

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

**Meeting of
January 15, 2025**

Board of Appeals Members Present: Dustin Hayden, Ken Evans, John Rusnov, Dave Houlé, Richard Baldin,

Administration: Assistant Law Director Daniel Kolick

Assistant Building Commissioner: Steve Molnar

Recording Secretary: Mitzi Anderson

The Board members discussed the following:

1) PINE LAKES CROSSING SUBDIVISION, PHASE 2/Thomas Sutcliffe, Agent

Requesting (2) 5.11' minimum lot width variances from Zoning Code Section 1252.04 (b), which requires a 90' minimum lot width and where an 84.89' minimum lot width is proposed for (2) lots, in order to split parcel into two lots, property located on Pin Oak Drive, PPN 398-07-062, zoned R1-75

Mr. Hayden – Item number one on the agenda is for Pine Lakes Crossing Subdivision, Phase 2 and this request is to split the parcel into two lots. Mr. Evans, please provide us with a brief history.

Mr. Evans – Pine Lakes is a development that has undergone a number of changes over the years, as ownership and development has taken place. At this juncture, we have looked at a couple of variances for properties in the area. Drees is asking to build on these two lots and I think we have seen from experience, from here in Strongsville and in other communities that Drees builds a good home. Whether or not this should be shoe horned in or not, but the problem is that this is going to get developed. John, who is an appraiser, and I were talking before the meeting and he knows that within Strongsville we have very few buildable lots left. In a lot of cases, this is going to be the type of situations we will be faced with where the lot may not quite be there. On each lot, they are requesting a 5' lot variance, if we were to grant the variances it would be smart on our part to condition this subject to that there would be no further variances within the individual lots, so that it would be exactly as the Code calls for. One of the problems is, the residents around this area think this was promised as common area and there have been things that have gone on over the years; however, things do change as developments are done. I am in High Point and I know that we had 13 phases and I can not count how many times we understood things but things changed. I think the bottom line is sometimes it is not as bad as what we think and hopefully not as bad as what it might be. There could be a number of different ways of developing this one parcel but I think those of us that have been around for a while know that this is not a bad alternative and there might be other ones. This one in and of itself is probably not as bad as some that we had to live with in the community, over the years.

Mr. Rusnov – We are dealing with out lots and these out lots are usually the last lots within the subdivision, which means they are the least desirable. The premo cul-de-sac lots go first, the inter lots go second and the out lots are the last to go, if they go at all.

Mr. Houlé – I agree with what Mr. Evans said and it looks like it is a good alternative. There is a lot of vacant land behind there, so there is some open land and that will probably be developed somewhere down the line too.

2) DANIEL E. BAUER (TRUSTEE), Titan Construction and Repair, Agent

- a) Requesting a 45' rear yard setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 50' rear yard setback from an abutting residential district and where a 5' rear yard setback from an abutting residential district is proposed, in order to construct a 720 SF accessory structure
- b) Requesting a 20' side yard setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 25' side yard setback from a non-residential district and where a 5' side yard setback from a non-residential district is proposed, in order to construct a 720 SF accessory structure, property located at 14000 Pearl Road, PPN 393-18-013, zoned MS – Motorist Service

Mr. Hayden – Item number two on the agenda is for an accessory structure, they are requesting rear and side yard setback variances. This will be a storage facility adjacent to the new fire station on Pearl Road. It is my understanding that there will be parking next to the structure on the side of the fire station. Is that correct Mr. Kolick?

Mr. Kolick - Yes, it abuts our property, which is where they are requesting a side yard setback and I spoke with our Engineering Department and they did not have a problem with the variance. It will be located next to our parking lot and it will not be next to the building. We normally would not grant a 45' variance against a residential area but there is a huge detention basin maintained by ODOT and there are no homes behind there and the nearest homes are way back in Settlers Village.

Mr. Evans – While the zoning may call for it, it is an anomaly in the Zoning Code the way it sets up against our property and the detention basin.

Mr. Kolick – In addition to that, they only need these variances because the City took their property that had the storage building to use for the fire station. Historically that is what happened with this property.

The Board members approved the minutes for December 18, 2024, with a correction noted by Mr. Houlé.

STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING & BUILDING CODE APPEALS
MINUTES OF MEETING
January 15, 2025
7:00 PM

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM by Mr. Hayden.

