

Bainbridge Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
October 20, 2022

Pursuant to notice by publication and ordinary mail, the public hearing was called to order at 7:00 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis and Mr. Emeil Soryal. Ms. Karen Endres, 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 Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector and he let the record reflect that Ms. Endres was duly sworn.

Application 2022-40 by Brian Wheatall for property at 17073 Snyder Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing an addition to an existing accessory building. The property is located in a R-5A District.

Mr. Brian Wheatall, property owner, was present to represent this application.

Mr. Wheatall stated that he has an existing 24' x 32' pole barn on the property and he is a hobby mechanic and would like to add some more space to the building as he is running out of room and he is proposing to add another 24' x 32' enclosed addition with a covered 8' overhang on the back as an outdoor workspace. He said he feels that it is within the character of the neighborhood, it is only visible to their house, they are surrounded by woods on all four sides and they are requesting a variance to the 900 sq. ft. limitation for an accessory building, it is the only accessory building they have on their property.

Mr. Lamanna said we have here a five acre lot.

Mr. DeWater asked Mr. Wheatall as a hobby mechanic if he is working on his own vehicles, no customers' cars.

Mr. Wheatall said that is correct.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Wheatall if he has a survey.

Mr. Wheatall said no.

Mr. Lewis said okay so we have no way to validate the actual real location of the existing structure, not without a survey.

Mr. Wheatall said he measured it, there is an existing pin there and then they also validated it on the original zoning permit for when the building was initially constructed, the measurement that he had matched that one, 50' from the front corner closest to the property line to that pin.

Mr. Soryal said in the drawing you have a covered area 8' x 32', he is thinking it is 8' x 24'.

Mr. Wheatall said 8' x 24' that is correct.

Mr. Soryal asked if the addition is open to the garage or is there a gap between them or is it just completely separate.

Mr. Wheatall said the intention is to connect them with a barn door in between.

Mr. Soryal said and then you have an addition to the driveway going to the site.

Mr. Wheatall said there is already gravel on the side of that building so it will leverage the existing gravel space that is there.

Mr. Soryal asked if he will have to add more to it to make a turn if you are going from the side.

Mr. Wheatall said maybe a few more feet.

Mr. Soryal said it looks like you won't have enough space to make a turn, you would need 30' or something.

Mr. Wheatall said not that much, the garage door of the addition is going to be 4' after the end of the existing building and that is the only door into that addition so it would just go back another 10' or so.

Mr. Soryal said from that door out you need to go quite a bit if you are making a turn to get into the garage, no. He asked how wide the gravel driveway is.

Mr. Wheatall said it may be 10' or so.

Mr. Soryal referred to the aerial and asked if that is a vehicle there.

Mr. Wheatall said it is a boat.

Mr. Lewis asked what is that.

Mr. Wheatall said a trailer.

Mr. Soryal said a trailer for the boat.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Wheatall if he has any specs or renderings on his proposed addition and asked what the roof pitch is.

Mr. Wheatall said he doesn't know.

Mr. Lewis asked what he is doing for gutters and downspouts and water run-off, where is that going and how are you directing it.

Mr. Wheatall said the plan is to tie into the existing gutters and downspouts.

Mr. Lewis asked where those go, do those just empty out at the bottom of the building or are you sending them to the ditch in the front, what happens to the water.

Mr. Wheatall said he doesn't know where they run to, there are a number of downspouts exits towards the front of the property, towards Snyder Road, he assumes the building is using one of those.

Mr. Lewis asked if they are tied in underground or are they dispersed.

Mr. Wheatall said he didn't build that building so he is not sure.

Mr. Soryal asked Mr. Wheatall if he knows where his septic is on the property.

Mr. Wheatall said yes he does.

Mr. Soryal said so you are not interfering with that.

Mr. Wheatall said no.

Mr. Soryal asked how old the house is.

Mr. Wheatall said the house was built in 1994 and the existing building was built in 2001.

Mr. Soryal said this is the same situation as last time when we don't know where the alternate septic location is.

Mr. Lewis said we don't have a survey, we are missing a lot of information here.

Mr. Gutoskey said we don't know if the current building is the proper setback off the property line. He said granted there is some wiggle room in these photos but.

Mr. Wheatall said the neighboring property was surveyed last year.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Mr. Wheatall if they located his garage when they did it.

Mr. Wheatall said there are just markers going up the middle of the tree line indicating the property line so he was able to measure from one of those points and they match the original application for the building.

Mr. Lamanna asked for the accessory building or the house.

Mr. Wheatall said the accessory building.

Mr. Lamanna asked where the actual property line is.

Mr. Wheatall said the actual property line is in the middle of this tree line here (he referred to the displayed aerial).

Mr. Lamanna said oh, it is way over there.

Mr. Wheatall said yes.

Mr. Lamanna said wow.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Ms. Endres if there is a drawing on file for that.

Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector testified by saying yes, the original.

Mr. Gutoskey said remember we had that house on Kenston Lake Drive.

Mr. Wheatall said there are multiple sets of pins on that line not just from the most recent survey but from the other and they are consistent.

Ms. Endres said this is the site plan that was approved for the first accessory building.

Mr. Gutoskey said and then we are hoping that we build it like that.

Ms. Endres said and here is the zoning inspector's inspection form that is relevant to that so it appears that it was inspected when it was built.

Mr. Gutoskey said but if you look at this though it shows that the garage on the house is 50' according to this drawing so if the existing garage is at 50' then that building isn't at 50'. He showed Mr. Lamanna and said he has got 50' to that garage and then he has got 50' to the shed but the garage there is at 60' but if you look at the photo and this was prepared by a PE. He said he is saying from the garage on the house to the property line.

Ms. Endres asked to the property line.

Mr. Gutoskey said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey asked 50'.

Ms. Endres said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey said because that drawing says 60'.

Ms. Endres said the lot line might not be right though.

Mr. Wheatall said that blue line cutting through the driveway is definitely not where the lines are.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there is a way to tell.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Ms. Endres if this is the current GIS.

Ms. Endres said this is Pictometry.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Ms. Endres if she can go to the Geauga County GIS.

