bad, you replace pieces and parts. He asked if this is something new.

Ms. Clarke said it has been out a while, yes.

Mr. Gutoskey said he was wondering because of the square foot of the size and because the way the panels are designed the percentages don't work.

Mr. Lewis said the different modules are pre-sized.

Ms. Clarke said they are seamless, you don't see the individual panels so if the sign is turned off it will just look like one flat panel.

Mr. Gutoskey said he was looking at the one picture that Mr. Averill just had up there, so that is kind of like the panel layout there.

Ms. Clarke said yes.

Mr. Lewis asked where does the Holy Angels name appear.

Ms. Clarke said it would be in the digital print.

Mr. Lewis said you would be putting it within there because the pedestal really doesn't say too much and if it is going to be your primary sign, is Holy Angels something that you were intending to display reasonably, prominently at least a fair amount of the time.

Mr. Lewis swore in Mr. Len Scarl and he let the record reflect that Mr. Scarl was duly sworn.

Mr. Scarl testified that they started this project about eight months ago or so and they have been going back and forth and they are basically trying to take the marble sign out that is there and move it up the hill in front of the angels and then replace it with a message board because they have had issues, they get banner signs and they put them up there, these big 4 x 8's to advertise what they want to do and when they want to do it, they have a lot of events and they get in trouble with the police department because they are too close to the road and he thinks they caused an accident once last year or something. He said it was a take-down sign, not one like this so the problem was to be able to have this message board there to be able to broadcast what they would like and then they are supposed to have a banner across the top that reads Holy Angels, it is part of the digital part.

Mr. Gutoskey said those 4 x 8 signs will be eliminated by having this digital sign.

Mr. Scarl said he thinks if you can see up here he does have it up there already, Holy Angels so that is going to replace the marble one that says Holy Angels.

Mr. Lewis said it certainly gets rid of the ground clutter of temporary signs.

Mr. Scarl said yes.

Mr. Lewis said it is hard to necessarily get your messaging across plus you have a lot of events and you are constantly changing things, this allows you to digitally change it, declutter your entrance and work within the setbacks from Rt. 306.

Mr. Scarl said absolutely.

Mr. Soryal asked if there is any concern about glare from these panels and/or the colors or the light being shiny with traffic at nighttime or anything else.

Ms. Clarke said no there is an automatic dimmer, that reflects on the specs because there are different brands but usually there is an automatic dimmer and you can program it, she is not sure they are going to have it on 24/7.

Mr. Scarl said no, they agreed to shut it off at the time it needs to be shut off.

Mr. Soryal asked all of it.

Mr. Scarl said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if there is a limit to what time.

Mr. Lewis said he didn't think there is anything.

Mr. Gutoskey said the school had the sign up there on Snyder that is in a residentially zoned area.

Mr. Steve Averill, Zoning Inspector testified that schools are conditional uses and can have certain conditions.

Ms. Clarke said even during programming she thinks it says every three minutes you can change the copy, it is not going to take up the entire screen the entire time she doesn't think, there will be different messages.

Mr. Lewis said our section 173.11 (c)(2) has the guidelines so if you don't have a copy of it that would probably be a good thing to work out so that also whoever your computer admin is when they are doing it they can get the delays, no scrolling images and of course if you are uncertain stop in with our zoning department.

Mr. Averill said there is a section on the permit for notes and he will copy that on there.

Mr. Lewis asked if there is anybody else who would like to comment on this application.

Mr. Gutoskey asked for the sign that is there now, where is that going.

Mr. Scarl said they have a couple of sites, there is a statue with a bunch of angels up front as you drive in, it may go there, they are going to decide that when they move it. He said there is marble granite on there that has Holy Angels on it, it is a 2 x 5 sign he thinks it is, they are not going to throw it away honestly.

Mr. Averill said he thinks he talked to Ms. Endres about that for what is allowable they were leaning towards the fact that it is decorative.

Mr. Gutoskey said that is what he was going to say, it is decorative.

Mr. Averill said it can be incorporated into the landscaping.

Mr. Gutoskey said put it in front of where you walk up to the church.

Mr. Scarl said yes, as far as the church we are not going to throw it away, definitely not.

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

Motion BZA 2022-34 – 18205 Chillicothe Road – Church of the Holy Angels

Mr. Lewis moved to grant the applicant the following variance.

