

**CAUCUS PRIOR TO STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING &  
BUILDING CODE APPEALS**

**Meeting of  
June 22, 2016  
7:30 p.m.**

Board of Appeals Members Present: Richard Baldin, John Rusnov, David Houlé, Kenneth Evans  
Administration: Assistant Law Director Daniel J. Kolick  
Building Department Representative: Mike Miller  
Recording Secretary: Kathryn Zamrzla

The Board members discussed the following:

**NEW APPLICATIONS**

**1) CHESTNUT LAKE APARTMENTS/Gene J. Stancak with Adam Building Company LLC, Representative**

Requesting a variance from Zoning Code Section 1270.08 (a), which requires that apartment developments maintain enclosed garages at a rate of two (2) spaces per dwelling unit and where the applicant is proposing the demolition and non-replacement of all apartment carports; property located at 17721 Whitney Road, PPN's 395-16-002, 395-16-006, 395-16-007, 395-16-008, 395-16-009, zoned RMF – 1.

**The Board noted that this item has been taken off the agenda until the July 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.**

**2) WILLIAM THOMAS HOMES, INC./Thomas Simon, Representative**

Requesting a maximum 17' Rear Yard Separation variance from Zoning Code Section 1253.11 (b) (3), which requires a 50' minimum Rear Yard Separation of adjacent units in a cluster development and where a minimum of 33' Rear Yard Separation of two adjacent units is proposed; properties located at 13121 Northpoint Circle, Sublot 23, PPN 398-12-014 and 13145 Northpointe Circle, Sublot 26, PPN 398-12-048, zoned RT – C.

**The Board noted that they have granted several variances for this development in the past, and it does not appear to be anything unusual.**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**3) MITCHELL'S ICE CREAM/Matt Plecnik of Dimit Architects, Rep.**

- a) Requesting a 52.25' variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.08, which requires a 150' Lot Width and where a 97.75' Lot Width is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;
- b) Requesting a 66' Front Building Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires an 80' Front Building Setback and where a 14' Front Building Setback is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;

- c) Requesting a 10' Side Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 10' Side Parking Setback and where a 0' Side Parking Setback is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;
- d) Requesting an 8' Rear Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 10' Rear Parking Setback to a residential lot line and where a 2' Rear Parking Setback to a residential lot line is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;
- e) Requesting a 20 Parking Space variance from Zoning Code Section 1270.05 (c) (4), which requires 36 Parking Spaces and where 16 Parking Spaces are proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store; property located at 18832 Westwood Drive, PPN 396-10-016, zoned Restaurant Recreational (RS).

**The Board discussed this being an unusual situation, but agreed that it is needed and believed the project will be a benefit to the City. They noted that the City Planner did not speak against the passing of these variances.**

**4) ADAM KALL, OWNER**

Requesting a variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15 (a), which prohibits an Accessory Building in a Side Yard and where the applicant is proposing a 12' x 16' Accessory Building in the Side Yard (East); property located at 18784 Cook Avenue, PPN 396-18-043, zoned R1-75.

**The Board agreed that they did not believe there was reason for this variance based on the topography of the property. They also agreed that they did not want a shed on the outside of the fence in the side yard of a house. They also did not want to set a precedent for similar requests.**

**5) UNION HOME MORTGAGE/Michael Gordon, Representative**

- a) Requesting a 5' Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1262.08 (c), which requires a 25' Parking Setback on a corner lot and where a 20' Parking Setback on a corner lot is proposed in order to expand a Parking Lot;
- b) Requesting an 18' Front Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1262.07, which requires a 50' Front Parking Setback and where a 32' Front Parking Setback is proposed in order to expand a Parking Lot;
- c) Requesting a 10' Rear Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1262.07, which requires a 10' Rear Parking Setback and where a 0' Rear Parking Setback is proposed in order to expand a Parking Lot; property located at 8241 Dow Circle, PPN 395-13-028, zoned Research – Development (RD).

**The Board noted that this was a pressing variance request so they are going directly to public hearing. They noted that since the building was built the code changed. They didn't see any obvious issues with this variance request.**

**STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING & BUILDING CODE APPEALS**

**MINUTES OF MEETING**

**June 22, 2016**

The meeting was called to order at 8:00 PM by the Chairman, Mr. Evans.