Ms. Endres said she thinks they use the same overlays.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Mr. Wheatall if he has the mortgage ID survey from when he bought the house.

Mr. Wheatall said no.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if the title company gave him anything.

Mr. Wheatall said just a plat map.

Mr. Gutoskey asked with the house on it.

Mr. Wheatall said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey said that should have the dimensions on it, the mortgage ID survey will have dimensions from the property line to the house.

Mr. Wheatall said it did not have that dimension, it just had the dimensions of each border.

Mr. Gutoskey said but no house or anything on it, normally when you buy a house and go through a bank they do a mortgage ID survey.

Mr. Wheatall said he doesn't recall getting that.

Mr. Lamanna said it is also possible somebody when they created this thing made a big mistake reading off the deed or something and made it a lot smaller or narrower than it really is.

Mr. Gutoskey said when the lots are drawn up usually the problem is it is oriented on the photos because he uses that a lot and there are certain subdivisions where they are off but typically they are pretty close. He asked if there was in the file a plan for when the house was originally built.

Ms. Endres said that is the same one you have, they added to the house plans.

Mr. Gutoskey said if the house was built at 60' then the shed was built too close.

Ms. Endres said it looks like it was built, the subset on here says it is 232' to the driveway and the front setback looks like it measures right.

Mr. Lamanna said you have the house 60' off on this map, from the garage.

Mr. Gutoskey said from the original house it shows 60'.

Mr. Lamanna said there is obviously a discrepancy because if you look at the picture.

Mr. Gutoskey said it shows the septic is actually in the front.

Mr. Wheatall said the front right side.

Mr. Lamanna asked Mr. Wheatall if he had any photos with him to show the survey pins.

Mr. Wheatall said he did not.

Mr. Lamanna asked if he had the survey that the adjacent property owners did that would give us enough information to know where we are.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is not going to show where that is relevant. He said he doesn't know if it is something that the zoning inspector could go and verify but we have to rely on the applicant to give us the information we need.

Mr. Lamanna said if there is something there you can go look at it and say okay, here is a set of things and it is very obvious that this is where it was surveyed to and now we have a defined point of reference. He said if he really is 50' away.

Mr. Gutoskey said he is fine with the building size, just where it is on the lot.

Mr. Wheatall said come over and bring a tape measure.

Mr. Soryal said the house is not that old, would there be a copy in the set of prints.

Mr. Gutoskey said that is what this is.

Mr. Soryal asked if there would be anything in the county with a set of plans.

Mr. Gutoskey said this was the site plan and they just added the shed on it when they did the shed, he asked Ms. Endres that.

Mr. Lamanna said we could approve it subject to demonstrating to the zoning inspector that the line is where it says it is.

Mr. Gutoskey said the problem is if he is adding onto that building and it is less than 50'.

Mr. Lewis said then we have to do housekeeping on that.

Mr. Lamanna said so basically that is where we are, we need you to verify where that line is and you can persuade the zoning inspector to come out and take a look at what is there and she is able to verify from what she can observe that the location of that line is somewhere else or at least 50' away from that, the corner of that building.

Mr. Lewis said the front corner, if it is less than that we've got to bring him back in anyway because then we will have to do a variance and do housekeeping.

Mr. Lamanna said right, if it is less.

Mr. Gutoskey said we could do a motion provided that it meets the 50' setback, he doesn't have any problem with the size.

Ms. Endres asked if we could handle that prior to the minutes being signed.

Mr. Lamanna said we should be able to handle it prior to the minutes being signed.

Ms. Endres said if there is an adjustment to be made it can be handled prior to the minutes being signed.

Mr. Gutoskey said and the typical, no business, no living.

Mr. Lamanna said right, yes. He asked Mr. Wheatall if he can get that done in the next month.

Mr. Wheatall said okay.

Mr. Lamanna said let's try to do it sooner rather than later. He said the other possibility is if that is inconclusive then you are probably going to have to have somebody come out and do a location on that corner, that is all you need is a location on that one corner.

Mr. Wheatall said he needs to call the zoning office and make an appointment for someone to come out and validate it.

Mr. Gutoskey said if the stakes are all in and asked Ms. Endres if that is something she would do.

Ms. Endres said Mr. Averill has been handling this kind of thing recently, we can't possibly go to every site when there are questionable sites and we are asked to come out.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks the easiest way to handle it is if you can go out and verify that this really is a survey line then we can go ahead otherwise you are going to have to get somebody to come out and do a location survey in that front corner so you know how far off you are because all of this stuff is inconclusive, that is just the way the facts are and hopefully we can resolve this without a lot of time and expense and if you do establish it you will still be on the timeline for getting this approved because it wouldn't be finally approved until our next meeting anyway. He said that will help the process and it can be resolved.

Mr. Lewis asked if the board is satisfied on where we left off on the water run-off and where it is going.

Mr. Gutoskey said it looks like it is going to the back of the lot.

Mr. Lewis asked if it is sloping that way.

Mr. Wheatall said yes.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the existing ones are going to the ground somewhere.

Mr. Wheatall said they do but he doesn't know where they are.

Mr. Gutoskey said it shows an alternate septic area to the back and the left of the house there.

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

Motion BZA 2022-40 – 17073 Snyder Road

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variance for the purposes of constructing an addition onto an existing garage.

1. A variance for a 960 sq. ft. addition to a 768 sq. ft. garage for an 828 sq. ft. increase to the maximum accessory building size allowed of 900 sq. ft.
2. A variance to 33' on the side yard setback for the existing structure.
3. A variance ranging from 39' to 46' for the addition.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. The applicant will have gutters on the new extension of the building and tied into the downspouts and drainage to the downspouts that exist on the existing garage.
2. The applicant also understands that this building is only for conducting personal activities and not for the conduct of any business unless it qualifies as a home occupation and a suitable certificate is obtained prior to commencing such work, nor will it be used as any additional living space for the property.
3. There are no structures near the property line on the adjacent property.
4. The reason for granting this application is that this is a large five acre lot.
5. The additional size of the accessory building is not unreasonable given the size of the lot.
6. It is also consistent with the character of the neighborhood and will not adversely affect that character nor will it adversely affect the adjacent property owners as well.