1. A variance for the increase of digital signage coverage moving it from 75% to 80% with a 5% maximum increase.
2. The board notes that the church's intent is to move the existing granite sign up to another location on their campus in an ornamental capacity.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. The location of the sign and the amount of available frontage on Rt. 306 is fairly substantial so the board is not worried or concerned about brightness or digital bleed off onto adjacent properties because there is a ton of frontage there.
2. One of the benefits of this is this will now take away the need for ground clutter of temporary signs where the applicant can still get their messaging out to their membership and those that would like to stop by.
3. The applicant will follow and comply with the guidelines on digital signage under Section 173.11 (c)(2) in the Bainbridge Township Zoning Resolution.

Mr. DeWater seconded the motion.

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

Mr. Lamanna returned to the meeting.

Application 2022-35 by Michael, Monica and Hannah Krasowski for property at PP# 02-419779, Lot 7, Tract 3 Kingsley Drive

The applicants are requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing a new single family dwelling. The property is located in a R-5A District.

Mr. Michael Krasowski, Mrs. Monica Krasowski and Ms. Hannah Krasowski were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Michael Krasowski and he let the record reflect that Mr. Krasowski was duly sworn.

Mr. Michael Krasowski testified that they are requesting side and front yard setback variances. He referred to the displayed aerial and said you can see it has a rather odd shape and the riparian area moves in this direction so they would rather much keep it to the east side. He said to the east side, northern most you will see the length and you will see the contours up there, they talked to two builders, a soil scientist and two septic installers that that is the optimal place to put a mound system for the continuous length necessary for a three bedroom house. He said it does not exist anywhere over here so proceeding with that you can see there is a primary and secondary and how much of the back is taken up and you can see the contour lines are perfect. He said here as you can see is a knoll and that knoll heavily drops off so to put a house in.

Mr. Gutoskey said you don't have enough length there on the contours to put the septic where you are putting the house.

Mr. Krasowski said that is exactly right and given the fact that it certainly can't go this way and if it were to go this way well then.

Mr. Gutoskey said they have to parallel the contours.

Mr. Krasowski said and the contours are this way here so we also checked with Geauga Soil and Water Conservation and they suggest that the gentle slope here is consistent with what they want and so this sort of shows up as the most optimal place to put the house however if we put the house this way we end up falling into the ravine so that creates then a 32-1/2' setback from our property adjacent at 45 rather than 50 and also not being able to go this way it is 90.2 rather than 100. He said what is interesting here too is you see the contours, this house and our house, it is not as if we are encroaching visually or otherwise on our other property because it is separated by that gorge, that ravine so aesthetically it doesn't mar anything and to be sure putting the house here allows us to keep the trees, if you go down Kingsley Drive we are the only two five acre lots on the street at the end, it is all woods, it has always been there. He said when we put our house in here we did our best to try to leave the tree line up for our one neighbor so they wouldn't have to look at our house and from over the years left some trees up and we would like to do the same thing for Rick, he moved there with his sons and it is beautiful here, it is like having a park next door so putting the house here, putting the septic there, if you look down the street everything is about the same, we don't really visually mar anything and as we look at our street where the lots are three acres or less, mostly the driveways seem to be about 7' or 8' long, so this seems to be our best solution to all of our problems.

Mr. Gutoskey said he has a zoning inspector question. He asked if they are allowed to put the septic in a riparian, no right.

Mr. Averill said no.

Mr. Gutoskey said so he thinks they are going to have to have their septic guy just move their fields over.

Mr. Krasowski said east.

Mr. Gutoskey showed Mr. Krasowski on the site plan and said see the replacement area, it goes into the riparian here.

Mr. Krasowski said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey said you need to move the septic to the east.

Mr. Krasowski said he agrees.

Mr. Gutoskey said because when you build these you have to build them from the uphill side and you always want to build the higher one first so that you are not disturbing the ground below it if you have to have it replaced because the ground below is what treats the sewage so you want to keep this undisturbed below so you are always building from the top.

Mr. Krasowski said okay.

Mr. Lewis said all you've got to do is shift the primary so that the replacement doesn't have to tap into the riparian and it is easy to do.

Mr. Krasowski said you can see too now if that were the case and they do have to move it up that also precludes putting the house over here.

The board discussed the proposed location of the septic system.

Mr. Krasowski said they tried to get the smallest footprint possible, that in itself was a compromise, the smallest footprint possible.

Mr. Lewis said you are kind of sitting on a knoll there and you don't have a lot of building footprint to drop it into.

Mr. Krasowski said that is correct sir.

Mr. Lewis said so you sized the house to fit there.

Mr. Krasowski said it was a compromise, they would have liked to have done otherwise but you can't be ridiculous.