Present:

Mr. Baldin
Mr. Rusnov
Mr. Houlé
Mr. Evans
Mr. Hayden

Also Present:

Mr. Kolick, Assistant Law Director
Mr. Steve Molnar, Assistant Building Commissioner
Mrs. Anderson, Recording Secretary

Mr. Hayden – I would like to call this January 15, 2025 meeting of the Strongsville Board of Zoning and Building Code Appeals to order. May we have a roll call please?

ROLL CALL:

MR. HAYDEN	PRESENT
MR. EVANS	PRESENT
MR. HOULÉ	PRESENT
MR. RUSNOV	PRESENT
MR. BALDIN	PRESENT

Mr. Hayden – I hereby certify that this meeting has been posted in accordance with Chapter 208 of the Strongsville Codified Ordinances.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Mr. Hayden – This evening on the agenda we have the Election of Officers for 2025.

Mr. Evans - I move to nominate Dustin Hayden for Chairman for the Board of Zoning and Building Code Appeals for the year 2025 and also request that the nominations for Chairman be closed and that this individual be unanimously elected.

Mr. Baldin – Second.

Mr. Hayden – Thank you, Mr. Evans for the motion and Mr. Baldin for the second. May we have a roll call please?

ROLL CALL:

MR. RUSNOV	YES
MR. HOULÉ	YES
MR. EVANS	YES
MR. HAYDEN	YES
MR. BALDIN	YES

MOTION APPROVED

Mr. Evans - I move to nominate Dave Houlé for Vice-Chairman for the Board of Zoning and Building Code Appeals for the year 2025 and also request that the nominations for Vice-Chairman be closed and that this individual be unanimously elected.

Mr. Baldin – Second.

Mr. Hayden – Thank you, Mr. Evans for the motion and Mr. Baldin for the second. May we have a roll call please?

ROLL CALL:

MR. HOULÉ	YES
MR. EVANS	YES
MR. HAYDEN	YES
MR. BALDIN	YES
MR. RUSNOV	YES

MOTION APPROVED

Mr. Hayden - Before us we also have minutes to approve from our meeting on December 18, 2024. We discussed this in caucus and Mr. Houlé noted a correction and the minutes will be updated and filed accordingly.

Mr. Hayden - If you are here this evening and you plan on addressing the Board, I would ask that you stand and be sworn in by our Assistant Law Director, as well as our Building Department representative and Secretary.

Mr. Kolick administered the oath to those standing.

1) PINE LAKES CROSSING SUBDIVISION, PHASE 2/Thomas Sutcliffe, Agent

Requesting (2) 5.11' minimum lot width variances from Zoning Code Section 1252.04 (b), which requires a 90' minimum lot width and where an 84.89' minimum lot width is proposed for (2) lots, in order to split parcel into two lots, property located on Pin Oak Drive, PPN 398-07-062, zoned R1-75

Mr. Hayden – Item number one on the agenda is for Pine Lakes Crossing Subdivision Phase 2. Please state your name and address for the record.

Thomas Sutcliffe, 6860 West Snowville Road, Brecksville, Ohio 44141

Mr. Sutcliffe – Thank you for hearing us, I am assuming that you all received the letter of introduction signed by me, going over the issues. This is a piece of property that has been owned by the current owner for three decades and during the three decades they have developed it partially. They have been developing it in bits and pieces and to your point, the Corridor of 71, 76, 77, 303 and 82 is compacted with dense development. What is left in all of those communities that we are working in, is what we call infill. There are a lot of infill pieces that were left there stranded by developments encroaching upon them whether it be commercial or residential. You have all these parcels that are continuing to be parceled off and shrunk and parceled off and shrunk, now people are buying the remains, which is often misshapen and not in anyway developable in the shape they were left in. This is due to the encroachment of things that do work around them. I only bring that up because in your zoning ordinance, you offer for a variance that you need to address these four issues that deal with hardships and of course you kind of created that hardship yourself. When this parcel was