Mr. Gutoskey seconded the motion.

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

Secretary's note: The aforementioned motion for BZA 2022-40 at 17073 Snyder Road was modified at the regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals held on November 17, 2022 due to additional information provided by the applicant. See minutes dated November 17, 2022.

Application 2022-41 by Michael Goldman, Waterway Gas & Wash for property at 7010 Aurora Road

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

Mr. Michael Goldman of Waterway Gas and Wash was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna asked Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector if there are any issues with this permit.

Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector testified that Waterway is a good business and she never had any complaints on them. She said Mr. Averill drove by and took a look and it looks like they are in compliance with any former conditions that were applied.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Michael Goldman and he let the record reflect that Mr. Goldman was duly sworn and asked Mr. Goldman if there is anything new he wants to tell the board about, any plans for the future that might be useful to address.

Mr. Goldman testified that the only thing he wants to bring up and he has spoken to staff a time or two over the years, there is an open lot next to them owned by Home Depot, they would greatly love to be able to expand their access and put a few more vacuums in that area, he knows that there is an issue with the open space requirement and he believes that there may, he is not bringing anything in for now, he just wanted the board to get a preview, he believes that there might be some changing in the ordinances or have been some changes to the ordinances around the open spaces.

Mr. Lamanna said the issue with the open spaces is because this property was ultimately carved up in different ways because of some tenants desiring to have their own ownership of the lots and some are not and what has happened is we created lots now where no individual lot is necessarily meeting its open space requirements so the object of what we have done is we are going to apply this on a site-wide basis and originally it is up to the management company to allocate that space out so that at the end of the day we don't want somebody to come back and say they have a piece of property but there is no more building space left, we don't want that situation to happen so that is kind of the way it is managed so he doesn't know what your situation is, are they fully utilizing it.

Ms. Endres said she has not done an evaluation, she thinks that they wanted to apply an area right in there.

Mr. Goldman said exactly and they own their lot and years ago, Home Depot, this was pre-pandemic, Home Depot agreed that they would be willing to sell us that other portion but that sort of died on the vine for obvious reasons.

Mr. Lewis said so there is X amount of greenspace banked for the overall development so when the developer agrees to over-allocate or generously allocate to one property owner he shortens up what happens on the other lots so it is really kind of up to the developer.

Mr. Lamanna said everyone of these things should have had an amount allocated to it on the original approval.

Ms. Endres said she is not sure that that happened, she would have to go back and re-research.

Mr. Lamanna said he guesses the assumption is that would be post the breakup, now the pre-breakup things in the absence to anything to the contrary, some agreement to the contrary, then to him those lots are what they are, nobody should be over and if they are over then we would need to go back and get a clarification of okay, where are you making up the rest of this.

Ms. Endres said this is Home Depot's lot and you can see that they are obviously over 40% lot coverage without doing any measurements.

Mr. Lamanna said right.

Ms. Endres said, she is speculating here, but this lot is owned by V & V, that is the developer, it counts towards it.

Mr. Lamanna said there are spots that are going to be open space anyway, they never really were contemplated being lots.

Ms. Endres said this area right here, she thinks there was an expectation that this was going to be developed into another lot and possibly this area right here.

Mr. Gutoskey said those could have been out lots there.

Ms. Endres said and the Chick-fil-A lot is not developed yet.

Mr. Lamanna said those lots in front are all definitely out lots.

Ms. Endres said those are all under 40%.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks with something like Home Depot that they are very clearly over so they don't have anything to give away, they are right up to their limit so there is really no extra there so unless they have some extra greenspace, which is possible because they may be less than the coverage they could then use theirs up that way. He said you would have to go back to the developer.

Mr. Goldman said and that is what he said, he said it is hard for me to give you anything that is going to squeeze him in other areas, in other parts of the development.

Mr. Gutoskey said but it doesn't look like he is selling anything.

Mr. Goldman said he is not making any money off of the move. He said one question he had and they have done this in another market is they have been able for lack of a better term do like a nature conservancy thing where they buy a piece of property and deed it over, they landbank it as undevelopable, make that undevelopable so it came back to us and they said okay we will do a swap out. He said he doesn't know if that is something that you would contemplate or not.

Ms. Endres said they have kind of done something like that already is her understanding there is some land in Solon that counts towards greenspace for these properties.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks it is part of that gore down there that goes down to Pettibone, the Pettibone/Aurora Road gore there.

Mr. Gutoskey said that would be more of a question of the trustees.

Mr. Lamanna said yes when you get to that you would have to amend the agreement that the trustees have with the developer.

Ms. Endres said right, that is the Memorandum of Understanding.

Mr. Lamanna said it is sort of weird because you are really in a situation, you are buying some property from Home Depot but you really aren't buying anything of value but what you really have to do is go to the developer and ask will they sell you the building rights to build what you want to build on that piece of property you are buying.

Mr. Goldman said yes and thus far V & V has been fine as a neighbor, he didn't have a whole lot of interest in doing that, he said we could buy that lot Chick-fil-A is on, before Chick-fil-A and that seems like a lot of money for him to get a few extra vacuums.

Mr. Lamanna said he doesn't know what his situation is in these other areas and how big your thing is going to be so how much space your going to need, if you had a concrete plan you might be able to talk to him and say you need to buy this much space, do you have that laying around, there may be some lot out there that has got thousands of square feet allocated to it and if you cut off two or three hundred it is not really going to make a difference to him and he has got money in hand now.

Mr. Lewis said or maybe stranded with an unsellable lot.

Mr. Lamanna said you are talking about such a small amount of area, from the center's standpoint it would be stupid to sell that lot for somebody to build something somewhere else.

Mr. Goldman said yes.

Ms. Endres said that has a lot of value, it has frontage.

Mr. Lamanna said right, its got frontage, that is the complication of the issue so that is kind of the way you have to approach him and discuss with him, really the development company because they are the ones who really have got control over how much buildable space is left and what they own and after that we can figure out a way to handle it from our end.

