

Bainbridge Township, Ohio  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
May 18, 2023

Pursuant to notice by publication and ordinary mail, the public hearing was called to order at 7:15 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis and Ms. Lori O'Neill, Alternate. Mr. Emeil Soryal was absent. 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.

Ms. Lori O'Neill, Alternate joined the board for consideration of the following applications in Mr. Soryal's absence.

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

Application 2023-5 by Dan Johnson for property at 8835 Taylor May Road- Continuance

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

Mr. Lamanna stated at this point the applicant has withdrawn his application so any further action on this is moot so the board will not have any further continuances on this application.

Application 2023-10 by Carolyn and Scott Rolf for property at 17339 Long Meadow Trail

The applicants are requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of constructing a front porch addition. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Mr. Scott Rolf and Mrs. Carolyn Rolf were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Scott Rolf and Mrs. Carolyn Rolf and he let the record reflect that Mr. and Mrs. Rolf were duly sworn.

Mrs. Carolyn Rolf testified that they would like to be able to put a front porch on the front of the house, they have lived in the house since 1999 and the front of the house was very flat. She said every winter ice builds up on the roof, they have icicles that form over the top along the front of the house and she is leaning out the window knocking the icicles off. She said they have tried some things, they have put new gutters on the house and they put a new roof on the house to hopefully help that situation but they still have icicles. She said between the driveway and the walkway right next to the house there is a patio and they would like to have that as handicap access from the patio onto the front porch because their parents are getting older and they need easier access to the house. She said the second one on there is the side yard setback and that was when the house was originally built and they got it a little too close.

Mrs. Rolf continued by saying their house was one of the first houses built in the neighborhood. She said the porch will be 6' x 36' with a 1'-8" overhang to match.

Mr. Lamanna asked if they will leave the plantings etc.

Mrs. Rolf said her son is a graphic designer and he put the porch on so we will see what it will look like but the plantings will be moved.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if the ramp will go where the landscaping is. He said you said to the left of the door there will be an ADA ramp there.

Mrs. Rolf said yes. She referred to the site plan and said right here there is a little patio that sits by the house and is set back so you can walk into this right now and then between here and the house is where there is landscaping right now and we want to put the 6' porch along the front of the house here and then the ramp would come up from the patio.

Mr. Gutoskey said the patio goes all the way across and then you have landscaping in front of it.

Mrs. Rolf said yes.

Mr. Lamanna said on the other side to the right.

Mrs. Rolf said to the right there the porch will stop right at the edge of the house.

Mr. Lamanna asked will you have decking there too.

Mrs. Rolf said no, the porch will just stop where the house stops.

Mr. Lamanna said there is going to be a whole level 2' high like you have your little steps up to your door all the way across but you are not going to have a ramp up to where your existing door is.

Mrs. Rolf said no, they are proposing to build a 6' wide porch across the front of the house and then there would be a ramp coming from the patio to provide handicap access.

Mr. Lamanna said okay and asked what the elevation of the porch is.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if there will be stairs in the front to the front door.

Mrs. Rolf said there is one step.

Mr. Gutoskey said but then there will be a walk.

Mrs. Rolf explained per the displayed aerial that the walkway will stay, the 6', this is over 7' out from the house so the porch would go from here and it will come straight to here with one step up here, the Trex decking will cover that so the step up would be here, they will be removing the landscaping from here and replacing it around the side of the house and then they are moving the landscaping that is in the 6' area.

Mr. Lamanna asked if there will be Trex decking too over there, along the whole front.

Mrs. Rolf said yes.

Mr. Lamanna said that was what he was trying to understand.

Mrs. Rolf said sorry, the house is 36' wide so the deck will be 36' by 6'.

Mr. Lamanna said it is 10 to 1.

Mr. Gutoskey said 1/12 on the ramp.

Mr. Lewis asked if this had to go before the Tanglewood Architectural Review Board.

Mrs. Rolf said yes.

Mr. Gutoskey said it was approved, he spoke with the president today, or chair of the board and he said it was approved but he didn't have time to do the paperwork on it, Scott Rico.

Mr. Lewis said okay, good.

Mr. Lamanna asked what was the original setback, was it 50'.

Mr. Gutoskey said he thinks it was 50', it shows 50' on the mortgage ID, that is what it would have been. He added that he doesn't see an issue with it.

