Bainbridge Township, OH
Board of Zoning Appeals Public Hearing
August 20, 2026

Pursuant to notice by publication, the public hearing was called to order at 7:12 P.M. by Mr. Mike Lamanna, Chair at the Bainbridge Townhall, 17826 Chillicothe Road. Additional members present were Mr. Joe Gutoskey, Mr. Todd Lewis, Ms. Beth Nagusky, and Mr. Emeil Soryal. Mr. Ted DeWater was absent. Mr. Steven Averill, Zoning Inspector, was present.

Mr. Lamanna welcomed everyone to the public hearing of the Bainbridge Township Board of Zoning Appeals and explained the public hearing process and stated that individuals will be sworn in when the application is started.

Mr. Steve Averill was sworn in by Mr. Lamanna. Let the record reflect that he was duly sworn.

Application 2026-9 by Phillip and Colleen Ryan and Meld Architects for
17385 Long Meadow Trail

The applicant is requesting area variance(s) for exceeding acceptable lot coverage. The property is located in a R-3A District.

Mr. Ed Parker of Meld Architects and Mr. Eric Husteck of Meld Architects were sworn in by Mr. Mike Lamanna. Let the record reflect that they were duly sworn.

Mr. Husteck began explaining the need for the variance. He started by giving a brief backstory to the project. As the architects, we were brought in to put an addition on to their existing house. They have a prep kitchen area over here that they want to extend less than 10 feet to house their golf cart. Prior to the homeowners asking them to put the addition, there was landscaping performed and the driveway was expanded. It was looked at by zoning when that was done, from our understanding, based on the GIS eagle view. It looked like it was pretty close, so it was accepted at the time, but now that we are coming in to put an addition on, we were asked to do an actual accurate survey. The survey revealed that the project is 1439 square feet with the golf cart addition over the 30% maximum lot coverage. To speak for the golf cart addition that they want to put on, we are requesting 120 square foot addition to go next to the prep kitchen, and we are over the current maximum lot coverage because of the landscaping that had already been placed. We do feel that this will benefit the owners because it will create a more secure enclosure for their golf cart. Right now it sits outside on the hardscape, not secure, open to public view; their neighbors can see it. It is unsightly so they want to cover it up. In terms of whether it is substantial, we do not believe it's a substantial addition. We are going less that 10 feet out, matching the existing structure, just the house only with the golf cart. Will the essential character be substantially altered, no. It's going to be the exact same style as the house, it's just going to be an extension, like I mentioned before, that prep kitchen area there. Governmental services will not be affected by this variance. The property owner was not aware of the zoning restriction before he purchased the property. Whether the property owner's predicament could be obviated through another method. We looked at maybe a covered overhang over the golf cart, but it wouldn't solve

the problem of lot coverage because it would still be impervious area and still require a variance. It would also still be open to the public, not secure and still be seen by the neighbor. Whether the intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance. We do believe, if this variance is granted, will do substantial justice to the spirit of the zoning codes as the golf cart garage will be equitable for the owner and neighboring properties. It will benefit both. The neighbor as they have to look at it. It will make the property more secure, people will not want to come onto the property to try tamper or steal the golf cart.

Mr. Soryal said, so you're basically squaring up the house, is that right?

Mr. Husteck answered correct. Actually, I can show you.

Mr. Soryal continued, so it looks like it's eclipsing the sidewalk. So are you reworking the sidewalk, because it looks like the corner of it sits on the sidewalk.

Mr. Husteck answered we would get rid of some hardscape and put gravel for the golf cart to come out.

Mr. Soryal followed up saying you're not going enlarge it or reroute it?

Mr. Husteck answered no, we aren't going to reroute it. I think we are going to put gravel in there.

Mr. Park added the owner was thinking that this is facing the actual golf course so we were just thinking we would cut this off and put gravel here and cut this off and this would be a stone step.

Mr. Soryal asked if they removed that when they did the calculations for lot coverage.

Mr. Husteck replied we did not. The existing lot coverage does count that but we do plan on getting rid of some of the impervious pavement.

Mr. Soryal asked if this will have a garage door?

Mr. Husteck answered yes. I can show that to you.

Mr. Averill added you want to consider the elimination of that walkway in your calculations. Depending on what type of stone you use or how you do your walkway like blue stone, so if you're going to lose that whole walkway, that's [interrupted]

Mr. Park stated that I think what they would like to do is look at it as a net zero as far as walk goes. That way when we get it in, if it ends up being needing to be cut off or however we can work the new walkway, but it's almost like we have an allowance. Essentially, if we can take away 120 square feet of the walkway, we're adding square feet back on and it will balance out zero – zero is what we're hoping.

Mr. Lamanna stated but what you're asking for today is not a net zero, you're asking for an additional 120 square feet.

Mr. Park added from the existing conditions.

Mr. Averill stated first of all, the existing conditions are over lot coverage. They are over what they are allowed.

Mr. Lamanna asked but they were never approved of being over.

Mr. Averill answered correct. So, they're over and they want to add on to it, but now they're saying they may not have to, they're going to be possibly taking some off with the walkway.

Mr. Park stated so it's almost like having an allowance of the existing condition to only be adding 120.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Mr. Averill, the driveway, the rear sidewalk and pavers, they were all permitted, correct?

Mr. Averill answered they were all permitted but the calculations were incorrect. They were submitted back in 2022.

Mr. Gutoskey asked, originally it was 30% based on the lot.

Mr. Averill answered correct. It was just under. What they proposed was just under 30%, 29.5%, I believe.

Mr. Gutoskey asked is that with eliminating the sidewalk?

Mr. Averill answered that is with eliminating the sidewalk.

Mr. Park clarified that was not by Meld (Architecture), just to be clear. The owner put the paving down and then when we submitted,

Mr. Averill said it wasn't even the owner, it was Breezewood. Steve ? was the applicant. He's the one that came up with the calculations.

Mr. Gutoskey asked by an error in a previous submittal, it created a 7% overage.

Mr. Averill answered yes.

Mr. Gutoskey continued and that included removing that sidewalk?

Mr. Averill answered it's an error. At the time they submitted that application, they revised the plan and proposed getting rid of the sidewalk to bring it down to under 30%. Now if

eliminating the sidewalk would have done that or not, that wasn't the calculation. I did my own GIS, I mentioned before. That was done by architectural plans, I don't accept them anymore. We want the survey.?

Mr. Gutoskey I guess the question is can you eliminate 120 square feet somewhere?

Mr. Park answered I think we can . One thing as example, the gravel right here, this is actually a gravel planting bed. Gravel is not allowed or permitted to be seen as permeable if it's used as a walkway. Technically that gravel there is the same as mulch.

Mr. Gutoskey said so what you're saying is if you take that gravel and put in mulch, then that would lose 200 square feet and you could do the addition and that would still be at what the lot coverage is or a hair less.

Mr. Park responded right, and I think the thing is through this whole process, we are trying to do it right so we told them to include it. and here we are almost defending what happened.