Mr. Goldman said he just wanted to raise that but yes, we are running our carwash.

Mr. Lamanna said it looks very nice, it always looks crisp and sharp when he drives by there.

Mr. Goldman said good.

Mr. Lewis said all of the pre-existing conditions still apply.

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

Motion BZA 2022-41 – 7010 Aurora Road (Waterway Gas & Wash)

Mr. Lamanna moved to renew the applicant's conditional use permit for a period of five years from the date that the board's decision becomes final. All of the existing conditions applicable to that original approval will continue in full force and effect as would the generally applicable conditions in the zoning ordinance.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. The applicant has operated since the board's original approval without any problems and currently has no open issues with the zoning department and it appears to be operating the premises fully in compliance with the conditional use.

Mr. Gutoskey seconded the motion.

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

Application 2022-42 by Jennifer Sigh for Chagrin Falls Daycare and Preschool at 7205 Chagrin Road

The applicant is requesting a review and renewal (new ownership) of an existing conditional use. The property is located in a LIR District.

Ms. Jennifer Sigh was present to represent this application.

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

Ms. Jennifer Sigh testified that she acquired the business in June and she just wants to renew the conditional use.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Ms. Endres if this one slipped through the cracks as far as conditional uses.

Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector testified that the zoning department is trying to catch up with all of the ones that have expired.

Mr. Gutoskey said this one has been expired a while.

Ms. Endres said quite a while ago and then it transferred ownership so the goal today is to get the conditional use into compliance.

Mr. Lamanna said officially transferred into the right name.

Mr. Gutoskey said but the business has been in continuous operation.

Ms. Sigh said correct.

Mr. Lamanna asked if anything is changing.

Ms. Sigh said no.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there are any open issues.

Ms. Endres said no complaints.

Mr. Lewis said we have no changes, no outstanding issues, no modifications to any of the activities, all preceding conditions will apply and we have a change of ownership.

Mr. Gutoskey said they increased their enrollment.

Mr. Lamanna said there were some changes in 2011 and then going back to 1995.

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

Motion BZA 2022-42 – 7205 Chagrin Road (Chagrin Falls Daycare & Preschool)

Mr. Lamanna moved to approve the transfer of the conditional use permit to the applicant, Ms. Jennifer Sigh and to renew that conditional use permit for a period of five years.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. The board notes that all of the existing conditions will continue and notes that the conditions were established in 1995 and again with some modifications in 2011 so these will remain in effect as well as all of the general conditions with respect to conditional uses.
2. This renewal will be granted for a period of five years from the date that the board's decision becomes final.
3. There are no violations or complaints to this operation so it is the board's judgment that it should be renewed for the full five year period.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

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

Application 2022-43 by Jiffy Lube - Frank Malawski for property at PP #02-421496 Aurora Road

The applicant is requesting a new conditional use for the purpose of establishing a garage, service station (Jiffy Lube Multi Care Facility). The property is located in the MUP District.

Mr. Frank Malawski was present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Frank Malawski and he let the record reflect that Mr. Malawski was duly sworn.

Mr. Lamanna stated that this is a conditional use permit and an area variance and is he correct on that.

Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector testified by saying correct. She said if the CUP is not approved then the area variances won't be.

Mr. Frank Malawski testified that it is going to be a new Jiffy Lube multi-care facility. He said just some background information, Jiffy Lube is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Royal Dutch Shell, there are 2,000 franchise locations across the U.S., Jiffy Lube is a very risk-averse company, Jiffy Lube's design business operations and safety record is exemplary. He said this site will be operated by a preferred franchisee which runs facilities nationwide with knowledge on how to operate and maintain a Jiffy Lube facility to the highest standards. He said the services that are offered are oil changes, vehicle inspections, filters, air, cabin all of that stuff, fluids, window washer, coolants, battery replacements, brakes and tire replacement. He said the primary focus is obviously the oil changes, it is quick, in and out service, change of wiper blades, that kind of stuff. He said Jiffy Lube is oriented to quick service not full service unlike competitors so it is a true minor auto use service in nature, it is light auto service and the typical service lasts around 30 to 120 minutes and there is no outdoor storage. He said the hours of operation are 8 to 6 daily with reduced hours on the weekend, peak hours are typically Saturday afternoons, there are 4 to 6 employees per shift, one being a location manager, pedestrian vehicles are serviced primarily and the largest types of vehicles would be a dually truck or F-350 equivalent and the location is not a big trip generator, estimate of 50 to 60 cars a day. He said when it comes to their site the flow of traffic would be coming into the southern entrance going north up the parcel to the back of the building and then exiting out the front, that would be the traffic flow. He said it is the typical way that Jiffy Lube operates that way the queuing can happen in the back of the building and not in the front of the building and it is not going to interfere with the Starbucks next door and their traffic flow.

Mr. Lamanna referred to the site plan and said the entrance is on the south side heading north and the typical staging area.

Mr. Malawski said a typical Jiffy Lube is the stacking of 12 so there would be four in the bays, four waiting outside and then another four and with this lot constraint this building is actually off proto, it is a tandem here so this is actually two bays over here so it is 1, 2, 3, 4. He said there is no overnight storage or anything like that for customers, it is quick in, quick out service. He said when it comes to the waste and all of that kind of stuff most everything is contained within the building so if a part is being replaced like a brake pad or a tire service typically what happens is the tires that are utilized, the used ones get put on that same shelf until the waste disposal company comes by to pick that stuff up so again there is no outdoor storage and whatnot of any of that stuff. He said the bulk oil and waste oil is in the basement so everything is being pumped into the building or pumped out so there is no oil in the trash enclosure or anything like that, the most flammable item ironically in the building is window washer fluid so you would think fuel or oil there would be some kind of flashpoint but window washer fluid is typically the highest flashpoint item and we will work with the fire inspector and ironically he thinks the winter blend is probably even more flammable.

Mr. Lamanna said they put even more in to keep it from freezing.

Mr. Malawski said and they will work with the fire department to put in what is required for this location so typically in Ohio the fire inspector could choose to either have the State do the above ground storage tank permit or they could locally pursue it. He said they did some research initially and he intended on talking with the fire inspector but he did not have the time.