purchased three decades ago, it was already in the shape that it was in and the owner developed it and put it into good condition. I would offer without the expertise to understand the shape would not fit a future development to the north. (Mr. Sutcliff distributed a GIS picture of Pin Oak Drive) You will note that the parcel you see that has Pin Oak Drive on it, there is a lot to the northwest that you see dimensions on, that is a corner lot, which is identical to what we are looking at, as far as our variances are concerned. You can see at the time they immediately realized, in order to give the City, the 60' easement they needed for its right of way at the time, they were forced to create a lot that was 85.67 feet wide. The City at that time, which was three decades ago, allowed them to put that lot in, understanding that it was the 60' right of way that caused it. Keep in mind, they could have asked for a 50' or 55' right of way, which is becoming the norm in my subdivisions today, in order to deal with this and remove that restriction. Unfortunately, that is not the way the property was left, as such when the 60' right of way went in it created what you see and left that piece to the north. You also have in front of you a plat, which shows a possible reconfiguration of that property. There are a lot of things that could happen and I could be anybody sitting in here but this just happens to be Drees Homes and we only do a certain kind of footprint, which are larger homes. We are not in the business of cramming townhomes or cluster homes into locations like this. We all agreed that the best use for this is the use that is already existing, which is larger single-family homes. The lot split that you see is to bring two single-family homes that will mirror and compliment the homes right across the street. I would also like to point out that there is a street being added there, purely at the cost of the developer, which is us and that is there so that we don't landlock the land to the north, that is purely voluntary. This lot split could just be two lots; therefore, landlocking future use of all the lots to the north, which is exactly what has been happening over the last 40 years. It eliminates that we are trying to use a monetary reason for our hardship, because we are investing a quarter-million dollars to put that road in. We are not asking for any variances on setbacks, which is what most neighborly concerns are, how close is the house to me. We will maintain the setbacks that exist in the R1-75 Zoning District. Our hardship is that we were left with a piece of land that is difficult to develop, which is all the cases in Northeast Ohio. We believe that allowing these variances creates a justice for the condition that this lot was left in for Drees Homes, not created by the owner of the property. It is certainly not a condition that will in anyway inhibit or reduce the value of the adjoining lots, the homes that we will put in will be well into the \$600,000 - \$700,000, as a starting price. This will not be detrimental but it will be very

positive to the community as a whole and it is certainly, not in anyway, against the general purposes of the community as a whole. We believe that all four of the variance conditions have been met and that the house on the corner exhibits the need for this to happen. We also believe that the 2014 Code changes added more hindrances to the property while it was under the ownership. I hesitate to bring this up because we don't like to use this as a precedent, but recently in October there was a variance for a similar piece of property for a much larger percentage of the property. We believe this is the right variance, for the right time, for the right piece of property. If you have any questions, upon those issues, I will be glad to take them. Also, I think Mr. Smerigan would be happy to see that we are not landlocking property as people typically do in the community. If you have any questions or concerns, I would love to answer them.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, for the applicant, as you are aware Mr. Sutcliffe this configuration was left because it was the intent of the original developer to buy that property to the north, to add to this property. Have you or the owner had any contact with Mr. Woods to see if he is in a position now to sell additional property to complete the subdivision.

Mr. Sutcliffe - I appreciate that question and I understand your line of thinking, but I don't know if it fits in this conversation. For two reasons, one is I have no idea of what the intent was 40 years ago with the Lipovits family, I can only conjecture from what I read from minutes in the past and those are only minutes, none of those are deed restrictions to this property. Secondly, what my company does everyday is that we go to the minutes in every single meeting held in the community and we read what is said at these meetings. If I were to release to you what I am speaking to neighbors about regarding their properties, I believe that is pretty confidential, in my world, but I appreciate your wish to know.

Mr. Kolick – I am asking because I was here at the meetings 40 years ago and I know what the developer represented to the City, at that point. The City requested for him to keep that as common area and he said no, because I am going to acquire the property to the north and I am in talks with Mr. Woods. I think it was Mr. Woods, who is the same owner now. I am not asking about any confidential conversations that might inhibit pricing or anything else. My question is, have there been further discussions recently with Mr. Woods about obtaining the property? If you did obtain the property to the north, you would not need these variances because you could make those lots wider to connect them.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Mr. Kolick, I believe repeating the conversation to me doesn't make my answer any different. I don't think that I need to nor should I give you confidential information on the finances of our company and negotiation with neighbors. I think it is inappropriate and I don't think that it applies to this zoning request. I am not trying to be argumentative, but I am pointing out that I don't know how that applies to what is in front of you.