Present: Mr. Evans  
Mr. Baldin  
Mr. Rusnov  
Mr. Houlé

Also Present: Mr. Kolick, Assistant Law Director  
Mr. Miller, Building Department Representative  
Ms. Zamrzla, Recording Secretary

Mr. Evans – Good evening ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to call this June 22, 2016 meeting of the Strongsville Board of Zoning and Building Code Appeals to order. Kathy if you'd call the roll please?

ROLL CALL: ALL PRESENT EXCEPT FOR MR. SMEADER

Mr. Rusnov – I'd like to make a motion to excuse Mr. Smeader for just cause.

Mr. Baldin – Second.

Mr. Evans – I have a motion and a second. May I have a roll call please?

ROLL CALL: ALL AYES MOTION PASSED

Mr. Evans – I hereby certify that this meeting has been posted in accordance with Chapter 208 of the Codified Ordinances of the City of Strongsville. Anyone in our audience this evening that wishes to speak before this Board, I ask that you stand now and be sworn in by our Assistant Law Director, also including our Recording Secretary, and our Representative from the Building Department.

Mr. Kolick then stated the oath to those standing.

Mr. Evans – Thank you, this evening we have minutes from our June 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. If there are no other corrections I will submit them as presented. Our meetings are divided into two portions; first is new applications and then the public hearings. We will ask that each of those individuals come forward in order and give us their name and address for the record. Then we are going to ask them to describe their request for a variance.

## **NEW APPLICATIONS**

### **1) CHESTNUT LAKE APARTMENTS/Gene J. Stancak with Adam Building Company LLC, Representative**

Requesting a variance from Zoning Code Section 1270.08 (a), which requires that apartment developments maintain enclosed garages at a rate of two (2) spaces per dwelling unit and where the applicant is proposing the demolition and non-replacement of all apartment carports; property located at 17721 Whitney Road, PPN's 395-16-002, 395-16-006, 395-16-007, 395-16-008, 395-16-009, zoned RMF – 1.

Mr. Evans – The first item on our agenda this evening is Chestnut Lake Apartments and it has been postponed, at the applicant's request, until our July 6<sup>th</sup> meeting. If anyone is here to speak or ask questions regarding this, it will not be discussed until our next meeting.

### **2) WILLIAM THOMAS HOMES, INC./Thomas Simon, Representative**

Requesting a maximum 17' Rear Yard Separation variance from Zoning Code Section 1253.11 (b) (3), which requires a 50' minimum Rear Yard Separation of adjacent units in a cluster development and where a minimum of 33' Rear Yard Separation of two adjacent units is proposed; properties located at 13121 Northpoint Circle, Sublot 23, PPN 398-12-014 and 13145 Northpointe Circle, Sublot 26, PPN 398-12-048, zoned RT – C.

Mr. Evans – Item number two on our agenda is William Thomas Homes with Thomas Simon representing. Please come up to the microphone and give us your name and address for the record.

Mr. Simon – Tom Simon, 10471 Lake Meadows Drive, Strongsville.

Mr. Evans – Thank you. You are asking for a variance for a property that we know as Bexley Place. Would you tell us about the request for the variance and what is driving it? Describe it a little bit because some of us were a little unclear from looking at the materials that we received as to exactly which way homes will be facing.

Mr. Simon – I apologize, I grabbed the wrong file so I don't have any drawings outside of this one that I'd like to pass around to you. We're asking for variances on two lots, sub lot 23 which is at one corner, and sub lot 26 which is at a corner at the other end of the subdivision. Long story short, Bexley Place is a cluster home subdivision. It's really intended to be built out with ranch

2) **WILLIAM THOMAS HOMES, INC./Thomas Simon, Representative, Cont'd**

**Mr. Simon continues** - style cluster homes. That's certainly what the current home owners want to see. We've gone through an extensive review period with them where we've submitted floor plans, elevations, and lot topos. They've approved those. We want to keep this community and what we do in this community in keeping with the flavor of the community as it was intended. That's primarily ranch style cluster homes. Doing a ranch that meets the requirements of the community on these lots means that the rear yards don't meet the 50' separation. My understanding from talking with the City Planner is that the 50' separation requirement wasn't even in place when Bexley Place was designed and approved.

Mr. Evans – I think, Mr. Simon that the code was in place, and there were a number of variances that we granted. My memory is that was one of the variances that we granted.