Mr. Lamanna added it would be a problem for us acting on this no matter what because we now have information that says we have a problem, we have a lot out of conformity. It does not have a variance. We are kind of stymied. Without going back and saying we now have to evaluate this on the basis of this work was done, it wasn't, somewhere, somebody did something and made a mistake or something worse, but now we have to look at this thing and say ok, we are now at 37%. In an area where the maximum lot coverage is already 30% which is higher than anywhere else and this goes back to a long standing PUD where that number was created because of the nature of the whole PUD golf course and the open space so when you start talking about going over that number…7% over is a big variance. 120 feet, probably not, so you're caught in a little of a Catch-22 here because you're only adding maybe 120 square feet, but we have a walkway that obviously is going to be impacted by what's going on here, so that has to be reconciled.

Mr. Averill asked what's the 200 square feet of gravel, I didn't quite understand that.

Mr. Gutoskey answered when you're looking at the lot coverage is, it's including…[interrupted]

Mr. Averill stated he would include gravel.

Mr. Gutoskey responded I know.

Mr. Husteck responded gravel, if you're saying that it's a drive, it is impermeable, but gravel as a planting bed is permeable. It's not getting stamped down by cars or people, right? So what I'm saying is if they replaced that gravel or put mulch over it, then that would just be a planting bed and be seen as permeable. We could say move the gravel closer.

Mr. Averill responded I would have to argue the fact that if that was crushed limestone or if it was just an architectural or washed gravel. I would agree with you. And you could probably remove that from that calculation because it's a landscape feature and it's permeable.

Mr. Gutoskey said so it's figuring out 120 square feet of [interrupted].

Mr. Averill said yes, where do you lose it? And they will still have an issue with overage.

Mr. Gutoskey said right, but they are looking to get a variance to do that which is 120 square feet so we are already at status quo because of stuff that was permitted.

Mr. Lamanna clarified it was not permitted.

Mr. Gutoskey said well it was.

Mr. Lamanna clarified you can't go in and get a permit where the information on there doesn't accurately reflect what is going on.

Mr. Gutoskey agreed.

Mr. Averill said that's a consideration ?? it's an overage and it was a misrepresentation of what's there. I think that the 200 square foot of gravel, you can probably lose that from your calculation and put in your golf cart.

Mr. Gutoskey said you saw that 4 feet off that driveway or you find somewhere else where you can eliminate 120 or 820 square feet.

Mr. Soryal added which is what we just talked about.

Mr. Park said where we are now we still need an actual variance.

Mr. Averill said so the story goes, they came for a permit and they got denied because they're over and now they have to have something to bring to you which is the golf cart addition, but ultimately I think they can get around that square footage if they are issued a variance. They're applying a variance for that figure.

Mr. Gutoskey yes, but what we should do though if that is the case, we should look at this impervious area calculation, and go down through it and see what is not going to be improved. They're got gravel, a rock retaining wall, I got landscaping gravel, a stone retaining wall, I've got all those areas, so if we're going to take those out.

Mr. Averill added I wouldn't take those out.

Mr. Gutoskey said I'm just trying to get to a percentage.

Mr. Averill replied, I understand. Ultimately we don't know what they're going to do with their walk. If you're going to lose the wall and put in some flag stones or blue stones or something, to walk on, they you've just eliminated the whole walkway as well. And that too will modify the number.

Mr. Husteck said in some sense, at this point because we are in this existing condition proposing a new, do we really just want to go for a variance getting the number, whatever it is, either 7330 or 7130 and then we will design to these parameters. So when we submit our golfcart, we can show you, here's the net added.

Mr. Gutoskey and Mr. Soryal agreed that that makes sense.

Mr. Gutoskey asked so this is their limit, the 7330.

Mr. Lamanna said I wouldn't say 7330 [square feet] is their limit.

Mr. Soryal so take the 200 off of that.

Mr. Gutoskey said this would be what their max is. If they want to do that they have to stay at that number. If they want to do the addition.

Mr. Lamanna I wouldn't agree that it's the max. If this was approved on the basis of nobody thought that they were700 feet or whatever the amount is.

Mr. Gutoskey said they're over around 1300 now.

Mr. Lamanna said so they're 1400 over.

Mr. Gutoskey said yes, with the addition.

Mr. Lamanna said if somebody came in and said we built all this stuff and we're this much over, and now you want a variance for it, we'd probably say let's start looking at what you can remove to get it down. Maybe take away the pavilion or patio but a lot of this other stuff you're going to have to do without and get it down as low as you can. 37%, nobody would get 37%. You may have gotten 32% or 33%, on a good day. I don't think you'd ever get 37%. Otherwise, people come in and say it's this and somebody doesn't catch it and you don't give us an accurate figure, you are at your peril after that. We wouldn't consider a variance

Mr. Averill said these permits, the drive, walkway and the patio were all done with architectural plans and it was done prior to me. I don't take architectural plans. For something like this, when you get close, it's got to be a survey, so I don't think you'll see this happening again. You shouldn't. This is from 2022?21? I shouldn't say that you won't see that again, there was a lot of permits issued in the last 4 years. It's not impossible.

Mr. Lamanna said just because that's what they built, we didn't actually get accurate things.

Mr. Averill said permits were issued.

Mr. Lamanna said permits were issued to do something but no variance was granted because nobody ever identified the fact that they were seeking a variance. You needed a variance,

you didn't ask for it, you didn't get it, now we are here. It's not a *fete a complis* to say we have to go along with this. It certainly would be easier if it was a few per cent, at 7 we are

Mr. Averill said I agree there was a big mistake in accepting architectural plans in place of a survey.

Mr. Lamanna said I don't think anyone disagrees with you and this is a good reason why, because it's too easy to make mistakes. The applicant's obligation is to determine what they're doing and how they're doing and how they are going to meet the requirements.

Mr. Gutoskey asked what would you like to do?

Mr. Lamanna said unfortunately, we don't have the homeowners here.

Mr. Park said he is trying to get here. He is at a school meeting.

Mr. Lamanna said now we are talking about what can we get rid of to whack this number down. We have discussions with all kinds of people when they come in with a plan, whether they want to add something and we say if you want this you're going to have to give up something else.

Mr. Lewis added the challenge that I have is that Tanglewood's HOA caps lot coverage at 30%. They didn't need a variance when they came in the first time, the property owner, and it was submitted that the totals were 29.XX, under 30[%]. So, for whatever reason we now have an as built at 37[%] which is substantial and I'm not even sure that Tanglewood HOA has ever really been given that ?? . The original things that HOA signed off on were under 30 and surprise, it got built at 37 and the applicant goes back to the HOA to say will you approve my golf cart thing which kicks it up even higher and Tanglewood has no idea, my perception, that the HOA would have any idea that it got approved under 30[%], it's already at 37[%], the applicant is asking for more and what is it that Tanglewood HOA really signed off. So to go back to Mike's point, the starting point on this is 30%. Any inch beyond that, it'd be a great idea that the Tanglewood HOA ARB actually knew that and approved it and we have all that in writing, which we don't .