Mr. Lamanna said it is a problem with a lot of houses in Tanglewood, there are just a lot of exposed front doors like that for some reason, people were not thinking very clearly about the issues of what happens in the winter especially and this will really dress up the house nicely. He said it certainly fits in and we are only talking about 6' with an overhang.

Mr. Gutoskey said it is like the house we had in Pilgrim Village, it was similar in the back, all of those are the same thing, they are all flat across the front.

Mr. Lewis said it is an open structure, even though it is 6' closer, you've got four columns but other than that it is not like a big solid wall that moved out 6' closer to the street so it is a very small impact.

Mr. Lamanna said the other thing about it too is it stretches across the whole front of the house, he thinks it is not going to be as noticeable, a lot of people put porches in and one stuck out a little farther, he doesn't think they look as nice because all of a sudden there is this thing sticking out but this is going to be nice because the entire two-story front of your house is going to have that porch sticking out so it is going to look much more balanced.

Mr. Gutoskey said he thinks it is going to look like it belongs there and then the other one just to clean up the side yard that has been like this since it has been there.

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

#### Motion BZA 2023-10 – 17339 Long Meadow Trail

Mr. Lamanna moved to grant the applicant the following variances with respect to an addition of a front porch across the front of the house including a ramp constructed up to that porch for handicap access.

1. The porch will be 7'-8" by 36' across and in connection with that there will be a variance on the front yard setback from 50' to 44' for a variance of 6'.
2. With respect to a side yard setback there is an existing, from the original construction, a setback of the property 13.1' and the required setback was 15' so somewhere along the way we lost 1.9' so the board will grant a variance with respect to that 1.9' so that the house will be conforming with respect to the side yard setback with that variance.

Based on the following findings of fact.

1. With respect to the side yard variance, it is a minor variance, the size is small and it will not adversely affect the character of the neighborhood or the adjacent property owner.
2. With respect to the front yard variance the same characteristics are true, this will not adversely affect the character of the neighborhood because many houses do have front porches on them.
3. Because of the way this porch will stretch across the entire house it will not be out of character with other things in the neighborhood and the small front variance again will not alter the character of the neighborhood.
4. The street kind of winds its way down and it is not going to stand out unusually for this small increase and for the necessity of adding a front porch and with the handicap access it outweighs the small amount of this variance.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Ms. O'Neill, aye.

Application 2023-11 by Randall and Amy Greene for property at 17570 Snyder Road

The applicants are requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing an in-ground swimming pool. The property is located in a R-5A District.

Mr. Gutoskey recused himself from this application.

Mr. Randall Greene, property owner and Mr. Jason Rion of Highland Construction were present to represent this application.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Randall Greene and Mr. Jason Rion and he let the record reflect that Mr. Greene and Mr. Rion were duly sworn.

Mr. Lamanna said we have a side yard variance request and a lot coverage variance.

Mr. Jason Rion asked if the board has a copy of the overlay of the pool on the plans. He testified that here is the side yard setback you are looking at and then the pool and the pool decking and the fencing going around it and the reason the pool has to go there adjacent to the driveway and the house is there is just no other flat area on the property to put the pool. He said the entire rear yard behind the house is a big ravine and it is wooded and obviously the property line on the side of the house there and then a long, long driveway coming down.

Mr. Lewis asked who owns this flag lot.

Mr. Randall Greene testified that he owns that also.

Mr. Lewis asked if that is one lot or two.

Mr. Greene said it is two parcels.

Mr. Lewis asked in addition.

Mr. Greene said the other one is landlocked, a five acre parcel right there and the other one with the driveway and the house is on 5.79 acres.

Mr. Rion said you can see at the rear of the driveway there is where they are planning to put the pool and that is the property line where we are looking to get the variance for. He said the next sheet down, you see the driveway there at the bottom, the existing house with the addition off the left there and then the pool right here, the property line here and then you've got all that area back behind the house along the side of that ravine.

Mr. Lewis asked if that is a riparian back there.

Mr. Rion said yes.

Mr. Lewis said out of curiosity, where are your primary leach fields for your septic and then your alternate reserve space.

Mr. Greene said the alternate is that open patch of grass there, right there is the leach field, the alternate is actually on the other side of the riparian.

Mr. Lewis said okay, not a lot of places to do this is there.

Mr. Greene said no.

Mr. Rion said the next sheet down he had a couple of pictures of the backyard, in that picture there, towards the garage you can see up at the top right there, it kind of really falls away so there is not a lot left unfortunately, they can't put the pool on stilts.