Mr. Gutoskey said Mr. Bill Lovell.

Mr. Lamanna asked if they have any underground tanks.

Mr. Malawski said no underground tanks, it is a little confusing because they are technically sub-grade in the basement but they are not in the ground.

Mr. Lamanna said a pit.

Mr. Malawski said they do have a grease interceptor but oil is not intended to be poured into it or anything like that it is mainly tied to the service sink downstairs and there are no drains in the basement to collect oil, everything is cleaned up through their spill prevention plan so not actually utilizing the oil interceptor to put junk down there and then have somebody clean it out so that is one of their procedures on keeping it a well maintained clean facility.

Mr. Lamanna said so primarily what you are keeping is oil.

Mr. Malawski said yes oils and light auto service type items, brake pads, filters, cabin filters, oil filters, window wipers, that kind of stuff and tire changes.

Mr. Lamanna asked if they use significant amounts of degreasers or just incidentally, you are not really doing big clean ups and things.

Mr. Malawski said there is a spill prevention plan.

Mr. Lamanna said occasionally you go in and find that you have to spray degreaser to clean something off to get nuts on it or do something but what you are doing generally doesn't require, you are not taking big things apart and cleaning them all up.

Mr. Malawski said correct, yes, not taking a transmission apart or any medium or heavy use of that auto.

Mr. Gutoskey said heavy repairs like that are not permitted, it is part of the conditional use.

Mr. Malawski said that is what he has got with the building so that is the conditional use and asked if there are any questions or comments.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Malawski what his role is.

Mr. Malawski said they are Sevan Multi-site Solutions so we represent the client, entitlement, zoning, permitting and then we also do the civil drawings for all of their projects nationwide and they get to pick and choose who is the architect on this job.

Mr. Gutoskey referred to the civil drawings and said have somebody fix this turn-out right here.

Mr. Malawski asked where is it.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is just a cad drafting error. He asked what about deliveries.

Mr. Malawski said deliveries are typically done during off-peak hours and everything had to manifest, everything is done in a standard procedure.

Mr. Gutoskey said what he is saying as far as is it a single axle tractor trailer or is it a straight truck or what.

Mr. Malawski said it is a smaller vehicle it is not like an 18-wheeler or anything like that, they are lugging over to this tiny little site and going around a turning radius here, yes, definitely no.

Mr. Gutoskey said the first thing we need to do is the conditional use part of it.

Mr. Lamanna replied yes. He said there aren't any rental trailers, everything is done inside, there is a central sewage system and they don't have any pumps so it is not an issue there. He asked if anyone had any issues with this conditional use. He said it is pretty low intensity, if you've only got four people an hour you can process through.

Mr. Lewis said you have four bays, how many techs.

Mr. Malawski said four to six.

Mr. Lewis asked if they work the cashier desk and rotate.

Mr. Malawski said yes.

Mr. Lamanna said when they are done they are gone, probably on a rare occasion when you might get somebody in there and two people waiting behind all of the ones in there and they still have room.

Mr. Gutoskey said they have a staging area, that is no problem at all. He asked Ms. Endres what the setback is on a conditional use.

Ms. Endres said the building is 100'.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks under these circumstances he is not sure what you would say is really applicable to this location because the lot lines are all carved up, the internal lot lines. He said the internal lot lines are meaningless once you cross over into the center.

Mr. Gutoskey said because of the center concept.

Mr. Lamanna said right and in fact the internal streets are not public highways.

Mr. Gutoskey said he doesn't have any other questions on the conditional use.

Mr. Lamanna said he doesn't think we have any specific requirements we have to deal with.

Mr. Lewis said he read it over and couldn't find anything that wasn't satisfied.

The board discussed the former 3,000' separation between service stations.

Ms. Endres said that was removed from the zoning resolution.

Mr. Gutoskey said he understands that if we get through tonight then they still have to go through the Board of Trustees to review the building elevations.

Ms. Endres said correct, they are required to go to the Board of Trustees level.

Mr. Gutoskey said and that includes the landscaping too right.

Ms. Endres said they don't get into landscaping too much but Mr. Markley will.

Mr. Gutoskey said especially because it is at the corner there.

Mr. Lamanna said he doesn't see issues that this raises.

Mr. Gutoskey said not as far as the conditional use.

Mr. Lewis asked if the trustees will deal with the sign package as well.

Mr. Gutoskey said he was reading through the specific criteria for the conditional uses, let's just run through that real quick. He said no loud speakers, correct.

Mr. Malawski said no.

Mr. Gutoskey asked about signage.

Ms. Endres said there could be a sign issue, she didn't look into signage but she believes there was a variance to allow multiple ground signs on the property when Ruby Tuesday was there but now that we have a totally new lot do those variances carry over because it is a different lot so she doesn't know if the board wants to talk about allowing for a ground sign for Jiffy Lube on this lot or just address it once the sign package comes to her.

Mr. Gutoskey said he thinks you will have to address the sign package separately.

Mr. Lamanna said really what we have to look at is not (b) but (a), (b) are requirements that they have to meet.

Mr. Gutoskey said and going through this lighting, all cut-offs.

Mr. Lamanna said that is all covered, he thinks the only one we have to address is (3).

Mr. Gutoskey said how about number (9), it should be adequately landscaped.

Mr. Lamanna said that is a requirement that has to be part of the approval. He said (3) is "All points of entrance or exit drives shall be located not closer than two hundred (200) feet from the intersection of two streets." He said he would say it is not applicable here because these are not technically streets.

Ms. Endres said right.

Mr. Lamanna said they are the same as (1) really, (1) and (3).

Ms. Endres said she didn't deny it because of that.

Mr. Lamanna said no, it is one thing to look at it in the general standards, it seems to be harmonious and will not be hazardous to existing or future uses, it is in a shopping center, we've got the services there already, he doesn't think it is going to create any additional requirements, we don't have production of traffic noise, smoke, fumes, glare or odor, we've got a well-designed traffic pattern. He said he thinks all of the general standards are satisfied and with respect to (b) (1) and (3) because of the fact that it is in a shopping center which is kind of governed by different rules with respect to the property lines and streets they really don't apply specifically to this and he thinks looking at what they are doing they have created no issues with respect to the general principals of access and traffic flow and those types of things, he thinks we are pretty well satisfied with the plan.