Mr. Simon – Maybe that was a misunderstanding. I met with the City Planner, we went through everything, and he said that we won't need a variance. We came with our topos and needed a variance, so here we are. Anyway, what we're trying to do is build ranch style cluster homes that meet the community's requirements, they will enhance the value of the homes that are already in the community, and they will fit architecturally. So that puts us at a little less than the 50' code requirement back to back. The topo that I'm sending around actually is not one of ours.

Mr. Rusnov – This is sub lot 28 not 23 or 26.

Mr. Simon – Right, and the reason I'm sending it around is that if you look at it you'll see the backs of sub lot 28 and 25. They are 18' apart. We aren't asking to do anything that is not in keeping with practices that have already been established in the subdivision.

Mr. Evans – OK. I do know that what we're going to ask and I think Mr. Houlé in caucus said that they were already staked.

Mr. Houlé – Sublot 23 was staked, but I wasn't sure it fronted so it's facing the south? Or is the front of the house going to face the west?

Mr. Simon – All the lots face what we'll call the main road. I'll bring another topo up from the existing subdivision.

Mr. Rusnov – You say the main, it's the same street. So what you're saying is that it's going to face here?

Mr. Evans – So Mr. Rusnov the topo there shows sub lot 23, it does not show 26.

Mr. Rusnov – Right.

2) **WILLIAM THOMAS HOMES, INC./Thomas Simon, Representative, Cont'd**

Mr. Evans – That's 23 showing it's facing sub lot 22 or the street that goes east to west.

Mr. Rusnov – It faces south.'

Mr. Evans – Yes.

Mr. Rusnov – The garage doors open to the south.

Mr. Evans – Correct.

Mr. Rusnov – OK. That answers the question.

Mr. Simon – It's the same situation for lots 26 and 27. The driveways face north and south.

Mr. Evans – Doesn't 27 already have a house on it?

Mr. Simon – Yes.

Mr. Evans – So we don't need a variance for that one.

Mr. Rusnov – its 23 and 26.

Mr. Evans – Alright. If 26 is not already staked out, and it may be that there is not a plan in place for it. It appears that 23 you may already have a design for that.

Mr. Simon – There is already a design for 23. That's correct.

Mr. Evans – So if that is staked out, then probably you won't need to do 26 because it's going to be a carbon copy I would guess of 23.

Mr. Simon – It's pretty close.

Mr. Evans – I don't know that we need to have both of them staked if 23 is done. We'll all be out to visit it, and that's fine. We will require a letter of approval from the Homeowners Association. If you could get that taken care of and get it back to the Building Department. Board Members, do you have any other questions?

Mr. Rusnov – No.

Mr. Baldin – No questions.

2) **WILLIAM THOMAS HOMES, INC./Thomas Simon, Representative, Cont'd**

Mr. Evans – There will also be a notice that will go out to your neighbors within 500 feet of your property. It will state exactly the description that is written in the agenda tonight. So if there is anyone in Bexley or that backs up to Bexley that will want to ask questions, you should have someone from William Thomas Homes get together with them before the next meeting to explain simply what your plans are. That may save everyone some time and the trouble. The public hearing is on July 6<sup>th</sup>. We will invite you back at that time. It is not necessary that you stay for the rest of the meeting tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Simon – Thank you. For what it's worth, they have a five member Architectural Review Board at Bexley and all five members attended the meeting and approved the topo for lot 23.

Mr. Evans – You'll just want to get a letter from the Homeowners Association that says that.

Mr. Simon – You got it. Great, thank you very much.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

3) **MITCHELL'S ICE CREAM/Matt Plecnik of Dimit Architects, Rep.**

- a) Requesting a 52.25' variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.08, which requires a 150' Lot Width and where a 97.75' Lot Width is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;
- b) Requesting a 66' Front Building Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires an 80' Front Building Setback and where a 14' Front Building Setback is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;
- c) Requesting a 10' Side Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 10' Side Parking Setback and where a 0' Side Parking Setback is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;
- d) Requesting an 8' Rear Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 10' Rear Parking Setback to a residential lot line and where a 2' Rear Parking Setback to a residential lot line is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store;
- e) Requesting a 20 Parking Space variance from Zoning Code Section 1270.05 (c) (4), which requires 36 Parking Spaces and where 16 Parking Spaces are proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store; property located at 18832 Westwood Drive, PPN 396-10-016, zoned Restaurant Recreational (RS).