Mr. Greene said out of the 25, 221 sq. ft. allowed for coverage he thinks over 20,000 of that or closer to 21,000 he thinks is the driveway.

Mr. Rion said it probably wouldn't be an issue if it was a normal five acre lot and had a 150' long driveway.

Mr. Lamanna said the lot up in the corner here 02-419737, that is the permanent parcel number.

Mr. Greene said 02-419737, that is the parcel.

Mr. Lamanna asked if this whole parcel is that parcel.

Mr. Greene said including the driveway that goes out to Snyder.

Mr. Lamanna said and the other parcel has no frontage.

Mr. Greene said no, it is landlocked. He said he bought that from the Hamiltons originally and they are not on Snyder anymore, they were where the Bauers are now and the county for some reason wanted them as separate parcels, he asked if they could make this one parcel and they said no and the same thing with the lot just north of that which is owned by Pfouts, Dave Pfouts, that one right there is also landlocked.

Mr. Lamanna said people can create landlocked parcels it is just that.

Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector testified that there is a variance on each parcel, on the parcel it is on as well for frontage.

Mr. Lamanna asked for both the parcels or just the flag parcel.

Mr. Averill said no, there is no record of how this parcel was created but this had a variance, it needed a variance to be subdivided, when this was subdivided this was all one parcel here.

Mr. Lamanna said over here and then he divided off the other parcel somehow along the way.

Mr. Greene said it included the one that is north.

Mr. Lamanna said that was back in the days when the county was not real careful about this sort of stuff. He said the problem is really on this adjacent lot here and we have a bunch of other issues that are floating around here that are sort of not connected with this lot but they are more connected with this adjacent lot here in terms of potential zoning violations.

Mr. Greene said yes but he has been there for 30 years. He said at the time zoning knew about it and he never had a complaint and in the past year he did plan on moving his business. He said he has a parcel on Queens Way next to Haberny's.

Mr. Lamanna said one of the difficulties you have is the only access to the parcel that these questionable activities are going on is over your property so whatever the status, his concern is we are hearing this parcel over here but in fact this parcel over is being used to service what the zoning inspector believes is a violation. He said this has been a residential area for more than 30 years.

Mr. Greene said he will tell you that he doesn't remember the gentleman's name who was at zoning 30 years ago.

Mr. Lamanna said the zoning inspector cannot change the zoning law. He said there are two problems, people come and say this all of the time, legally, the zoning inspector doesn't have the authority to grant something that is inconsistent with the zoning law. He said the second problem is we don't know what he was told and this is the big problem you run into all of the time because people only give half the story to the zoning inspector and they say they are going to do this, this and this and you only get half a story and they say well that sounds like it might be okay but then you find out what the whole story is and if you knew the whole story then the answer might be different so this is why we have a real issue with people coming in and saying they talked to the zoning inspector and he said this or that and there is no written record and there is no written record of what was sent in, there is no written record of what his response was so it leaves us in a very difficult position.

Mr. Greene said you could ask Steve Roth who was the building inspector, he is two doors to the south, he is retired now but he wasn't the zoning inspector, he was the building inspector for Geauga County at the time. He said this wasn't anything that is hidden from anybody, it was obvious to all.

Mr. Lamanna said it is not the obligation of the township to go out and discover what is going on, it is the obligation of the landowner to come in and obtain the proper zoning and building permits and inspections, it is not our obligation to have somebody going around and asking what you are doing here, if somebody notices it or somebody happens to say something but now we've got a difficult situation on our hands here and there are buildings that have no zoning permits on this property and the difficulty is as for this access road we would probably just say okay we will just let this go. He said there will be an enforcement proceeding against your other property, the trouble is since you are using the same access road you are now using this lot for the purposes of all of the things that are going on on that lot that are not permitted so now you are in here asking for a variance and we are saying you've got multiple zoning violations and we are not going to give you a variance unless you fix the zoning violations.

Mr. Greene said he is asking for a variance on the residential lot.

Mr. Lamanna said that is what he is saying but the way he sees it you have got zoning violations on that lot because it is being used to service a commercial business in a residential area.

Mr. Greene asked how the residential property is being used to service the business.

Mr. Lamanna said because, how do you get into that property. He said by the driveway over your land that is part of that parcel.

Mr. Greene said so are you saying you are going to deny the variance.

Mr. Lamanna said unless we can figure out something on how we are going to resolve these problems.

Mr. Greene asked what his options are.

Mr. Lamanna said one of the problems is how long are you going to continue to operate this business here.