Mr. Gutoskey said he has some questions about the traffic flow.

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

Motion BZA 2022-43 – PP# 02-421406 Aurora Road – Jiffy Lube

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant a conditional use for the purposes of establishing a Jiffy Lube Multi Care Facility as has been described in the application and testimony before the board.

1. Based on a few general standards for conditional uses in Chapter 117.13 that those have been satisfied.
2. The board finds that with respect to specific criteria in (b) (1) and (3) are not really applicable to this property because it is located within a shopping center, not on a public street and the issues with respect to street access in that matter that have been proposed are consistent with what is already existing in the shopping center.

The board notes that the following conditions apply.

1. No parking of unlicensed or inoperable vehicles and no outside storage of materials for sale or waste materials.
2. The period of the conditional use permit will be for two years before it will require a renewal.

Mr. Gutoskey seconded the motion.

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

Application 2022-44 by Frank Malawski for property at PP #02-421496 Aurora Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing a garage, service station (Jiffy Lube Multi Care Facility). The property is located in the MUP District.

Mr. Frank Malawski was present to represent this application.

Mr. Gutoskey said mostly everyone was here when we did the Starbucks and they were talking about the shared drive coming in and looping around and based on Jiffy Lube's setup it kind of doesn't work because they are running cars through their building the same direction as the other drive and the question he has is and he doesn't know how long Starbucks is going and what kind of traffic flow they have through there.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks they are getting busier and busier.

Mr. Gutoskey said where their driveway is, where their egress is here so close to the other driveway what he is wondering is if this thing could be narrowed down and just be made a one-way, one lane in. He said he didn't know if Mr. Malawski was aware of that and asked Ms. Endres if the board could see the plans for Starbucks. He said that is why he was asking about the trucks because if he could narrow this down and just limit it to one way through and then we won't be having this problem of somebody trying to pull out so close to this intersection.

Ms. Endres said these are civils from Starbucks, the plans. She displayed the Starbucks plans on the large screen.

Mr. Gutoskey said the driveway in the back we are looking at was the old Ruby Tuesday entrance, if he remembers correctly, so when we originally looked at Starbucks they were going to have that center drive and then you could go left or right depending on which because he thinks when they did the Starbucks they were presuming that this would maybe be another fast food or something like that so that driveway there was going to get closed up and they were going to share that center drive and then you would be able to turn right or left depending on which flavor of the day you want which helps with traffic plus they blocked up that center island coming off of Rt. 43. He said the one question is based on their building setup and business model, they are running traffic the same way that drive is set up for so his question is can that driveway be narrowed down and just keep all of the traffic going through because you may have a hard time getting out.

Mr. Lamanna said you are saying that should be one way going through.

Mr. Gutoskey said yes.

Mr. Lewis said there is only one entry into Jiffy Lube off the shared driveway so we did not have another egress in particularly when there was on top of the corner because that is a four-way stop down there on the left.

Mr. Gutoskey said because you do have that bypass drive on the side of the building.

Mr. Lamanna said they can recirculate down to this other building, the Japanese restaurant building and go back into the shopping center.

Mr. Gutoskey said you could turn left and go out onto Rt. 43 or you could turn right and cut down parallel and go down.

Mr. Lamanna said yes go back to the shopping center.

Mr. Gutoskey said yes, cut back to the shopping center but that is really close to that stop.

Mr. Malawski said his perspective is he thinks that drive is in the lease documents, we didn't touch it and if you look at the survey they only own a little sliver of that, that drive there, a couple of feet they own, they don't have enough of it to really do something to make it a one-way.

Mr. Gutoskey said you can do it, it could be done.

Mr. Malawski said it was an exhibit in the deed as well, that access drive between the two parcels.

Ms. Endres said one of the requirements was there would be a driveway agreement prior and she thinks that is all in the paperwork so that driveway agreement was created and was recorded.

Mr. Lamanna said all it means is to just amend the agreement and he doesn't see how Starbucks cares if it is one-way.

Mr. Gutoskey said he would suggest that it is one-way through the Jiffy Lube because everything is set up to go in the same direction with this driveway.

Mr. Lamanna asked where the cars are going to exit.

Mr. Gutoskey said they are coming out there, he is talking about the initial curb cut in the lower right.

Mr. Lewis said that is wide enough for a two-way.

Mr. Lamanna said unless you are an employee coming into park.

Mr. Lewis said you could still take the exit on the top side of the building which is basically a bypass without going through the bays.

Mr. Lamanna said cars that are actually getting service are going to come out over there.

Mr. Lewis said with people in them.

Mr. Lamanna said they either get in the one in between so they can circulate back that way so there really isn't any need for people to come out so there is no reason that anybody really has to go back out that, that could be an entrance only because everybody is going the other way anyway except for maybe a few people, employees.

Mr. Malawski said that is right.

Mr. Lewis said if we move the entrance further from the corner intersection, chop the lower half of it off from the four-way corner stop there.

Mr. Gutoskey asked could it even come out, see where the concrete pad is for the dumpster enclosure, somewhere in there.

Mr. Lamanna asked where are you going to put the dumpster.

Mr. Gutoskey said leave it, he is just saying, move the driveway up that far.

Mr. Lamanna said move it to that point, to that line there so you are moving that driveway up a little bit and maybe make it narrower, it doesn't need to be wide.

Mr. Gutoskey said instead of 24' or whatever it is, maybe 14', one way.

Mr. Lewis said that kind of goes right along with what Starbucks did, they ran a continuous one-way loop, you come in here and you go out there and once you are ready to exit you've got a choice of turning left or right either way.

Mr. Gutoskey said it would give you some more stack because you know what it is like during the holidays, it will be gridlock. He said there are a lot of cars that stack up there so if you push that entrance down a little bit and just make it one-way.

Ms. Endres said she thinks it is already one-way.