Mr. Gutoskey said and the lot coverage is only 1%.

Mr. Krasowski asked if that is good, he doesn't know.

Mr. Lamanna said otherwise you would have had a 200' driveway.

Mr. Krasowski said it is a practicality because everything shifts and we lose the septic.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is the smartest way to do it.

Mr. Lewis said it is a really good layout.

Mr. Krasowski said they have been working on this plan for 30 years, it took them 30 years to get started, when they first moved here, they always wanted to do something. He said we bought these two lots because we had twins and so it is like they are going to set up an empire. He said the way they looked at it was when we die then they can duke it out, with these two properties, they can work it out.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if there is anybody in the audience interested in this.

Mr. Dave Sinkovic of 9189 Kingsley Drive swore to tell the truth, the whole truth and testified that he is their neighbor and he is in support of this variance.

Mr. Lewis said so you are good with this.

Mr. Sinkovic replied yes.

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

Motion BZA 2022-35 – PP# 02-419779, Lot 7, Tract 3 Kingsley Drive

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variances for the purposes of constructing a house in accordance with the plans that have been submitted by the applicant.

1. A variance to the minimum front yard setback from 100' to 90.2' for a variance of 9.8'.
2. A variance to the minimum side yard setback on the south side from 50' to 32.5' for a variance of 17.5'.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. A practical difficulty exists due to the topography on this property.
2. The septic fields have to be located in a certain area near the north front side of the property which then limits the location of the house.
3. There is also a knoll in that area where the house goes so by putting the house on the knoll then you avoid the rapid drop off of the property to the south side and west side.
4. There is also a riparian on both sides of the knoll north and south so the location of the house is pretty much physically constrained to the area where it is.
5. The size of the house is certainly probably even modest for the overall size of the lot and it would not be reasonable to shrink the house any further.

Motion BZA 2022-35 – PP# 02-419779, Lot 7, Tract 3 Kingsley Drive - Continued

6. Furthermore this location will not be inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood nor will it adversely affect the property neighboring to it.

Mr. Gutoskey seconded the motion.

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

Application 2022-36 by Pearce Properties LLC for Brian and Tara Long for property at 17142 Sunset Drive

The applicant is requesting area variances for the purpose of constructing a front porch addition and patio. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Mr. Charles Pearce and Mr. Brian Long, property owner were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Charles Pearce and Mr. Brian Long and he let the record reflect that Mr. Pearce and Mr. Long were duly sworn.

Mr. Lewis said they are adding to the existing and they have a patio off to the side.

Mr. Pearce and Mr. Long testified by saying yes.

Mr. Lewis said their proposed is reducing that patio area and putting on a front porch but it is interesting also that it actually reduces their lot coverage from 44.80% to 44.40% and Lake Lucerne ARB has approved it.

Mr. Gutoskey said so basically the deck that sticks out is going to be brought back.

Mr. Pearce said the deck was technically illegal and encroaching into the side setback so we are trying to fix that side setback and do the patio. He said the overhang is more of a structure.

Mr. Gutoskey said so there is just the shed roof over it.

Mr. Pearce said the dormer project is already going on with the remodel.

Mr. Gutoskey said so you are going to put a porch on and that is going to be the look with the stone columns.

Mr. Pearce said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey said and this will be a new pad for the back patio.

Mr. Pearce said correct, it was an existing deck that was pretty dilapidated.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if the deck was just right at grade.

Mr. Pearce said pretty much, one step up maybe.

Mr. Gutoskey said you superimposed this on a picture of the house.

Mr. Pearce said there is actually no overhang on the patio portion, it is just a slab, the deck is coming off and we are just moving it back, the front porch is the only area where there is a structure if you would.

Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector testified that they have a shed that was on the property, they are eliminating that, they are going to be reducing their lot coverage but they want to come back in and they brought this to our attention after this whole thing came about to get another shed. He asked if the shed is 10' x 20'.

Mr. Pearce said 10' x 12' which will be 120 sq. ft.

Mr. Averill said if they came in and the board approved it, he doesn't know if the board wants to address that now because they are going to be coming in for a 120 sq. ft. shed and they are reducing their lot coverage now.

Mr. Lewis said he is not comfortable about doing that at this point because the Lake Lucerne ARB hasn't seen or approved that structure yet, it is not on their sign off.

Mr. Pearce said it is still under their review.

Mr. Lewis said he is thinking let's kind of continue through the process.

Mr. Pearce said okay.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks we have a notice issue on whether that would be properly noticed because people might be more interested in that particular item.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Mr. Averill if this 4,440 sq. ft. lot coverage is reduced from what it was because they are taking off that part of the deck.