Mr. Evans – Alright that takes us to public hearings. Item number three on our agenda this evening is Mitchell's Ice Cream. Matt Plecnik with Dimit Architects is representing. Gentlemen please come up to the microphone and give us your names and addresses for the record.



**3) MITCHELL'S ICE CREAM/Matt Plecnik of Dimit Architects, Rep., Cont'd**

Mr. Plecnik – Matt Plecnik with Dimit Architects. 29241 Beachwood Drive in Wickliffe, Ohio.

Mr. Mitchell – Mike Mitchell, 1867 West 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Cleveland.

Mr. Evans – Thank you gentlemen. We have a number of variances that you are requesting. Since our audience has thinned out considerably, I'm going to ask that you just give us the two minute brief on the variance requests. We'll entertain questions from Board Members and then we'll go to the public hearing.

Mr. Plecnik – Essentially a lot of the variances that we are requesting today come from the components that we need to support the Mitchell's Ice Cream and patio facility. Due to the constraints of the site, the dimensions and the size of the site, we're a little pinched. So we did our best with our planner doing the site plan to kind of provide adequate access to parking. We want to provide space for maneuverability in and out and trash access while still maxing out the parking that we could get to fit on the site. Most of the other variances are for setbacks and again are results of the size of the site. One thing I want to mention is that there is a preexisting parking agreement with the adjacent development. Also there is public parking located directly across the street, so I think there's a good amount of parking available. In general I think the Mitchell's Ice Cream store will be a positive addition to the Strongsville Community. It'll help activate the commons, people could come in, get ice cream, and sort of walk around the park. Hopefully it'll fit in well with the adjacent development. We're looking forward to this addition to Strongsville.

Mr. Evans – Should Mr. Mitchell be as successful here as his store on W. 25<sup>th</sup> on Sunday night, we're going to need a whole lot more parking there. I suspect that the game Sunday night may have had something to do with the block long line at Mitchell's to get ice cream.

Mr. Plecnik – They were giving away free ice cream.

Mr. Mitchell - It was a free scoop.

Mr. Evans – I think that actually happened on Monday if I remember right. Board members do you have any questions?

Mr. Rusnov – No.

Mr. Baldin – The only question I have is did I hear you say you had some type of agreement in place for additional parking with the other developments going on? Did I hear that correctly?

Mr. Evans – There's cross easements.

**3) MITCHELL'S ICE CREAM/Matt Plecnik of Dimit Architects, Rep., Cont'd**

Mr. Mitchell – Yes, we do have an easement with the Catanzarite development right next door. We're able to use their parking lot. So we own this parcel, but for parking purposes its part of that shopping center. We would not have gone forward with our plans without that easement in place to use their parking. We don't want any parking problems any more than anyone does because that's not good for us.

Mr. Baldin – Thank you.

Mr. Evans – Anyone else have a question? OK. Mr. Evans – This is a public hearing. I'll ask if there is anyone here this evening who would like to speak for the granting of this variance. Is there anyone here who would like to speak against the granting of the variance? Hearing none and seeing none, I will now entertain a motion.

Mr. Rusnov – I would like to make a motion that we approve a request for a 52.25' variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.08, which requires a 150' Lot Width and where a 97.75' Lot Width is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store; also a request for a 66' Front Building Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires an 80' Front Building Setback and where a 14' Front Building Setback is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store; also a request for a 10' Side Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 10' Side Parking Setback and where a 0' Side Parking Setback is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store; also a request for an 8' Rear Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 10' Rear Parking Setback to a residential lot line and where a 2' Rear Parking Setback to a residential lot line is proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store; also a request for a 20 Parking Space variance from Zoning Code Section 1270.05 (c) (4), which requires 36 Parking Spaces and where 16 Parking Spaces are proposed in order to construct an Ice Cream Store; property located at 18832 Westwood Drive, PPN 396-10-016, zoned Restaurant Recreational (RS).

Mr. Baldin – Second.

Mr. Evans – Thank you, I have a motion and a second, and may I have a roll call please?