Mr. Gutoskey said I can answer that. The HOA is dated March 22, 26 and the survey is dated May 9, 2026. So the HOA had approved it before knowing.

Mr. Park responded I completely agree with you, the HOA should absolutely be aware. Where we stand right now thought is that if we weren't here for a golf cart garage, it is over through issued permits, so if the owner sold their house not knowing that he's over and someone bought the house we would have to remove it?…

Mr. Lamanna said somebody would be having a title claim, potentially, that's what would happen. Because you have a house and we tried to clean up all these things, we've had instances where people have had to come in because the title company looked at what they had and they had an encroachment and they did not have a variance for that and they were not going to write the title until they came in and got that resolved one way or another. That's what could happen to you,

somebody looks at this thing and says wait a minute, this is a non-conforming property. And the title companies are getting more particular about these things.

Mr. Park asked at what point would it come bac to the fact that Bainbridge did issue the permits. They did submit and I'm not

Mr. Lamanna said an application was put in that did not identify properly what the lot coverage was.

Mr. Park responded, correct, but one of the first questions is, are you aware of this zoning, so there's a little confusion there. If you're submitting and saying I wasn't aware that this is a variance, but yet if we just walked back and said just get rid of the golf cart garage, then.what did we just do here. The owner tried to come forward and now he's going to have his property taken apart.

Mr. Lamanna said my suggestion to the owners is you better find out where the property stands because where it stands right now, you've got a property that's got a lot coverage and there's not lot coverage and that's a potential title problem. Now how that would play out ultimately, it gets into some interesting questions about that.

Mr. Park said we are in a tough spot.

Mr. Lamanna responded you're asking me to make a judgement without actually going back and reviewing the record from the previous hearing and seeing exactly what the documents said and exactly what the record said. What led up to this thing and whether it was an honest error or whether, it.appears more that someone was trying to …. People come in and try to fog stuff by.

Mr. Park said I think that's the point is had they put the pavers in their backyard and done that an done that without permit, then it's so much easier to like you did this all wrong. But I think the thing is when we submitted for the golf cart, you reviewed it, we then stepped back and said do you want to go through the variance process or do we just let it go and they want to go through the variance process.

Mr. Lamanna said getting back to the original thing, we would be in a very difficult situation, you walk in and say I want this variance to build this thing and oh, by the way, your property is currently way out of conformity on lot coverage so we can't even think about adding another 120 until we resolve the issue with the other 1500, 1600 that you're over.

Mr. Lewis said this is the one that was submitted and it's at 6028 at 30%.

Mr. Park stated I know that he's willing to do what he can. I don't think he's going to be taking his back patio apart. I think he could get rid of the gravel, get rid of that back walk and really try to bring it in. We don't want to lose retaining walls, it's obviously retaining something. The back patio is a hangout.

Mr. Gutoskey asked does he have that many cars that he needs that big of a driveway?

Mr. Park replied he has 4 kids or 5 kids?

Mr. Gutoskey replied so he needs a parking garage.

Mr. Lamanna said I don't think the lot coverage limitations would work.

Ms. Nagusky asked how many cars does the garage hold?

Mr. Park answered 2. It is a decent-sized garage but it is 2 cars.

Mr. Averill added I don't want to complicate things, but you asked about the previous record. This is what they calculated, and this figure is obviously wrong, too. But to bring it back down…

Mr. Lamanna asked that's 30%?

Mr. Averill answered no. That was over 30%, so to bring it under 30% they proposed taking out the walkway. That is 216, so that is bringing it down under but ultimately this figure.

Board Discussion

Mr. Averill said From a real world, what they're building, sidewalk, If they're getting rid of the sidewalk they can eliminate that figure as well. eliminate the sidewalk square footage. You've got a figure that you guys can consider and the HOA too. And then at that point, if they have a figure that they can establish working with and they can eliminate another 128 and get me an application that still meets the requirements.

Mr. Soryal went on and said there are other areas here that's stone like the retaining wall, landscape with gravel 153 feet. There are a couple of other areas like the rock retaining wall is 120 feet. There's a lot of other stuff.

Mr. Lewis said right now they are 1,319 [square] feet over before the golf cart addition. 30%, and they're at 37[%], they're 1,319 feet over and if you're going to go over that, Tanglewood ARB and HOA is going to need to participate. Maybe they'll set their pain threshold and then you guys can decide, if it's at 32%, you decide what you're going to keep or do or get of and new plans get submitted, our zoning inspector gets to verify them and from there you go to the permitting process.

Mr. Gutoskey said adding to that it probably needs to be run back through the HOA because when they gave their approval I don't think they were aware that it was over.…

Mr. Park said I know that the owner is the one who has been communicating with them. I believe they have. We can easily get you a letter or if we don't out that letter then it's obvious that we make the revisions.

Mr. Lamanna said the big question we would ask is what can you do to get this number down.

Mr. Gutoskey asked what is the date on the email.

Mr. Park said we aren't trying to pull a fast one on you.

Mr. Lewis added to Mike's [Lamanna] point with the deeding and the title and the property, there's some housekeeping to do.

Mr. Lamanna we couldn't act on this application without resolving the whole issue. We can't say you're over on lot coverage and we are going to go deal with this sole sighted? No. We are going to deal with everything at once and then you're going to have a property that's in conformity. You know what's in and what's out.

Mr. Husteck asked if this was going to be tabled.

Mr. Lamanna said yes, tabled. I think that's best.

Mr. Soryal added I do think that Steve [Averill] is correct though, you have to go down this list item by item and see what is and isn't counted. There are some questionable numbers here.

Mr. Gutoskey added I agree with that. They work with Steve on determining that.

Mr. Lamanna said exactly what's in and what's out and understanding the overview on this is we're at 37%, that's what we're looking at from the size. We'll probably give you some break because of the past history on this thing but we'd like to push the number down as far as we can.

Mr. Park added I think that the surveyor was just following our directions and to list everything.

Mr. Lamanna said let them start with everything in there and then we can say this isn't counting but I think the owners have to go back and decide how do we get this number down. We are far beyond what would have ever been knowingly approved. There will probably be some consideration for the fact that a plan was submitted but the plan doesn't represent what was built.

Mr. Averill offered to get together and go through the surveyor's list and see what we can do.

Mr. Park added and we will get the HOA letter.

Mr. Park and Mr. Huseck thanked the board.

Application 2026-9 – 17385 Long Meadow Trail

Mr. Lamanna moved to table application 2026-9 until the next regularly scheduled meeting for collection of additional information.

Mr. Gutoskey seconded the motion.

Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Ms. Nagusky, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Application 2026-10 for Gretchan Francis for 19041 Depot Road

The applicant is requesting multiple area variances including minimum parking spaces, rear yard setback, and landscaping. The property is located in the MUP zone.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Jason Baylor from Payne & Payne Builders and Gretchan Francis, property owner. Let the record reflect that they were duly sworn.