Mr. Averill said right.

Mr. Lewis said and they are going to dump the existing shed so they are picking up 40 there.

Mr. Averill said he knows sometimes the board makes variables for lot coverage just because it isn't always exact and that is kind of what we are getting at because they are going to be taking the shed out so it really wasn't just the shed.

Mr. Gutoskey said it would have been nice to know what the lot coverage is now with the existing shed.

Mr. Averill said it is 49 sq. ft. more.

Mr. Lewis said you are adding the patio, you are dumping the shed but you are adding a front porch so it is pretty close to a wash on that.

Mr. Averill said that square footage for that extra is just a variable.

Mr. Gutoskey said that would be a 70 sq. ft. increase from what they are now.

Mr. Averill said it will be 120 sq. ft.

Mr. Gutoskey said he is looking at the existing though, it is 4,480 so they would only really be adding a little more and that would have to be a future application.

Mr. Lewis asked if anybody has anything about adding the front porch.

Mr. Gutoskey said no and as far as drainage, is the drainage going to go to the existing.

Mr. Pearce said yes back into what is there.

Mr. Lewis said they are going from 75' to 41'.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is 51' now and then they are coming out 10' with the porch, that is an open porch too.

Mr. Lewis said so the code is 75', they are going to be at 41'.

Mr. Lamanna said right, they used to be at 51'.

Mr. Gutoskey said and the house is already at 11.4' and we see this in Lake Lucerne all of the time.

Mr. Lewis asked if Lake Lucerne is good with a metal roof.

Mr. Pearce said yes, we already have that on the dormers so that will tie in down below.

Mr. Brian Long said that eventually when we need a new roof on the entire house it will probably be metal.

Mr. Lewis said we are starting to see more and more of that as its popularity is growing and a lot of the homeowner associations are trying to figure out how to address metal roofs in their guidance packages.

Mr. Pearce said he can see people getting some crazy colors that are red roofs that are a little more loud than just your standard black.

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

#### Motion BZA 2022-36 – 17142 Sunset Drive

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variances for the purposes of constructing a new front porch and replacing an existing deck with a patio on the side of the house.

1. A variance from the minimum front yard from 75' to 41.1' for a variance of 33.9'.
2. A variance to the south side yard setback from 20' to 11.4' for a variance of 8.6'.
3. A variance to the lot coverage to 4,600 sq. ft. versus 4,000 sq. ft. for a variance of 600 sq. ft.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. A practical difficulty exists with respect to the side yard setback.
2. With respect to the existing house and patio, actually the patio encroached even closer than the 11.4'. The 11.4' represents the side of the house which has been existing.
3. The patio now runs contiguous with that so there is no increase in that.
4. With respect to the front setback, the current front setback is 51' so the only way that you could possibly add a porch onto the house would be to get closer to the road.
5. With respect to the lot coverage this is a small increase from that permitted and it also is a very small increase from what actually exists at the moment which some of the aspects of the changes being made including the decrease of the patio will offset some of the increase.
6. These changes have been approved by the local architectural review board of Lake Lucerne so they have looked at the issues of whether this conforms to the character of the neighborhood and have ruled accordingly on that and we also accept that these changes will not affect the character of the neighborhood and also they are consistent with many of the existing setbacks in Lake Lucerne and the changes would not adversely affect the adjacent property owners.

Mr. DeWater seconded the motion.

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

Since there was no further testimony, the public hearing was closed at 8:00 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: September 15, 2022

AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE

Bainbridge Township, Ohio  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
August 18, 2022

The regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 8:00 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joe Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis and Mr. Emeil Soryal. Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector was present.

Motion BZA 2022-23 – 17896 Kingswood Drive

The Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was in agreement to confirm the setback of 20' for the proposed deck.

MINUTES

Mr. Gutoskey moved to adopt the minutes of the July 21, 2022 meeting as written.

Mr. DeWater seconded the motion.

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

APPLICATIONS FOR NEXT MONTH

Application 2022-37 by Premier Custom Homes/Brad Camposo for Joel and Jenelle Wolfe for property at 17960 Geauga Lake Road

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

Application 2022-38 by Dominic M. and Emily M. DePompei for property at 17230 Corban Drive

The applicants are requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing an accessory building with drive. The property is located in a R-5A District.

Application 2022-39 by Tim Scarl for property at 7025 Cedar Street

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

The Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals set a public hearing on the above applications for September 15, 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 8:55 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: September 15, 2022