ROLL CALL:

ALL AYES

MOTION PASSED

Mr. Evans – Gentlemen, the variances have been granted again pending a 20 day waiting period during which time Council may review our decision. You will get a notice from the Building Department when that time has passed. Mr. Kolick is there anything else they need to do?

Mr. Kolick – They need to appear back before the ARB and the Planning Commission. Get back to the ARB now, and you have to wait for Planning until the 20 days has expired.

**3) MITCHELL'S ICE CREAM/Matt Plecnik of Dimit Architects, Rep., Cont'd**

Mr. Evans – While we could not recommend it for the whole town, but if you wanted to offer to everyone on the Board of Zoning Appeals a lifetime subscription to Mitchell's you could do that. That's only because we'll all be there anyhow. So welcome and we hope everything else goes as smoothly, and we hope you're successful at your new store there.

Mr. Plecnik – Thank you.

Mr. Mitchell – Thank you all very much.

**4) ADAM KALL, OWNER**

Requesting a variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15 (a), which prohibits an Accessory Building in a Side Yard and where the applicant is proposing a 12' x 16' Accessory Building in the Side Yard (East); property located at 18784 Cook Avenue, PPN 396-18-043, zoned R1-75.

Mr. Evans – Next on our agenda is Adam Kall. Please come up to the microphone and give us your name and address for the record.

Mr. Kall – Adam Kall, 18784 Cook Ave, Strongsville.

Mr. Evans – You have asked us to put the shed in the side yard there. You heard us in caucus talking. We've all been out to the property, we're all familiar with Cook. We know that McDonald's went in on the one side, and took the house out. They did a number of things when they did the drive-thru and everything. You mentioned at the last meeting that there was a drainage problem in the backyard. It has been dry, so when most of us were out there it was not a case where there was a lot of rain. You need to convince us of why you need this shed in the side yard because the reasons for us granting variances are usually topographical, or because of the nature of the layout of the lot or something. Here this really doesn't seem to be the case.

Mr. Kall – The ground in the top eastern portion in the rear of the lawn is uneven because of the water runoff. I could fill that with gravel but the shed would also sit on a portion of the ground that would not have gravel on it. So I feel like it would still continue to runoff, unless I terrace it and grade it. I don't want to damage the root system for the large tree that's in that back corner. The only other portion of the lawn I could put it in would be in the front of the rear property, but because of the fence and the other large tree in that section plus the 20' requirement to be away from the garage limits where I could put it in that section, limits this.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Miller does it need to be 20' away from the garage?

Mr. Miller – From the dwelling.

**4) ADAM KALL, OWNER, Cont'd**

Mr. Evans – That's what I thought.

Mr. Houlé – Yes, its 20' from the dwelling. So it could be closer to your detached garage.

Mr. Kall – OK. I was under the impression after speaking with you on the phone that it also had to be 20' from there too. OK. Because of the large tree in the front corner of the lawn I feel like I would still need to bring the shed one or two feet towards the sidewalk. I'd also have to cut a 16' section of fence out. Which I'm willing to do if that's my only other option.

Mr. Evans – Part of what I mentioned in caucus is that we hate to set precedents because every time we do we've gotten bitten somewhere that's uncomfortable. With the fence where it's at, if you moved the fence 2' to accommodate the shed going back.

Mr. Kall – I wouldn't move the fence, it would stay where it's at. The shed would protrude 2' into the side lawn if I cut a 16' section out of it. The shed will be 12' by 16'.

Mr. Evans – Out of the fence. OK. So you would tag the shed in-between sections of the fence.

Mr. Kall – Right, so it would still be 5' in from the property line, it would be 15.5' from the garage. If I just line it up with where the fence is right now, if I line the front of the shed up with where the fence is, and the back that goes into the back lawn, it gets very close to the root system of that very large tree. The tree that is in the front of the back lawn. That's why we want to pull it at least probably 2' forward.

Mr. Evans – The reason we have all these other members on the Board is because collectively we're much smarter than one individual.

Mr. Rusnov – Sir, would it be feasible to have you table this and maybe rethink the location based upon what Mr. Miller says about 12' not 20', and even if you moved it to 10' within the garage, you're talking a 2' variance in a location that wouldn't be visible from the street.

Mr. Kall – Well, it'll still be visible from the street if I...

Mr. Rusnov – But it wouldn't be in the side yard.

Mr. Kall – Not the side yard, correct.