Ms. Francis began by giving some history on the vacant land. It is right behind Geauga Lake Park. I grew up going to Geauga Lake Park and it is very historic. This is the site of the old train station that used to bring vacationers to Geauga Lake. The rear of the property had some old train tracks, and they were actually just removed this year, I wish they would have kept them, but I understand there's some rails to trails conversion so that's exciting as well. It is an historic location. I did quite a bit of research not only with the local historical societies but also searched the National Archives to try to get the original floor plans for the original train station. There were actually 2 train stations on this location. The original one, which is very ornate, it was built in the late 1900s [1800s], we think it burned down because it only stood for about 20 years. In the early 1900s there was a replacement building that was built, it was a stucco building. Not as ornate. This stood until the early 2000s, and it was demolished. I bought this vacant land from a widow of a train enthusiast who owned it for many years. She was a widow and she didn't know what she was going to do with it so I bought it from her about 4 years ago.

What I would like to do with the property is to rebuild the original train station, the very ornate one that was built in the late in the late 1900s [1800s] and I would like to use it as an office building. I own a very small insurance agency; we only have 4 employees. We have nearly zero foot traffic because the type of insurance we sell is a very, very niche type of insurance that we sell to financial institutions across the country. We do not sell home and auto, we don't need a lot. There's no one who comes to our office. We need very limited parking. I love the idea of rebuilding an old structure for current use. So over the variances that we are requesting today are to preserve the historical nature but also make it accessible for today's use.

This is a rendering of the current plans that we have.

Ms. Nagusky asked if that's the front of the building and that's the rear?

Ms. Francis replied that it used to be the front of the building that was the track side. Now we would consider the front of the building the roadside. So, instead of saying front and

back, because we've been through this over the last few years, saying front and back, we say track side and roadside. The left picture would be the roadside and the right picture is the track side. The track elevation is higher so from the track side you only see one level with the little loft area. From the roadside, you would see the walk-out part. You would see the 2-story.

Mr. Gutoskey said and it's a pretty severe drop-off there?

Mr. Baylor answered it's about 10 feet. A couple of the notes I had to share. Did she answer your question before I pivot? [speaking to Ms. Nagusky].

Ms. Nagusky answered yes.

Mr. Baylor continued, I wanted to go over the 3 variances we are seeking, a couple of practical difficulties that go along with it. The three variances are rear yard setback. We are putting the train station back where it originally was and where it originally was 20 feet off of the rear setback where 60 feet would be for the ordinance. That would be a 40 foot variance at the rear.

For parking spaces, that's a factor of how much space is inside. That should be 10, we have 8. I'll tie that back to some of the comments that Gretchan had about the nature of her business and so forth.

The last piece is landscaping. There is a requirement for some landscaping along the road and again this ties to a lot of grade going on and we had to do a lot of things to provide accessibility and to modernize the building and the site. The old site was essentially gravel with a building in the middle of it. We have accessible parking, and ramps to the lower level and upper level. None of that was really accommodated for back in the day.

So, between the lot depth which is unusually shallow, the building, just being what it was, and the topography where it changes 10 feet over that short distance from the road back to the tracks, we've had some practical difficulties that we were designing around all the while providing modern accessibility.

We are asking for 3 variances that would allow us to proceed with putting the train station back to where it was.

Mr. Lamanna asked if Mr. Baylor could widen the view of the property and Mr. Baylor accommodated the request.

Ms. Francis explained it's this little triangular area right here.

Mr. Baylor said the hand [cursor of the computer on screen] is where the station goes.

Ms. Francis explained this whole part up here is unusable space. So we would be using that space there.

Mr. Lamanna asked about a small spot of property and Ms. Francis explained it was part of the green space.

Mr. Baylor said that is owned by ICP.

Mr. Lamanna asked if the small piece of land now has a road right of way running through it now. This shows one parcel?

Ms. Francis said it does. It's about an acre, but the usable space is about half of an acre.

Mr. Baylor answered 1.2[acres] and change.

Ms. Francis said we would only be using this small triangular piece.

Ms. Nagusky asked if the land is a buildable lot.

Mr. Averill responded they're trying to.

Ms. Nagusky clarified saying is there enough land there to build on it without a variance.

Mr. Baylor explained that it is and went to the screen to show some important information. This is the buildable area, front setback is 15 feet, rear setback is 60 feet, we would be essentially right on top of the road and whatever you can fit in this space. To give some idea of portion, you couldn't build something the size of a train station anymore. Something might be able to fit there.

Mr. Gutoskey said I have a question for the chair. If there's an area, if that building fits in that buildable area on the lot, is it a practical difficulty for a variance. When I looked at it, the building fits in there.

Mr. Lamanna asked including the setback area.

Mr. Lewis responded yes, the setback area. Without a variance requirement and the parking

Mr. Baylor offered, you're proposing something like this?

Mr. Gutoskey replied like this. The side yard is 0 and I think, correct me if I'm wrong, Steve [Averill], if this wasn't in the MUP, you probably couldn't build on this lot because you're front setback. There would be no buildable area.

Mr. Averill responded correct.

Mr. Gutoskey continued since it's in MUP with the 15 foot front setback, if there's room to fit the building within that buildable area with the 60 foot rear setback, the 15 foot front setback, and the 0 side yard.

Ms. Francis responded if that's possible, the elevation there would not allow us to make it historical. We are using the elevation of the lot, maybe we can go back to the original.

Mr. Gutoskey replied I understand but is it a practical difficulty or a want.

Ms. Nagusky asked if that was the slope there.

Ms. Francis replied yes. We are using the same slope by putting it in the same exact spot we can use the same slope and build it as close to the original as we could. If we moved the location, it removes it's historic character.

Mr. Baylor added at that point it is 15 feet off the road.

Mr. Lamanna offered I would like to have this more that 15 feet off of the road. There is a curve there and the road is not real wide and there's enough traffic in there and it's probably going to get worse or be like it is now with Pettibone closed. This would look weird 15 feet off the road.
Mr. Gutoskey replied but the other thing is too, if it wasn't in MUP you couldn't even build on this lot.

Mr. Lamanna responded now we get caught up in the arguments that went on and on over the lot that's next to the bank in Tanglewood where people were, but on a much smaller parcel. There are issues associated with how that lot got created anyway. Just because there's not much land left that you can build on doesn't necessarily mean something is unbuildable. There are other considerations happening.

Ms. Francis replied if this were any other building, if I were building a coffee shop, that would be a reasonable ask, but I think [interrupted]

Mr. Lamanna said given what we are trying to accomplish here, I think we have to look at it as you're going out of your way to actually construct something that is a semi-historical reproduction and to do that you actually have to go through more trouble in a lot of ways because of the elevation change to be the way it was because of the nature of the way that land was there with the tracks up here and the station was actually built from the ground down here to get up to the track platform. Because of the fact that the track area is never going to be anything. It might become a trail someday but it's basically a non-build area so it's better to be closer to that and away from Depot Road.