Mr. Kolick – It was the representation of the developer that the original restriction is that it wouldn't be developed until they acquired the property to the north. I am not saying that we can not do it because this Board does have the authority to grant variances and Planning Commission can waive those restrictions if they so deem necessary. I am just asking because I know that the question will come up before this Board and also before Planning Commission, if this is something that is imminent and that this property is going to be obtained, then it would not make sense to go forward and request the variance because then you could get the full width of the lot heading to the north and that is the only reason I am asking.

Mr. Sutcliffe – At this risk of sounding repetitive, as a term of art restriction, but I don't believe that there is a legal restriction recorded on this property at all. I still can't release to you my conversations with the neighbors and things do change, decade, after decade, after decade. I am entitling things that were promised in meetings to be something else, to the relief of the people in the room because there is always somebody who wants to maintain decades old restrictions and standards. I just don't believe there is any deed restrictions on this property.

Mr. Kolick – If this Board grants these variances, can you assure the Board that there wouldn't be any other variances required for the homes that you are proposing to put on there? Are there any other setback requirements, required on the two lots that are being created?

Mr. Sutcliffe – Definitely, I thought I stated that earlier but maybe I did not say that strongly enough.

Mr. Evans – You did, but we are saying it again because particularly in Pine Lakes, we have been down this road four times that I know. Someone wanted to add a sunroom or wanted to add a deck and the developer said we did not know that we would not be able to do this and we need to be able to do that.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I agree with you and I believe with these variance requests, I will gladly personally for the company tell you that we will not ask for additional variances.

Mr. Kolick – The variances can be condition on subject to no other variances being requested for the two lots. I am telling you if this is granted, that is one of the conditions they would be looking at.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Thank you, I acquiesce in that and thank you for offering it.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Chairman, we said some things in caucus and I would like to make sure we state them here, so that they will be on the record. We are in a difficult situation in Strongsville because lots that are buildable are few and far between. In many areas where there are leftover lots, as John said they are all fill in lots. It is very difficult to be able to build according to today's standards because whatever is left-over is based on the Zoning Code and Standards from maybe 20 - 30 years ago and they have changed since then for the better. In most cases those are within developments we have pretty well maintained them and Mr. Baldin and I have been on this Board for 50 years combined and have seen many developments. We have had the initial developer and then we had a successor developer or we have had changes in it. As those have taken place, many times variances have been required and we look at each one of those and we are very careful at looking at them. We all live in Strongsville and understand what everyone goes through because many of us have been through it. I am in High Point and we had 5 situations like this, where a street was cut in and someone thought there would be houses there and it winds up being a street going in to connect to other properties that were added on, it does happen. I think that what this Board is responsible for is that it does not adversely impact the areas around it. These variances will not impact you dramatically because they are on a corner and you are going to find as we did in High Point, when they added lots in on us that it works out and it is not that bad. That is a judgement call on my part, that is why I am on the Board to be able to make judgement calls for the City based on my experience and my knowledge. In this particular situation, you could also wind up with someone putting in smaller houses and at that point it might not be what you want because you would want your property values to go up as a result of this and not to go down. We understand that Drees is asking for variances but we have to look at it in a broad context of how we are doing it. As I indicated, if we were to grant these variances, I would make sure that we condition it that there are no additional variances on those homes being

built there to accommodate whatever somebody buying that house might want. That would be our way of making sure we have contained the damage to make sure that there is a minimal impact on the area.

Mr. Kolick - Mr. Chairman, for the applicant, if this Board grants the variances, you will need to return to the Planning Commission with a subdivision plat; however, make sure that you have a signature clause on it for the Homeowners Association. They will need to sign it because you are going to change the easement to them and show the easement on the plat that it will go to the Homeowners Association. Additionally, there is a \$1,600.00 recreation fee that is required, which you can pay to the City or the Homeowners Association. If you pay it to the Homeowners Association, we are okay with it but just show us that they are agreeable with it.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Mr. Kolick, thank you for that advice and we have already reached out the HOA in regards to the first issue of the easement and we are more than willing to put that on the plat as well as pay the \$1,600.00, as we have done in the past.

Mr. Kolick – Make sure that you add a signature clause for them to sign on the plat, as well. I do not want you to get held up at the Planning Commission because you do not have your subdivision plat correct.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I appreciate the advice, we will make sure that we do.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Chairman, there is a HOA letter from Pine Lakes.

Mr. Hayden – We did not speak about this in caucus but we do have HOA approval for this request. Mr. Sutcliffe, thank you very much, we appreciate all of the information.