Mr. Greene said like he said, he bought property on Queens Way, he didn't buy it to satisfy zoning he bought it because he planned on moving. He said if you could tell him what the interest rates are going to be in a year or two.

Mr. Lamanna asked if anybody else had any comments.

Mr. Lewis said yes, the two properties are very much interconnected because the residential property at the back end has a driveway but you have a landlocked property in the middle doing things that are not permitted that is borrowing a driveway of another property.



Mr. Lamanna said if you look at the whole thing it is interconnected with roads going across and through.

Mr. Lewis said it is a weave and it obviously links the two properties together and there are parts of that driveway that appear to be encroaching on the other two parcels, the middle one with your business stuff on it and then the one that is out by the street as well, it looks like there is an encroachment there.

Mr. Greene asked where he is talking about.

Mr. Lewis asked Mr. Averill if he got that right, there is a pad out at the street.

Mr. Averill said that is not part of the driveway.

Mr. Greene said there is a gas well back there and originally that was accessed, you see the drive right there. He showed the board on the displayed aerial photo and said this is the drive, the original drive to the gas well going right up, the well is right on the property line at the top and those tanks and stuff are right here in this area, right there. He said those have been there for 50 years.

Mr. Lewis said so your business equipment and employees, materials or anything else are using your residential property's driveway to get to the commercial use section on this other property.

Mr. Greene said yes, right.

Mr. Lewis said our zoning inspector did list several violations, he doesn't know if he shared those with you specifically.

Mr. Greene asked about the business being on the property.

Mr. Lewis said yes.

Mr. Greene said yes, we discussed that.

Mr. Lewis said he thinks they are actually on the paperwork for this evening. He said he can read them off or do you (Mr. Greene) have them.

Mr. Greene asked if they are these right here.

Mr. Lewis said pages 3, 4 and 5, yes sir.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks where we are right now is he would need more information before the board proceeds on this so he knows exactly what the situation is here.

Mr. Greene asked what kind of information do you need.

Mr. Lamanna said what the history is, how things came to be where they are.

Mr. Greene said believe it or not he was always told from zoning and the building department of Geauga County, when he moved there, they said you are so far back in the woods no one really cares. He said this is what he was told and he doesn't think he had any complaints from zoning for him being there, not one in 30 years.

Mr. Rion said he doesn't think the pool could go in any other spot just because of the land and buildings and the way the front of the house is and asked if there is an issue with the location of that, assuming all of the other stuff was taken care of.

Mr. Lamanna said we are trying to figure out what the second parcel is, it is a pretty big parcel and he is not exactly sure what all of the buildings are but without being able to totally answer the question of how that might totally affect that parcel, probably given what we see, given where the location of the house is, given the riparian.

Mr. Lewis said his concern is the other landlocked parcel and we stay within 20' for the side yard on the pool.

Mr. Lamanna said he thinks his question is, is there any more information we even need to collect on the pool aspect of this thing so we don't have to drag him back to further consider this and he thinks we probably from the standpoint of, he doesn't know if there is any easy way to modify it given you have a house that is already here, we can't really go behind the house, you can't shift it way over to the left behind the house, from the pictures it looks like you can see the drop off. He said so back in that little notch there, going back from that and then to the right.

Mr. Rion said correct.

Mr. Greene said he wanted to point out something too. He referred to the displayed aerial and said this structure is not attached to the ground and neither is this, both of those are like tarps that would be moved. He said this one no longer exists, this is on skids and these soon will be so the only structure with the foundation would be this one.

Mr. Lamanna asked what that is.

Mr. Greene said it is a barn. He said he had cows, sheep, chickens, turkeys and pigs back in there, they are not there at the moment.

Ms. O'Neill asked if he does concrete leveling.

Mr. Greene said yes.

Ms. O'Neill asked if he has chemicals and things stored there for his business.

Mr. Greene said inside the trailer that is right here (he referred to the aerial photo).

Ms. O'Neill asked Mr. Greene how he disposes of them.

Mr. Greene said they use them to rip concrete, we have used them for Bainbridge Township, we used them for Karen Endres' house, two of her homes as a matter of fact, one in Willoughby and one in Newbury.

Ms. O'Neill said she was just curious about the disposal of chemicals and you have been there 30 years, would there be a chance that you caused any environmental issues during that time.

Mr. Greene said no. He said we are paid to pump that material underground, the Department of Transportation, they love that material. He said they have done city streets in Solon with it.

Ms. O'Neill said but you don't store any of it underground, there are no underground storage tanks.