Mr. Gutoskey said he is talking about the entrance into the Jiffy Lube.

Ms. Endres said okay, into the Jiffy Lube.

Mr. Gutoskey said right.

Mr. Lewis said one-way in.

Mr. Lamanna said almost all of the traffic is going to be going down and out and away out the other side, the only people who would be coming back out that way would be people who are parking in those spots there, employees basically right.

Mr. Malawski said yes pretty much.

Mr. Lamanna said customers are going to come in and pull into the queue line unless somebody wants to stop and ask a question about something.

Mr. Malawski said he thinks the reason why we have this kind of buffer is if they are getting the trash in the morning at least this is a little bit of a buffer, if we move it up further.

Mr. Gutoskey said if you hold the northern part of that, the turn out that goes into there, if you held that as the one edge and then came over about 18' or 14' whatever, just narrow that down.

Mr. Lamanna said one-way in, enter only.

Mr. Lewis said if your trash trucks come in there at 6:00 in the morning he can go up the one-way on the side and there isn't going to be anybody there anyway.

Mr. Lamanna said he can come in and back up.

Mr. Lewis said you are right, just swing in and back out.

Mr. Malawski said he thinks that is what the engineer's intent was having the two-way, probably mainly for the trash and trash truck circulating around the site, it's a thought.

Mr. Lewis said it is doable because they can pull basically straight in and then back up to the receptacle and at that hour of the day where they come and go and what direction they are going on that property, it is empty at that hour.

Mr. Gutoskey said you could even slide the trash enclosure over and slap it with a parking space.

Ms. Endres said just be aware that they don't really have any latitude for lot coverage.

Mr. Gutoskey said we are not going to reduce it though.

Mr. Lewis said we are giving you an extra 3.5 sq. ft.

Mr. Lamanna said yes, some more greenspace.

Mr. Lewis said that seems so minor, at least we've had a conversation about that shared driveway separating the two lots.

Mr. Gutoskey said and that shared driveway counts on the rest of it doesn't it.

Ms. Endres said the portion of the driveway counts as Jiffy Lube's lot coverage.

Mr. Lewis said he can live with changing that entry to one lane and all one-way and then as far as the architect.

Mr. Gutoskey asked how do we want to close it up, if you want to take some out of both.

Mr. Malawski said he will ask the engineer of record how he wants to wrap that up.

Mr. Lewis said to squeeze it down to one and it is one-way however and as far as you can push it from that intersection.

Mr. Malawski asked if worse case, he doesn't foresee it as worse case having to maintain that wide of a mouth on the driveway but if we had to maintain it for one reason or another for the trash to kind of come in and come out because he knows he does that truck turn layout on his cad before he is finished with these would you accept removing this obviously and putting some kind sign just saying one-way or something, enter only.

Mr. Lewis said you've got to cut the width of the opening to one-way, you can put all of the signs in the world and it won't mean anything.

Mr. Malawski asked down to how much, 16'.

Mr. Gutoskey said 14' maybe 16'.

Mr. Malawski said just less than a two-way.

Mr. Lewis said less than a two-way and we realize that you've got to get Waste Management or one of the guys in.

Ms. Endres said a one-way minimum drive aisle is 14', a minimum two-way drive aisle is 24'.

Mr. DeWater said that will work.

Mr. Lewis said if you put signs up as well people will get the hint. He said he really doesn't have any more questions on this it is going to go to the trustees for everything architectural and landscaping and we will eventually see a sign package.

Mr. Gutoskey said we may or may not see it here.

Ms. Endres said there is the setback too of 7.2' and the loading space.

Mr. Malawski said for loading generally they are way over on their required amount of parking so with this real estate deal he doesn't know the exact details of this part but they are not disturbing this existing Ruby Tuesday little area here which gives us a solid nine stalls which is enough, we wouldn't even need stalls back here but.

Mr. Gutoskey asked when the deliveries usually come in.

Mr. Malawski said it is a regular, it is less than an 18-wheeler, he is not too technical with trucks.

Mr. Gutoskey said it would be a single-axel truck, bigger than a UPS truck, but smaller than a tractor-trailer.

Mr. Malawski said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey asked when they come, during hours, off hours.

Mr. Malawski said during open hours of the facility.

Mr. Lewis said you've got the front driveway paralleling all of Aurora Road on the left which goes from that entrance to the shopping center all the way to the other entrance so even if the guy says he doesn't want to screw around over here he can come down with his 18' or 24' truck with a gate and a dolly and your doors and entry to your building on that side so it is manageable.

Mr. Gutoskey said he also has a strip there where the bypass is on the side you can stop and park a truck. He said he thinks there is ample room in the back to park a truck for deliveries.

Mr. Malawski said typical sites that we have worked with have less parking and that is just the nature of it.

Mr. Gutoskey said another thing too is you have spots on the north side there and if they are inside you could park a truck there and you are not really blocking anybody working.

Mr. Malawski said yes most likely there is going to be more parking for the frappe lovers.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if you think they will be parking in your lot.

Mr. Lamanna said they will drop their car off and run over and have a Starbucks while they are waiting, that is what is going to happen.

Mr. Gutoskey said so we are looking at variances for setbacks due to the conditional use.

Ms. Endres said there is a 100' setback for a conditional use but there is also the 20' normal setback, if not for the conditional use there would have been a 20' setback on that one side. She said the one setback is 7.2'.

Mr. Gutoskey said that is to the main entrance.

Ms. Endres said that is parallel to that median.

Mr. Lamanna said all of these are interior lot lines of the shopping center.

Ms. Endres explained the 7.2' building setback.

Mr. Lamanna asked how far it is to the actual street.

Mr. Gutoskey said the building to the edge of the pavement.

Mr. Malawski said he would say 25'.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is 21'.

Mr. Lamanna said it is 21' to the actual pavement. He said he doesn't think it is creating any issue here, everything is pretty tight along these front lots area.

Ms. Endres said she can't approve it.