Mr. Hayden – This is a public hearing, is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak for the granting of the variance. Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak against the granting of the variance. Please come to the microphone and state your name and address for the record and we will take you one at a time.

Gary Drlik, 14611 Pin Oak Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Mr. Drlik – I speak in opposition of the granting of these variances for a number of reasons. As was mentioned earlier, some of my other neighbors, prior to my coming on the property, were told at the time that the property would not be developed and now I guess things change. There is no legal standing but there are a lot of upset people based on that alone. We also have concerns regarding safety issues and congestion, it is a tight S-spin turn followed immediately by this stub street. I am concerned about congestions, safety, traffic, aesthetics and the fact that these houses will not be facing Pin Oak Drive like the others, we do not want to see the side of someone's house. Also, we feel that there is a potential property value impact, regardless of the \$600,000 value, because of the side of the house versus the front. I would also argue, just because there is an odd lot left over that hasn't been developed, I don't necessarily think that it should be. The impediments that have been in place the last 40 years that prevented that development has not changed fundamentally, I think those impediments are still there. Lastly, this is somewhat of a self-inflicted issue because as I understand the property changed hands not that long ago and I would state that it is incumbent upon the people that purchased the property prior to the purchase to determine if the property could be developed without this requested variance, thank you.

Mr. Hayden – Point of note, I do think the ownership has been the same.

Irene Rehberg, 14555 Pin Oak Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Ms. Rehberg - Mr. Lipovits is the one that built a lot of the area, I have been here for 25 years and he told us that the lot was not deep enough to build on and that it is just a strip. He could not get the owner on the corner to sell him his backyard. I would suggest, if you could convince him to sell the lot so that the house would be deep enough to build, then I would have no problem with this. The lot is so narrow and they are suggesting putting the houses sideways and that is kind of weird. Mr. Lipovits promised us that, the land was never going to be built on.

Mr. Rusnov – When you brought your property, the developer promised you that this would never be developed. We heard this before, we empathize with you for that and we have had this happen so many times. Where there is a change of ownership or power structure and they change their mind and want to build on it now. In retrospect, maybe you should have had a written agreement, but who in

the world would think of that, when you buy a new house in a new subdivision. We have been down this road before and it makes us a little bit leery and we have heard this before where people have not received what was promised, with the realtors or developers.

Ms. Rehberg – My point is, if they can convince the owner to sell him the backyard, then he could build the houses in a normal manner and I would have no problem with that.

Mr. Rusnov – Ma'am, you are applying common sense.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, for the applicant, has this property transferred? Is it under Drees or under the original developer's name?

Mr. Sutcliffe – It is a delicate answer, as you can imagine it is contractual; however, it has been in the Lipovits's name since 1993 and it is still currently in the Lipovits's name.

Dino Vitanza, 14583 Pin Oak Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Mr. Vitanza - I am respectfully asking the Zoning Committee to enforce the zoning laws that exist, as is. The lot is unusual for a reason, just because we have land to build on, respectfully doesn't mean that we have to build on it. There are a number of logistical reasons of why this is not a good idea. Starting first and foremost with safety, for many of us on our street we have young children that play on the street and that is a very tight turn if you look at how the road is constructed it has a winding curve, my house is the second one from Webster, next door to Mr. Drilik, that would be a very tricky situation for my children and the cars that are ongoing. In addition, we just received a no outlet sign because we get a lot of traffic off of Webster, they realize that our development is not a cut through, it is a dead end and they then realize that they can't cut through and get to Sprague this way. Regarding home value, we are all proud homeowners and we pay our HOA fees that keep our houses up, not to say that these potential homes would not. We are talking about a very small lot, which means the houses couldn't possibly be unique and as robust as ours. The property value is another reason we are against this and that this is really an opportunity to shoe horn more development that is not needed. We love the greenspace that it provides and

the noise level that we have. Adding another layer of two additional homes with more population brings up the noise level to a level that we are not comfortable with. The safety, home value, noise levels and obviously you have this law and it is there and they are asking for a variance for a reason. The bells and whistles there let you know that this is a very unique property and I was promised by my real estate agent that the property will remain vacant, but we all know how promises are.

Mr. Rusnov – You struck a raw nerve with the safety issue. We don't happen to be police but this might be a job for Patrolmen Drlik to determine if there is a safety issue here. They have the jurisdiction and we don't to make a determination on if there is or isn't a safety issue. I would be more comfortable having an expert do this, like Patrolmen Drlik because he does this for a living.