Mr. Averill stated this is a trail attached to a maintenance route.

Ms. Francis said I think it's the City of Solon that ?? … the trail. I actually contacted Norfolk Southern and asked to buy the piece behind my lot to make my lot deeper so I wouldn't have to ask for a variance but they declined.

Ms. Nagusky had a couple of questions about a timing issue. The permit from the, is it ODNR.

Mr. Baylor responded Ohio EPA.

Ms. Nagusky continued are you going to be able, the effective date was January 10, and you have to have, construction has to be initiated within 18 months from the effective date.

Ms. Francis said I think we have until October and we've already contacted the EPA about an extension. This has been quite a project. We've been working on this for 2 years just to get to this point, between looking at elevations, going through all the historical record, getting EPA approval, we had to do soil testing, we had to do a whole bunch of things so when we finally got that, we do know it's about to expire in a couple of months

Mr. Baylor added we reached out to them a couple of months ago and they seemed amicable. They were asking how much time we needed.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if that was for a sewer system.

Mr. Baylor said that is for the waste water.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if it was strictly on lot or is it off lot discharge?

Mr. Baylor answered off lot discharge.

Ms. Nagusky continued, the driveway permit had a time on it too.

Mr. Baylor answered that the driveway was already there.

Ms. Nagusky said I like the fact that you're trying to preserve the historical significance and that you're being sustainable so along those lines, have you thought about having all the parking behind the building so there's no visible parking. Is that possible?

Ms. Francis answered I don't think we have it behind the building.

Mr. Baylor added with 20 feet setbacks, it would be a small situation there.

Ms. Francis continued explaining that there is parking over to the right. It is a bunch of trees so our understanding is that it would be sort of hidden.

Mr. Baylor asked are you talking about that.

Ms. Nagusky replied you only have about 8 parking spaces.

Ms. Francis said there's going to be pavers under there so it will look like grass. The two in the front there you won't really see. That would be for overflow if it was necessary and the

ones on the right, it's all trees over there, I don't know if we could drive up and around to the back.

Mr. Baylor added there's just no where to navigate a car back there. It's 20 feet. I think the biggest challenge, let's say we could keep the elevation, if you look up here for a second, there's a change of another 6 feet just here and we did this long ramp just so we could get to the back and make the distance between and here. So the parking lot is sitting down a little bit from where the level of the tracks is back here. I think if you could drive there, we still wouldn't have a place to put cars back there, it's too narrow.

Ms. Nagusky replied Okay. And then what is projected to be on the back side of this in the future because you're asking for a variance on the rear setback.

Ms. Francis answered there is a landscape plan.

Mr. Gutoskey added they're talking about putting a hike/bike trail in there.

Mr. Baylor said it's a rails to trails.

Mr. Lamanna said the other side is residential.

Ms. Francis said it's all dedicated green space behind that rails to trails. From what I understand, it's not buildable. It's a lot of wetlands and from what I understand, it was always meant to be a buffer between the homes and the amusement park.

Mr. Lamanna said the railroad

Ms. Nagusky stated my final question is about lighting and how you're minimizing it. As a lay person, I'm just interested in minimizing night glare. What steps are you taking to minimize it?

Mr. Baylor answered in the lighting package, it looks like you have it, these fixtures are full cut off, they are downward projecting, the minimum requirements that we have because of the commercial space, we've got to have lighting in the parking lot and the walkways and things. Those are all calculated at that fancy chart graph thing is [photometric plans]. It tells you about how many lumens are in each of those little quadrants. And so the idea with designing the lighting proposed that it's all facing down, it's not projecting outward and hopefully we're keeping it at minimum levels. We don't have a lot of control over that because of the commercial requirements.

Ms. Nagusky answered Okay. The original train station probably had no lighting.

Ms. Francis added probably candles.

Mr. Soryal asked are you going to occupy the building.

Ms. Francis answered we did build it as the walkout is separate from the top, but that is specifically because there's no room for a staircase. I really only need to occupy half of it, but I don't have plans currently to lease it out.

Mr. Soryal responded but that could be a problem when you go, the parking spaces being short.

Ms. Francis answered potentially. I only have four employees and one lives in California.

Mr. Soryal added but if you lease the other space, we don't know what kind of business will go in there.

Ms. Francis said I don't have any plans to currently but the way it's built, it is built as two separate spaces.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Mr. Averill what other uses could go in this building.

Mr. Averill answered that's a loaded question, I mean it's commercial. I can give you a list.

Mr. Soryal asked, the amount of parking spaces is based on use, right?

Mr. Averill responded yes.

Mr. Gutoskey added so down the road if it gets sold and somebody wants to do something else, they may be short on parking. Do you know how the septic was sized, is it 500 gallons per day?

Ms. Francis replied the size is based on drains and faucets.

Mr. Baylor said I thought it was based on occupancy.

Mr. Gutoskey said it's based on occupancy. So like for the way the EPA looks at it for an office is 20 gallons per employee. Based on the building code, what is the maximum occupancy for the building?

Ms. Francis answered it looks like a big building up here, but it's actually a very small building. I think it's 1400 square feet per floor.

Mr. Baylor corrected 1137. 1,137 square feet on the first floor and a little bit less because the foundation takes up space on the lower level. You're looking at something around 2,400 square feet. 2300 square feet?

Mr. Gutoskey asked and whatever you've got on the third floor.

Mr. Baylor answered storage- it's attic space in there. It's interesting that got roped into the total parking square footage would be occupying the attic space which is accessible only by a decorative staircase and there's kind of some storage up there. It's not full height.

Mr. Gutoskey said it says on your plans an occupant load of 27.

Mr. Baylor said code says you can get 27 people in there.

Mr. Gutoskey added that's why I think it's sized for 500 [gallons per day septic] because EPA requires 20 gallons per employee for office. Fire suppression, it says it's automatically sprinklers?

Ms. Francis said if it needs to be sprinklers, it will be sprinklers.

Mr. Baylor said I don't remember.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if they had the letter from Assistant Fire Chief Bill Lovell. Because apparently from what he said [interrupted]

Mr. Baylor responded that Asst. Chief Lovell has not responded to his inquiries. Since I received a copy of the letter, I haven't heard back. I will continue to try to do that.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if they saw his letter response, wanting a hydrant, they usually want alarms.

Mr. Baylor replied I don't know how to accommodate it with the well service that we have. I wanted to talk to him about his expectations.

Mr. Gutoskey added there is a proposed development right across the street that's probably going to have water going through it. Maybe they could extend a hydrant from there.

Mr. Baylor responded that would be absolutely possible. I would love for some progress across the street.

Mr. Gutoskey said I understand that there are plans submitted for the property across the street. How many, Steve?

Mr. Averill responded 72.

Mr. Baylor said he thought the 72 was further down.

Mr. Gutoskey said no, it's pretty much right across the street.

Mr. Averill said its on the corner of Depot and Big Dipper.