Mr. Greene said no.

Mr. Lamanna said you just take the product to the work site, and pump that into the ground.

Mr. Greene said we pump it through concrete.

Ms. O'Neill said she understands how it works and for your commercial vehicles are you servicing them there.

Mr. Greene said no, not really, they take them to different mechanics, the ones who handle them, everyone is busy these days. He said that was another  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre there that they consolidated, it was two parcels.

Mr. Joe Gutoskey said that is what he did the survey for, to consolidate them. He said Mr. Greene did an addition behind the garage a couple of years ago.

Mr. Greene said it was 3' or 4' off of the garage and he got zoning permission back in 1994, it was literally 3' or 2' right there (he referred to the aerial photo). He said that is where this was and he got permission from zoning to put the house there. He said that was a 75' wide lot and they gave him permission to build that house with the garage 2' or 3' off the property line and that is your zoning and he took that to the building department in Geauga County and got a permit.

Mr. Lamanna said yes, that is probably when they had the contiguous lots of record issue.

Mr. Gutoskey said the reason he got involved is he wanted to do an addition and he told him he had to apply the strip with the lot so that you had 50'.

Mr. Greene said and then Mr. Averill mentioned combining the lots.

Mr. Lamanna said one time there was a provision that if people had two contiguous lots to ignore the lot line and what happened was it was one of those things that very rapidly became abused so what happened was, people built up to the lot line and the idea is they could build up to the lot line, that is fine because you own both of the lots but then people came in and wanted to sell one of the lots, if you sell that lot now you no longer have a compliant lot because we let you build there on the theory that you owned all of the property so in his view it puts an equitable servitude on the second property that says you can't sell that property without redividing it or doing something else to correct what you have done but then people would come in and sell the property and no one would catch it and the next thing we know we've got somebody 2' off the property line that shouldn't have been there so that is why that provision was removed from the ordinance because it was being abused and people created situations that weren't intended.

Mr. Greene said he understands and Mr. Averill mentioned combining that other five acre parcel but when he moves his business which he plans to do all of those structures will be moved so someone who owns contiguous property may want to purchase those five acres rather than keeping it with the house because there are two other properties that are contiguous to it.

Mr. DeWater said you said you own property in Queens Way.

Mr. Greene said it is right next to Haberny's at the very end of the cul-de-sac on the left side.

Mr. DeWater said obviously you don't have a building there right now.

Mr. Greene said no as a matter of fact, Mr. Gutoskey just surveyed it he thinks in January.

Mr. DeWater asked if he is able to store any equipment there.

Mr. Greene said not until he gets a structure up.

Mr. DeWater asked if he has some type of plan going forward.

Mr. Greene said right now he is trying to find out whether he is going to have to put in a retention pond.

Mr. Lewis asked what the lot size is of the adjacent property.

Mr. Averill said five.

Mr. Lewis asked if that is five even.

Mr. Averill said yes.

Mr. Lewis asked if that is after adjoining the strip, peeling it off of that and adding to the other.

Mr. Averill said right.

Mr. Lewis said so they took it down to five even, got it.

Mr. Gutoskey said he owns a lot on Queens Way and has intended to move, he has been here 30 years, is there a timeframe you would give him to move his operation, one year, two years, three years.

Mr. Lamanna said that is why we have to look at this thing and get our arms around it a little bit more. He said the other thing is we've got a landlocked parcel here, its got no frontage access and somebody is going to say they want to sell this as a building lot. He asked Mr. Greene if that is what he is thinking to sell it as a building lot.

Mr. Greene said there is that parcel in front of it.

Mr. Lewis asked the Bauers.

Mr. Greene said the Bauers own that, someone may want to build a house and want a barn there because like he said this is not on a foundation and this is not on a foundation (he referred to the displayed aerial photo), this no longer exists and this one is not on a foundation, this doesn't exist and these two are used so he is going to pick those up and put them on skids so they can be moved around, this one had cows, this one had chickens but these no longer exist.

Mr. Lewis said so the only permanent structure is the main barn.

Ms. O'Neill asked how many square feet it is.

Mr. Greene said this, he wants to say is 48' x 40', a little less than 2,000 sq. ft. and with that other part on it it is probably somewhere over 2,000 sq. ft.

Mr. Lamanna said one of the other options is you've got all of this acreage there you could move your line over to where you don't need to have a variance.

Mr. Averill said that is a five acre lot so there is a minimum, it is a five acre district so you would need a variance to make it smaller.