Mr. Houlé – I didn't know until today, are the driveways going to enter into the new street and shouldn't that be an improvement on the safety issue?

Mr. Rusnov – That is why we have Patrolmen Drlik.

Mr. Houlé - I don't see how this will impact the access that is going in, on that street if the two houses that are going in will enter in, off of the other side street.

Mr. Rusnov – That is why we should bring Patrolmen Drlik into this, to give them some comfort, to say yes or no.

Mr. Kolick – What he is saying is that you are going to have a new street coming into Pin Oaks Drive and that will be the safety hazard because the road curves around there.

Mr. Vitanza – People are backing out of their driveways on the southside of Pin Oak Drive. If you are backing out and someone is coming out of the stub street and there is crossing traffic coming into the development, there could be potential accidents.

Mr. Rusnov – It is better to be safe than sorry. It won't hurt to have Patrolmen Drlik take a look at this or someone in the Police Department to ensure them or us that there are no safety issues.

Mr. Vitanza – Keep in mind that this a young community and there are young kids, this is our only opportunity to express our concerns. I am not asking you all to be safety experts, but I am letting you know that it is a concern of ours.

Mr. Rusnov – Can we condition this on the safety issue?

Mr. Kolick – No, if you feel that the Board needs additional information, we can contact our Engineering Department and Patrolmen Drlik. You can not condition it on a safety issue.

Mr. Rusnov – I know that is not one of the four criterias.

Mr. Kolick – Yes, it is because safety is one of your criterias that you look at under the four criterias.

Mr. Rusnov – Then why can't we make it a condition?

Mr. Kolick – What would be the condition, that it could be done safely? Who is going to determine that? It is up to this Board to make the determination based on what you hear and the input that you receive.

Mr. Rusnov – We are not qualified to make that decision.

Mr. Kolick – You can get it from the applicant by asking them if they have done any traffic or engineering studies. We have our Engineering and Safety Departments that we can refer it to.

Mr. Vitanza – At the end of the day they are requesting variances. Why are they doing it? They have this piece of land that they can capitalize and make money on. It is not there for that reason. I respectfully ask the Board to do their job and enforce the zoning laws that exist.

Anthony Kafantaris, 14499 Pin Oak Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Mr. Kafantaris – I don't want to beat a dead horse, I think we are all aware of some of the issues that new construction brings to the neighborhood. The safety issue, I agree with one hundred percent and shoe horning in a street to put in two houses is going to cause congestion on the street from garbage trucks, school buses etc.... I don't want to get into the issues that have already been

brought up, I believe the Board is well aware of them. I am asking, what is the rush? The variance was brought to us about a week ago and I understand that is the process but I have to think that there are better alternatives. I am not opposed to it, I understand it, if someone owns a piece a property they want to develop it, that is there right. At the same time, I think there should be some input or some additional feedback on the safety issues, so that we have a better understanding of what the houses are going to look like. The size, aesthetics, are these spec houses or are they sold and questions that I think we as a neighborhood at the very least are able to maybe discuss with them to know what their overall process is and what this is going to look like. More importantly, are there other alternatives and I have to imagine that there are. My request or ask is that before any variances are granted, give it another 30 days to have some of these questions answered or at least provide the neighborhood with a little more answers or details with what is going to happen with the empty area.

Mr. Hayden - I appreciate the comments, just so you understand, this is the process. When an applicant approaches the Building Department about a project and are in need of a variance, we do notify properties within 500' of the affected area of the project. At that point, you can contact the Building Department to understand the scope of the project, so we do give you that time before the meeting and then of course we hold a public hearing to allow you to voice your questions and concerns.

Mr. Kafantaris – We as a community and a neighborhood would like to have a better understanding of what is going to go on over there.

Mr. Hayden – Thank you, would anyone else in the audience like to speak against the granting of the variance?

Leslie Kellogg, 14471 Pin Oak Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Ms. Kellogg – We oppose the approval of the variance because it establishes a precedent that others will follow. What is the point in having lot regulations or requirements, this will also be disruptive to the flow of the neighborhood, as well. I also agree with what everyone has said and when this property was sold the builder said to my in-laws and we now own the house, that the lot was not going

to be built on across the street. This is called deception, when you say something that is not true and implying that it is. Also, this should have been in writing but when you are told by the builder, so we oppose it.