Mr. Gutoskey said it's across from the western part of your property.

Mr. Baylor said I think it's down here further.

Mr. Gutoskey said it's right in there then it comes further east.

Mr. Baylor said that would be amazing.

Mr. Gutoskey suggested that they talk to Assistant Chief Lovell about the hydrant and sprinklers.

Mr. Baylor responded I will continue to pursue him, I just haven't heard back yet.

Ms. Nagusky asked if they thought there might be people interested in seeing the sight because of the historical significance and would you consider putting up some signs about the history of the train depot?

Ms. Francis responded that she would absolutely love that. While they were ripping out the train tracks I asked them for some pieces that maybe we could incorporate into a wall piece or landscaping and I think they left some for us on the property. I have quite a bit of information already about the train station. I never went to that train station and I never rode that train, but I went to Geauga Lake as a kid and I think it's very significant for that era. Anything that we can do that is historic would be welcomed.

Mr. Soryal asked there's no way to add anymore parking, right? You've done everything.

Ms. Francis responded unless we can acquire that little piece next to us.

Mr. Lamanna said that's got to be attached to something.

Ms. Francis said it's kind of land locked, because the railroad is right behind it and the road is right in front of it. So, if I could acquire that extra space, I would be happy to have more parking spots.

Mr. Lamanna asked if that was a bigger lot.

Mr. Gutoskey added when the railway right of way went past this site, it got narrower because it's actually a 100 feet except in front of this site.

Mr. Lamanna said Depot Road hooks back and eventually, it's going to pinch it off.

Ms. Francis added this little piece that we're talking about that I would love to acquire, the reason that is the way it is, Depot Road used to go this way and at some point, I don't know when, 50 years or whatever, they moved it up here and created this little unusable piece of land.

Mr. Lamanna stated that before they relocated Depot Road it used to go right in front of Geauga Lake [Park]. It came out across from the shopping center is then they moved it behind Target. I don't know if they did anything on the other side.

Ms. Francis responded they did. You can actually see [trails off].

Mr. Gutoskey said if you go straight, did they remodel for when they did Seaworld?

Ms. Francis said Seaworld, I think it was.

Mr. Averill clarified that the land in question is part of ICP's property which is locked up in a CJE [Consent Judgement Entry]. You're not going to acquire that property.

Ms. Francis said I can certainly reach out to them. In fact, I think I did at one point.

Mr. Lamanna asked if it was a separate parcel.

Ms. Francis said this land you see here is actually part of this. It is not two separate parcels.

Mr. Lamanna said oh, because they put the road through it.

Mr. Averill stated that this is part of all of this and it is all one piece.

Mr. Lamanna added even though it is not contiguous anymore and they should have separate parcel numbers.

Mr. Averill said there are use specifics that were established in the CJE.

Ms. Francis said what I would like to do is give ICP the little hook and then give them this.

Mr. Baylor said Steve said they're not going to let you do it.

Mr. Lamanna said the township would have to approve it. I would be complicated. It makes sense because you have a piece that's got the same problem. It's a piece of land and the road now runs through the middle of it.

Ms. Francis asked if it could be acquired through imminent domain.

Mr. Lamanna responded the thing is you don't own that property. This is, a lot of things go back and you'll see a lot of places are platted to the center line in the road. Well, you don't own that property anymore. That is dedicated public road. It belongs to the municipality. Now whether they took it by actual imminent domain process or whether it even matters at this point in time, I don't think it does. They've had it for so long so really it should not be too ?? because they're not contiguous. I don't think you're actually supposed to have permanent parcels that are

not contiguous. It's certainly a little late to create on enow now that we've gone back and cleaned up the ones that aren't.

Ms. Francis said I can certainly approach ICP about acquiring that small, little piece that would give us more room. There are a lot of trees there and I don't know if we want to take them down, but it would give me an alternative.

Mr. Lamanna said from a long term planning standpoint, I don't know how complicated it would be, but there would have to be a small amendment to the properties within the CJE and take that out and fill in the other piece. .

Ms. Francis asked, aren't they selling off parcels, couldn't they just parcel that off and sell it?

Mr. Averill responded there are very specific land uses that are relevant to everything to that whole project. Across from you is going to be residential over commercial.

Mr. Lamanna said it's part of the CJE. What would have to happen is you'd have to enter into an agreement to swap and then the township would have to amend the CJE and take that piece of property into it and take that piece of property out of it. Then that piece of property would be subject to regular zoning.

Ms. Francis asked with that being said, my property moves around?, if there were ever utilities on the other side that actually could benefit me like if there was a sewer tie in over there.

Mr. Gutoskey responded there probably will be when they construct those. It's a matter of whether or not there's an easement.

Mr. Lamanna added that if you own the land and they run the sewer through it, you can get accessed It's a weird situation because this is what happens when things get built and relocated and sometimes they don't really do what they should. It's the way things were done for 100 years and now it's a problem because of the public roads and people think it's part of their property, but it's not. Someone goes to get their deed and it looks like it's part of your property but it really isn't. It belongs to …

It would be a bit complicated, but I don't see that anybody would have some sort of structural problem with doing it. You've got 2 isolated pieces of property and they don't really make sense where they are now, but maybe you'll combine this and make one single parcel here and we'll take this property out of this part and put this property in here. It's such tiny little pieces.

Ms. Francis asked if they thought that kind of swap would be required to get any type of approval for our request.

Mr. Lamanna responded no, because it would take, the administrative details would take a while. I think it would be a sensible thing to do. If you have to add more parking spaces, you'll wish you had more property there.

Mr. Soryal added it's benefitting to you.

Ms. Francis asked if anyone had any additional questions or if they'd like to see more photographs.

Mr. Gutoskey said I have a question. On the grade, so when I look at the topo, there's about 6 foot difference, give or take, from the road back to where the building is. When you look at those elevations, how did you figure the height. I think what's jacking this thing out of the ground is just going more to the modern 8-9 foot poured foundation and that headroom versus the height.

Ms. Francis answered we think the original walkout part was not a full 8 or 9 feet.

Mr. Gutoskey said yes, I don't see how with the grade on the site.

Ms. Francis continued, we did have to adjust certain things to make them usable for today's use, but

Mr. Baylor added we stepped down ?? part of the building.

Mr. Gutoskey said I think that's part of what's driving part of your grade problem, because I see your 8 feet higher on the track side to get to your floor.

Ms. Francis responded we were trying to deal with water run-off. We didn't want water running into the building.

Mr. Gutoskey added I think that's what's driving a lot of your grading and ramps because of where that floor elevation ends up.

Ms. Francis said I think we did a good job of making sure the ramp was not only an easy, accessible slope, but also setting it along the perimeter so it didn't detract from the building. Similarly, we made sure that the handicap was on the side so you could access the top of the building as well as the bottom. We did try to keep the view, what we would see from the road, as clear and? As possible.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if the basement was handicapped accessible. I think you have to be 5% or less grade.