Mr. Gutoskey said not if you rotate the property line.

Mr. Averill said he could do a swap, he just got done doing that.

Mr. Lamanna said the odd thing is you've got a lot here, how are you going to build on it, it's got no frontage, it would have to get a driveway variance anyway.

Mr. Averill said the county isn't doing easements anymore.

Mr. Lamanna said there is really only two possible uses for this property, well only one, it has got to be joined to one of these adjacent properties or carved out.

Mr. Gutoskey said try to get a strip from Snyder and keep the lot five acres.

Mr. Lamanna said find another access in.

Mr. Gutoskey said put another strip up to that lot but he thinks the other lot is five, right.

Mr. Greene said he thinks it is 5.25 acres.

Mr. Lamanna said it looks like you are going to have a tough time finding a spot.

Mr. Lewis said about all you can do is get Bauer to sell you a 50' strip.

Mr. Lamanna said he can't because he doesn't have enough land, then he goes below. He said this is going to require a little more consideration as to what is possible here.

Mr. Averill said you could get Bauers to consolidate that with his and give you 50' right up the middle, up one side from that.

Mr. Lamanna said he could slice off a piece.

Mr. Averill said either consolidate these and then buy a strip.

Mr. Lewis said and then sell a strip.

Mr. Averill said you've got two acres, there are ways around it and reducing some non-conformities.

Mr. Lamanna said the board is going to continue this until the next meeting so we can look at some of these issues and give you a chance to get some more information. He said he thinks as far as the pool goes he thinks the board has all of the information we need about the pool and he thinks we understand where it is and how it fits on the lot and what the existing topography issues are here.

Mr. Lewis said we've got some information on your fence that was included.

Mr. Greene asked what other information the board would need from him.

Mr. Lamanna said the board just needs to understand exactly what is going on here, what activities are being conducted.

Mr. Greene said they don't have customers coming to their location.

Mr. DeWater said you have employees.

Mr. Greene said he has employees and most of them are named Greene but there are a couple of others and yes they do come there in the morning and leave and go all over northern Ohio and come back in the evening.

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

Motion BZA 2023-11 – 17570 Snyder Road

Mr. Lamanna moved to table this to the next regularly scheduled meeting to be held June 15, 2023.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Ms. O'Neill, aye.

Additional testimony

Mr. Greene asked the board if he needs to come to the next meeting.

Mr. Lamanna said yes but we don't need Mr. Rion to come.

Mr. Greene said he imagines that the board is going to be giving him an ultimatum and giving him a couple of years to move his business.

Mr. Lamanna said that is one of the things the board will consider.

Mr. Greene said he is 68 years old and if it is going to take him five years to move it or four years or two years or whatever he may not be ready or wanting to build a pool anymore. He said his grandkids are getting older and he might stay there and sell his parcel on Queens Way so you should consider that too. He said life is only so long and there is only so much time. He thanked the board for their time.

Since there was no further testimony, the public hearing was closed at 8:17 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: June 15, 2023

AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE



Bainbridge Township, Ohio  
Board of Zoning Appeals  
May 18, 2023

The regular meeting of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 8:17 P.M. by Mr. Michael Lamanna, Chairman. Members present were Mr. Ted DeWater; Mr. Joseph Gutoskey; Mr. Todd Lewis and Ms. Lori O'Neill, Alternate. Mr. Emeil Soryal was absent. Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector was present.

MINUTES

Mr. Gutoskey moved to adopt the minutes of the April 20, 2023 meeting as written.

Mr. DeWater seconded the motion.

Vote: Mr. DeWater, aye; Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Ms. O'Neill, aye.

APPLICATIONS FOR NEXT MONTH

Application 2023-11 by Randall and Amy Greene for property at 17570 Snyder Road-Continuance

The applicants are requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of installing an in-ground swimming pool. The property is located in a R-5A District.

Application 2023-12 by V & V Lakeshore Ltd. (Shops at Marketplace) for property at 7080 Aurora Road

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for the purpose of adding a second wall sign for Chase Bank. The property is located in the MUP District.

Application 2023-13 by Sean Latona for property at 17098 Sunset Drive

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

Application 2023-14 by Lord of Life Church for property a 17989 Chillicothe Road

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

Application 2023-15 by Lord of Life Church for property at 17989 Chillicothe Road

The applicant is requesting a renewal and expansion of an existing conditional use permit. 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 June 15, 2023 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 8:45 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: June 15, 2023