Mr. Lamanna said again. we are talking about interior streets of an interior lot line of a shopping center so you can look at it from the standpoint of does this create some kind of issue or visibility hazard or is it creating something that is going to look out of character with the rest of the shopping center and he thinks this is close in to this particular driveway, he doesn't think it is going to create any issues for traffic, it is not inconsistent with the character of the shopping center, now if it creates any particular problem there that we need to be worried about.

Mr. Gutoskey said as far as the loading space there isn't a space technically marked but there is space there for a truck to park and unload.

Mr. Lamanna said the guy can back up to where the cars come out, even if they are servicing a car he can park on the side of the building, either way, they are going to be in and out, they are not going to be unloading for an hour and a half.

Mr. Malawski said they have got dollies.

Mr. Lamanna said they are not getting enough stuff, it is not like somebody pulling up to Walmart with a tractor trailer and they have got to unload an entire tractor trailer and it is going to take them an hour to get all of it out, they will roll out four tires and roll them into the garage.

Mr. Soryal asked if there is a specific entrance for the deliveries or do they just go anywhere.

Mr. Malawski said it would just be where the ramps are, you've got ADA ramps here, you've got ramps over here so they just utilize that and to your point, opening up a bay if it is a little bit of a less busy day, sometimes the delivery equipment type and where is that delivery typically stored, is it in the basement, is it on the first floor. He said he thinks the basement wouldn't be much because the oil would be pumped to the basement and that is typically oils and liquids and whatnot that are in the basement where the first floor primarily would have that stuff.

Mr. Gutoskey said so the oil is delivered and pumped versus dropping off a 55 gallon drum.

Mr. Malawski said exactly.

Mr. DeWater said it would be like an Ullman fuel oil truck.

Mr. Soryal said he thinks the deliveries are more or less this customer wants tires, wait a half hour, this truck is going to come in and drop off four tires.

Mr. Lamanna said right and the guy is going to come with a couple of boxes of windshield wipers and other things.

Mr. Lewis said the guy has got a route to run. He said if the employees are going to park out on the other side of those other spots, people in their cars they don't get out of their car when they are being serviced, he doesn't think, you stay in your car.

Mr. Soryal said he believes so.

Mr. Lewis said it is a drive-thru service.

Mr. Malawski said you sit in the lobby, during the whole COVID stuff he sat in his car when he got his car serviced, he doesn't know if that was just a temporary thing but the policy is the customers wait in the lobby. He said you wheel it in, get out and you go sit in the customer service lobby there.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Ms. Endres to go back to the site plan on the large screen.

Mr. DeWater said to Mr. Malawski when you narrow down your lot to make it easier for your rubbish trucks to come in you've got those three parking spaces next to your rubbish bin, take the rubbish bin and flip it like this with your parking spaces to the back of the lot and your trash bin the other way that way you actually move it a little bit to the side of the property line and it opens up your turning radius for your garbage truck in there through those other parking spaces.

Mr. Malawski said so you are saying take this and move it out there.

Mr. DeWater said put it right there where your parking spaces will be and then when your garbage truck comes in he can actually K-turn to get out that back entrance.

Mr. Malawski said okay.

Mr. Lewis said good suggestion.

Mr. Malawski said he will ask his engineer because he knows there was another site they designed.

Mr. DeWater said employees now don't want to walk far to the dumpster either.

Mr. Malawski said that is true.

Mr. Lewis said he has nothing more on this.

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

Motion BZA 2022-44 – PP #02-421496 Aurora Road (Jiffy Lube)

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the following variances.

1. A variance to the setback from Marketplace Drive from the required 100' to 7.2' for a variance of 92.8'.
2. A variance to the south/east lot line from the required 100' to 26.5' for a variance of 73.5'.
3. A variance to eliminate the requirement for one loading/unloading space.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. With respect to the setbacks these are effectively internal lot lines in the shopping center and after looking at the setbacks provided the actual distance on the Marketplace Drive side from the building to the actual street the board does not see any adverse situation being created by that building location with respect to visibility with traffic flow nor is it inconsistent with the character of the entire shopping center development.
2. With respect to the loading and unloading space there are ample areas on this property for delivery vehicles to park and make deliveries through multiple different locations in the building since there are four bay doors on this building so there is not a need for a dedicated space for that in this particular situation.
3. The board notes and this goes back to the conditional use permit as a condition as the board has examined these requirements is that the applicant will look at modifying the southwest entrance so that southwest entrance will become one way, will be narrowed down.
4. The applicant is going to look at the most effective way to accomplish that and possibly revise the spacing of the actual physical location of the entrance and the radius of the turns and possibly the location of the dumpster area vis-à-vis the parking spaces by trading locations to find the optimal location in order to provide the most easy and appropriate access for the garbage pick up accomplishing the goal of making that a one-way entrance only and moving it as far as possible from the Marketplace Drive intersection on the side road there.

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, this application was concluded.

Since there was no further testimony, the public hearing was closed at 8:36 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: November 17, 2022

AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE

Bainbridge Township, Ohio
Board of Zoning Appeals
October 20, 2022

The regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 8:36 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joe Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis and Mr. Emeil Soryal. Ms. Karen Endres, Zoning Inspector was present.

MINUTES

Mr. Gutoskey moved to adopt the minutes of the September 15, 2022 meeting as written.

Mr. Soryal seconded the motion.

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

APPLICATIONS FOR NEXT MONTH

Application 2022-45 by Archer Sign Corporation/Matt VerBeck for property at 8575 Tanglewood Square – Unit F-3

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing a second wall sign for Goodwill. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2022-46 by Mark Bailin/Diamond Signs & Graphics for property at 8575 Tanglewood Square – Unit F-3

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing window signs on the East elevation, right of the entrance for Goodwill. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2022-47 by Mark Bailin/Diamond Signs & Graphics for property at 8575 Tanglewood Square – Unit F-3

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing window signs on the East elevation, left of the entrance for Goodwill. The property is located in a CB District.

Application 2022-48 by Cary Sanders for property at 7557 Chagrin Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing an addition. The property is located in a R-5A District.

Application 2022-49 by Kathleen Dangelo for property at 16681 Savage Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing an in-ground swimming pool. 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 November 17, 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 9:34 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: November 17, 2022