Ms. Francis responded 1 foot for every 20 feet. And if it goes higher than that I have to have a rail. We tried to make the majority of it 1 foot to 20 foot so that we did not have to have a rail.

Mr. Gutoskey asked what about the landscaping in front of the building. You're asking for a variance for landscaping in front of the building.

Mr. Baylor responded we have considered what the landscape plan would look like and [interrupted]

Ms. Francis said there's no existing landscaping at the front of the property. There will be landscaping around the building as well as the back of the property. Along the road, first of all we want to make the building viewable from the road. Second, we are concerned about salt and debris and the viability of actually planting anything along the front part of the property. Other than existing trees that are there, there's no true landscaping.

Mr. Gutoskey asked what is the requirement of the landscaping in front of the building.

Mr. Averill responded that it is in their packets. It's pretty specific and what the separation is between the different types of plants. From my point of view, I would probably want to have a landscape architect approve to our code and confirm and have them sign it.

Ms. Francis said we have a landscaping plan with the front landscaping. We thought that it would add significant cost and might not be viable considering the road salt. I want to add this is a very small building but it's also very expensive and to eliminate some trees that might be killed by the salt, we thought we would ask for the variance and if it is denied then we will have to do it.

Mr. Gutoskey stated there is a ton of landscaping behind the building.

Ms. Francis said that's because of the trail. If you would allow us less landscaping around the back we would be okay with that. It was always open to the track side, it was always the view. So this was the front landscaping bed.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if that much landscaping is required in the rear per our code.

Mr. Averill answered that is what is in the regulations.

Mr. Baylor added the idea was, working with the setback we had, we challenged Mike, the landscape architect, to meet the code back there.

Mr. Gutoskey asked what you're showing on that is what is required to meet code.

Mr. Baylor and Ms. Francis confirmed back and front.

Mr. Gutoskey said that section to the right helps screen the parking lot, plus it's probably lower than the parking lot anyway.

Ms. Francis explained we are not opposed to the front landscaping, we were looking at it as it may not live and we're paying for it.

Mr. Lamanna added you can get salt resistant things. There are definitely things you don't want to put there, certain fir trees and such that are decimated by salt. There are other things that are a little more resistant.

Mr. Averill added it says 1 large or 3 small trees shall be planted and 5 shrubs shall be planted. It doesn't say it has to be a specific.

Mr. Baylor asked if it was per linear foot or something.

Mr. Averill responded 1 large or 3 small trees shall be planted in the front or side planting areas for each 30 linear feet of ???

Ms. Nagusky commented, if they have trees existing…

Mr. Averill said they can incorporate that. There are some size requirements here.

Mr. Gutoskey mentioned during the grading most of those are going to get wiped out.

Ms. Francis said there are 1 or 2 trees over to the right that we were going to keep. Over to the left, on the left side of the driveway, I don't think there are any there.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak about this.

Mr. Lewis said the pictures showed a fair amount of landscaping in the front, trees along the front.

Mr. Soryal said that is what is required.

Ms. Francis responded we are going to keep the ones in the back and not have these here in the front because of the location. It could be hard to pull out and see around them and they are so close to the road.

Mr. Baylor said if we plant stuff here, we can't see the cars here, it's a bit of a blind spot.

Ms. Francis added there are some trees existing along the front that we would keep those.

Mr. Lamanna said it might be nice to but some closer to the parking lot and away from the road. Some shrubbery so it's not obscuring the view, but it screens the parking lot.

Ms. Nagusky asked if it is being proposed that we do not accept the variance for the landscaping. Or write a condition? How would you phrase that we are not accepting the variance for the landscaping?

Mr. Lamanna responded instead of having the plan that was up there, we would substitute here. If you planted lower shrubs in here, then come out here, you're not trying to look through trees across from the corner.

Mr. Lewis asked if Depot Road had ditches on the side of the road.

Mr. Baylor said there is next to nothing here. There is decent coverage.

Mr. Lewis said sometimes the ditches act as a really good place for the snowplows. They come down the road, the salt, the snow all goes into a ditch like a catch basin so the front of the property is not all salted up.

Mr. Baylor said there is really no ditch at this point. As we go down this way there is a ditch that starts to form.

Discussion

Ms. Nagusky stated that I am trying to figure out if we want to include some landscaping in this, how do we word it so that…Do they have to come back with a landscaping plan or could we phrase it somehow that there is a plan.

Board discussion

Motion 2026-10 19041 Depot Road

With respect to case 2026-10, Mr. Lamanna moves to grant the applicant the following requested variances with respect to the construction of a building on the Geauga Lake Train Depot.

1. Minimum rear yard setback from 60 feet to 20 feet, a variance of 40 feet..
2. A reduction of the minimum number of required parking spaces from 10 to 9, a variance of 1 as shown as shown in the exhibit that is being attached hereto.
3. With respect to the required front/street side landscaping, a variance from the requirements reducing the amount of landscaping to that that is shown and agrees by the applicant on a document known as the "front landscaping plan" dated today [August 20, 2026] and initialed by the board and the applicant.
4. There are certain requirements the applicant will resolve with Assistant Fire Chief regarding hydrants and alarms in the building.

Based on the following findings of fact:

1. Practical Difficulty. This is a very unusual and narrow property located on a steep rise in gradient from Depot Street to the former railroad right of way. The building is also being designed to be architecturally similar to the historical train station that was once located on this property and for that reason it is being located close to where the former railroad tracks were located which is to the back of the property which is the reason for the reduction in the minimum rear yard [setback].

a. Additionally this moves the building farther from Depot Street than would be otherwise permitted which is also advantageous and more consistent to what the zoning was trying to accomplish.

2. That part of the building, near the former railroad right of way, which is being converted into a multi-use pathway and will not be developed beyond that. The land further beyond that, because of its nature and development occurring on that parcel, will not ever be developed so there will be no potential adverse affects on other property owners in that area.
3. This is a very uniquely shaped and sized piece of property. The applicant is constructing a very unusual building that fits with the character of the property because of that and because of the shape and size, it is necessary to have these variances in order to make feasible use of the property and to construct a building that has this unique character and thus the practical difficulty and the fact that this will not adversely change the character of the neighborhood or adversely affect any neighboring properties, these variances should be granted.
4. If the building was located closer to the road, because of the curve of the road it would also create additional problems for traffic on the road or trying to enter from the property onto Depot Road, allowing the building to be set back farther to the rear.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Ms. Nagusky, aye; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Application 2026-11 for Lee Buck and Collins Construction for 7415 Samuel Lord Drive

The applicant is requesting an area variance for an accessory structure size. The property is located in an R-3A District.

Ms. Nagusky recused herself due to living on the same street as the appellant.

Mr. Lamanna swore in Mr. Andrew Collins representing Collins Construction. Let the record reflect that he was duly sworn.