Mr. Rusnov – Would it be possible to table this to rethink things until the next meeting?

Mr. Kall – Is there a minimum requirement of feet from my garage?

**4) ADAM KALL, OWNER, Cont'd**

Mr. Miller – No. I have a question. Are you talking about rotating the shed 90 degrees?

Mr. Kall – No.

Mr. Miller – You'll still have a 16' wide section that will be visible from the front of the sidewalk.

Mr. Kall – Correct.

Mr. Evans – Right.

Mr. Miller – To put into your side yard.

Mr. Kall – Correct.

Mr. Miller – But behind your garage? It's not ahead of your garage.

Mr. Kall – Only 2' of the 16' section would be into the side lawn.

Mr. Rusnov – Only 2' would be visible.

Mr. Kall – The whole 16' face of the shed would be visible from the street, but it'll only protrude 2' into the side lawn. So the 12' wall going into my back lawn, 2' would be in the side lawn and 10' would be in the rear yard.

Mr. Rusnov – Would it be possible that you reconsider and see what your ultimate plan would be?

Mr. Kall – If there's no minimum distance from my garage to where my shed would be then I'll just line the front of the shed up with the fence and then just move it into the garage more. I was trying to put it as far out to the edge of my property as I could to have it 5' from the side lawn. That gets me close to that tree though at the edge of the property.

Mr. Rusnov – Wouldn't that be more acceptable to us if it was close to the garage rather than the side of the property? What we're doing is that we're eliminating the precedent that it would set.

Mr. Kall – I understand that, yes.

Mr. Rusnov – Would you consider that?

**4) ADAM KALL, OWNER, Cont'd**

Mr. Kall – I'd consider that. I don't want to have to cut my fence, but I'll do that if that is something I need to do.

Mr. Rusnov – We'll take a road trip out there again.

Mr. Kall – OK.

Mr. Rusnov – OK?

Mr. Kall – Yes.

Mr. Evans – If he were to do that it would not necessarily require a variance.

Mr. Rusnov – Variance, right.

Mr. Kall – OK.

Mr. Evans – That means that you would just be able to move forward.

Mr. Kall – I don't mind being introduced to this process. This is much easier the second time around.

Mr. Evans – The reason that the setback from the dwelling is there is because most sheds have gasoline and combustibles. You don't want that right next to you. Garages are different, they already have combustibles in it so it's not really the same situation. As I mentioned in caucus Cook Ave is a different street because you have a lot of different types of residences that were built along there. They all sit differently. Our problem is that when we allow a side yard variance for you then someone comes along who lives somewhere else, and asks why they can't do it too. Then if we don't have a really good reason why it puts us in a real disadvantage.

Mr. Kall – I wouldn't want to be the guy to create that for you guys either.

Mr. Rusnov – What you might want to do then would be to contact the legendary Mr. Miller and see what you can do to maybe eliminate the possibility of any type of variance.

Mr. Kall – OK.

Mr. Rusnov – OK?

Mr. Kall – Yes.

**4) ADAM KALL, OWNER, Cont'd**

Mr. Rusnov – If you need more assistance...

Mr. Miller – I have a question before we let him walk away from the Board. If you took the front of your shed and lined it up with the back of your garage and took out 16' of fence so it's abutted right to the garage.

Mr. Kall – OK. Right.

Mr. Miller – Technically then you'd be in the rear yard if it's in line with that dwelling. That would forgo the variance.

Mr. Kall – Right, OK.

Mr. Evans – So again, what you'd want to do is make sure that you get that drawing to the Building Department. They can tell you if it's OK. Then the need goes away. So what we can do is table it for tonight so you have the option if you need to do that. If you are able to comply then at our next meeting you do not need to appear we will just withdrawal your request for the variance and you can go ahead when the Building Department says OK then you can start work.

Mr. Kall – OK. So would I just go on my own to submit the new drawing to the Building Department then? I could do that tomorrow?

Mr. Evans – Yes.

Mr. Kall – OK.

Mr. Evans – So before you table it I want to do the public hearing just in case we would need to come back to do the variance.

Mr. Kall – Right, and that's two weeks from today?