Mr. Collins began by stating he is representing the homeowner, Lee and Vicki Buck. They are looking to demolish their existing shed and replace it with a larger one in order to hide all of the things in their driveway. The house has virtually no storage. It is a raised ranch with a garage underneath and the garage is very tight. They are doing the best they can but they also have a boat and many other things that sit in the driveway. They also each have 2 children from previous marriages so there are 5 cars in the driveway most of the time. They are looking to get some of the clutter out of the driveway. They want to put in a 40x30 building and the only thing that is not in conformity is the size, we are looking at 1200 [square feet] versus 896 [square feet].

Mr. Soryal stated that the existing shed is beautiful. The existing shed is as old as the house and it's a beautiful shed.

Mr. Collins responded yes, it is beautiful but it just is not big enough and the inside is really falling apart. They would love to keep it but it isn't big enough for them.

Mr. Lamanna asked what is the size of the existing shed.

Mr. Collins answered the existing shed is 13x18.

Mr. Gutoskey said he did a search on GIS of the Samuel Lord subdivision and there's really no buildings this big as far as outbuildings. There are a couple detached garages but other than that there's just small sheds. This is what shows up on the GIS, I'm assuming it's permitted, but if you look on the GIS, there are really no big outbuildings in this development.

Mr. Collins replied a couple houses on the other side of the road, they have a massive 2 story detached garage.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Mr. Collins to show the location on the screen.

Mr. Collins located the property.

Mr. Gutoskey asked Mr. Averill to look at the size of the building on the Realink website. The building is 864 square feet.

Mr. Collins said it is also 2 stories.

Mr. Gutoskey said that's the footprint.

Mr. Gutoskey said I looked and there's maybe a couple more and all the rest are sheds. 100-120 square foot sheds.

Mr. Collins said the problem is the lot has so many trees and he has a water feature that the previous owner put in and built by himself. That takes up a good amount of their back yard. He's just stacking stuff down the driveway, he's not really able to hide anything. He doesn't want to look at it and I'm sure the other neighbors don't want to look at it either.

Mr. Gutoskey said I think one of the corner lots has an outbuilding for a garage. Almost across the street maybe.'

Mr. Soryal asked if they were extending the driveway too.

Mr. Collins answered, the driveway is gravel and it's already existing that goes to that shed. Our plan is to put the building right there so we're not doing any driveway at all.

Mr. Averill said 31x36 according to this.

Mr. Gutoskey said 1,116 and that puts it right under 25% over. Who knows what year that was done...2022. I'm assuming we permitted that.

Mr. Averill responded it's probably because it's a larger parcel.

Mr. Gutoskey said it's a bigger lot. We have that sliding scale.

Mr. Averill said they are allowed that.

Mr. Gutoskey said 3 acres, 3.6, because we are on the sliding scale with outbuildings.

Mr. Soryal?? Asked how high is the building going to be.

Mr. Collins answered we planned it to be 12 foot high with a 6-12 pitch.

Mr. Soryal asked if that was in the acceptable range.

Mr. Averill answered yes, 28 [feet maximum allowed].

Mr. Soryal asked if the shed could be seen from the street now.

Mr. Collins replied not really, no. He does have his boat parked in front of it now. But if that wasn't there you'd be able to see a little.

Mr. Soryal responded but the building will be behind that.

Mr. Collins said yes, it will start where that opening is and go back towards the woods.

Mr. Gutoskey asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak on the matter.

Mr. Lewis asked if this was an all metal building.

Mr. Collins confirmed that it was.

Mr. Lewis asked about the roof and siding.

Mr. Collins confirmed that it was.

Mr. Lewis continued that he got curious about the LRV. Do you know about that? The Light Reflective Value. When you have a metal building or metal roof, the sun is going to reflect as it passes and that goes to the neighboring lots. If the color of your roof is black, on a scale of 1-100, that is a very small reflective, if you are white or silver, it is a very high reflective. I think aout what is the impact of an all metal building on the adjacent property owners. I was looking, we don't really deal with color as a BZA board, but I was looking to see if there was any definitions of what it is going to be.

Mr. Collins stated that he wasn't sure if there were any specifications that you wanted us to change so we are a blank slate on basically black roof with white sides, but obviously we can change that. He would prefer greys to keep it a little more close to the house.

Mr. Lewis replied I can't suggest what color to use, but I can suggest that the lighter the color the more reflective and the more potential impact it has on the neighbors.

Mr. Collins said the house across the street has a black metal roof and they don't have any problems.

Mr. Lewis said that's a really low reflective value.

Mr. Collins said we will keep that in mind.

Mr. Lamanna asked what color is the house.

Mr. Collins responded it's a medium grey. We would like it to match the house.

Mr. Gutoskey asked about drainage, downspouts, gutters, where are you going to direct the drainage.

Mr. Collins responded all of the property pitches right towards the back. He said there is a swale and everything is directed back to that.

Mr. Gutoskey said that is the other thing, no living in it, no business run out of it.

Mr. Collins answered no, he is in dental sales so I don't think he's running a business. He likes his hobbies.

Mr. Lamanna stated we do this as a standard thing when we get larger buildings. Some people decide they will have an in-law suite.

Mr. Collins said we are only running electrical to it.

<u>Motion BZA 2026-11 7415 Samuel Lord Drive</u>

Mr. Lamanna moved that the BZA grant the applicant a variance for the purposes of constructing a 1200 square foot, 40x30, outbuilding according to the plans submitted. A variance of 304 square feet. The applicant has agreed that the building color will be similar to the house and the roof will be black or very close to black.

The reasons for granting this variance are

1. It is not an unreasonable size variance. Even though it is one of the larger outbuildings in the area, where it is located and going to be near a group home facility and adjacent property, it's not going to alter the character of the neighborhood.

2. It will not be troublesome and the overall size will not adversely affect the neighborhood.
3. The building will not cause the owner to go over acceptable lot coverage and the additional 304 square feet will not significantly increase that.
4. Its location is such that it will not impact the adjacent property owners.
5. Accessory structures of this size can not be used for any living purposes, temporary or longer. It can also not be used for the conduct of any business unless otherwise specifically authorized by zoning regulations or by a separate variance.

Mr. Lewis seconded the motion.

Mr. Gutoskey, aye; Mr. Lewis, aye; Mr. Lamanna, aye; Ms. Nagusky, recuse; Mr. Soryal, aye.

Since there was no further Testimony, the public hearing was closed at 10:05 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Brent Barr, Alternate, Member, Board of Zoning Appeals

Ted DeWater

Ted DeWater, Member, Board of Zoning Appeals

Joe Gutoskey

Joe Gutoskey, Member, Board of Zoning Appeals

Todd Lewis, Vice-Chair, Board of Zoning Appeals

Michael Lamanna

Michael Lamanna, Chairman, Board of Zoning Appeals

Beth Nagusky

Beth Nagusky, Alternate Member, Zoard of Zoning Appeals

Emeil Soryal

Emeil Soryal, Board of Zoning Appeals

Attested to by: Allana Hennette

Allana Hennette, Secretary
Board of Zoning Appeals

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 17, 2026

AUDIO RECORDING ON FILE