Mr. Evans – July 6<sup>th</sup>. So I will go ahead and do the public hearing. I'll ask if there is anyone here this evening who would like to speak for the granting of this variance. Is there anyone here who would like to speak against the granting of the variance? Hearing none and seeing none, I will now entertain the applicant's request to table so that you may make adjustments. If you decide you don't need the variance then that can be done without having to come back. You can submit to the Building Department, they'll approve it, and you'll be under construction by the time we're meeting again.

Mr. Kall – OK. Well thank you guys very, very much.

Mr. Evans – You have to make the request to table it.

**4) ADAM KALL, OWNER, Cont'd**

Mr. Kall – I request to table it. Is that how I say it?

Mr. Evans – Good, yes. We appreciate you being able to work with us. Get to the Building Department, and should it be necessary that you go back home and decide that it will not work then we'll see you on July 6<sup>th</sup> to reconsider it. OK?

Mr. Kall – Alright, thank you guys.

Mr. Evans – Alright thank you.

**5) UNION HOME MORTGAGE/Michael Gordon, Representative**

- a) Requesting a 5' Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1262.08 (c), which requires a 25' Parking Setback on a corner lot and where a 20' Parking Setback on a corner lot is proposed in order to expand a Parking Lot;
- b) Requesting an 18' Front Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1262.07, which requires a 50' Front Parking Setback and where a 32' Front Parking Setback is proposed in order to expand a Parking Lot;
- c) Requesting a 10' Rear Parking Setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1262.07, which requires a 10' Rear Parking Setback and where a 0' Rear Parking Setback is proposed in order to expand a Parking Lot; property located at 8241 Dow Circle, PPN 395-13-028, zoned Research – Development (RD).

Mr. Evans – Item number five on our agenda is Union Home Mortgage. I'm guessing you're Michael Gordon. Please come up to the microphone and give us your name and address for the record.

Mr. Boron – No, I'm Bill Boron, Representative. We are the Survey Civil Engineers for the project. 6000 Lombardo Center in Seven Hills, Ohio.

Mr. Evans – OK. You're requesting three variances here. Tell us a little about what's going on, and what is planned.

Bill Boron - Union Home Mortgage would like to expand the parking lot for businesses that are thriving. They need more spaces so they want to expand the north; fill in the green space essentially. It would almost mirror what their neighboring business has for the parking to the north. We've been in contact with City Engineering and things like that in terms of detention and retention for the property already. I talked with Lori Daily about that already so we kind of have the wheels in motion here, but obviously we're coming to you for the variances.



**5) UNION HOME MORTGAGE/Michael Gordon, Representative, Cont'd**

Mr. Evans – You brought along a photograph is that one that you intended to describe what you're doing? That's what the easel is there for.

Mr. Boron – (inaudible) ...and basically outlined in red is the... (Inaudible)

Mr. Evans – We're looking at what?

Mr. Boron – This is Sprague Road.

Mr. Evans – Sprague is at the top there.

Mr. Boron – (inaudible)

Mr. Evans – Let me have you come back over to the microphone over there.

Mr. Boron – As you can see the existing park lot to the north of the building that will be redone and added and expanded to the north similar to what is to the east in the neighboring property. The request is for three variances. One is off of Dow which is essentially aligning with the existing parking lot to the south. One off of Sprague, a 5' variance off of Sprague. Then what is called the rear property because of how it's situated to the east.

Mr. Evans – As we talked in caucus, this is an area that was developed prior to the way the code is now. Were we to go back and wave a magic wand we might do it differently, but in order to accommodate the businesses that we have in Strongsville we've had to adjust. Union Home Mortgage has been around Strongsville for a while, we definitely want to accommodate growth. Are there any questions from Board Members?

Mr. Baldin – No questions.

Mr. Rusnov – No questions.

Mr. Kolick – Maybe for the applicant, Mr. Boron, how many more parking spaces will this permit you to add to the building?

Mr. Boron – What we're doing is a net of I think 84, so it comes up to 132 I believe. I'm sorry, I don't have them. I think they're on the site plan. I believe there is a parking count on the site plan. To the right.

Mr. Kolick – Existing 83 and the existing is 69.



Mr. Boron – Thank you very much gentlemen. Have a good evening.

Mr. Evans – Is there anything else to come before the Board tonight? Then we will stand adjourned.

<u>Signature on File</u>	<u>Signature on File</u>	<u>July 6, 2016</u>
Mr. Evans, Chairman	Kathryn A. Zamrzla, Sec’y	Approval Date