Mr. Kolick administered the oath to Mr. Trejbal

Daniel Trejbal, 14443 Pin Oak Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Mr. Trejbal – I brought my son, Gavin, with me today to represent the youth and to see how the government process works. We walk our dog down the street on the sidewalk and one of the things we noticed is there is wildlife that live in the grass area and in the woods. There are coyotes, foxes, geese, ducks, and you name it, that live in this area and my concern would be the displacement of the wildlife and where will they go. They will wind up in our yards or in the street and that will create further problems for us.

Kathy Burkart, 14527 Pin Oak Drive, Strongsville, Ohio 44136

Ms. Burkart – I would like to agree with all of my neighbors and I am here to stand with them. What he said about nature is what I was going to say, I know that builders don't really care about displacing nature. However, it means a lot to us as residents to see the deer over there, I am a bird person, the woodpeckers and the crickets at night, it is all going to change. Our whole development will change by this building, it is a whole field for the development and the community. I know that probably doesn't matter to any of you, but I just need to say it. My daughter comes over with her boyfriend and they watch the deer and it is a nice place to live, but if you allow this to happen, it will be totally different.

Mr. Rusnov - If the original owners would have honored what they told you, we would not be having this conversation. We are aware of all of your concerns and we do not take them lightly. Some of these things we can not do anything about because it is not within our jurisdiction, but your concerns are not falling on deaf ears.

Ms. Burkart – We live in the house where the street is going to be right across from. I will get to sit on my porch and see a street that the two houses face the opposite direction, opposed to seeing nice trees with birds and deer. I know you don't care or give a damn but that is what is happening and it is really upsetting. Thank you for listening.

Mr. Hayden – Is there anyone else in the audience who would like to speak against the granting of the variance? Mr. Sutcliffe you have heard some of our residents' concerns, would you like to take sometime to address those things?

Mr. Sutcliffe - I will start by asking if any of the Members would like me to address any of the specific comments?

Mr. Kolick – You have heard the comments and can address any of them that you want to.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I first want to remind everyone, including the neighbors behind me that this is a process. It started with us going to Planning Commission, where we planned on this being denied because we needed 5' variances. We knew that we would be coming here, to ask for one issue, which is what is in front of you, which is a 5' variances. They mentioned a cavalcade of concerns, which we understand and are really for the next meeting, that is the Planning Commission and their job is the planning of the development. They take into account traffic and how the houses will be shaped and many things that are not variances. Not for you, because you all know your jobs well and you have explained it, but I don't think they realize there is another step and I am sure I will be talking to all of them again in more depth. To address things that have to do with what my responsibilities are tonight and just a couple of quick things, I don't want to bore you and just want to get this straight. It has been sort of represented that we are shoe horning in small lots, maybe because we haven't been very good at presenting. It is far from it, the zoning allows 12,750 SF lots, which is what they are on; however, these two lots are 13,500 SF and 17,988 SF, which are substantially larger than the lots across the street. Secondly, there was a concern about how these houses are going to look to them. There are corner homes on every street and the purpose of us facing them towards the stub street we are creating is to prevent cars from backing into their street, we have actually avoided that, so there will be no backing of traffic. Look at every street that is adjacent to their street, they are all double loaded. All streets are designed to have homes on both sides but the anomaly is that they don't have homes on both sides. This is not a safety issue, but a perception of a safety issue and perceptions sometimes are reality. They are living on a street where they don't have to deal with a double loaded street and every other street in the City and around them is double loaded and we are not doing that. If we did speculatively, control the land to the north, we could turn the lots the other way and put many more lots facing them, with driveways backing into their driveways. This is exactly the opposite and is a best-case scenario for safety. There is also a stub

to the east of Pin Oak Drive, which the City required to be there, so that someone would connect that driveway in the future, causing that cut through. We are the far less option that would be dangerous because someday someone will take that stub and continue it and that will be the real argument. In the next meeting what we will be talking about is, directly to the north of us, about 5 parcels north is a heavily redacted riparian setback area, if you noticed, nobody has built on it. It travels west to east for $\frac{1}{2}$ mile. There will never be cut through traffic to the north unless someone wants to build a half million-dollar bridge over that and no one has done it today because it is cost prohibitive. This is the most effective use and the least dangerous and to your question, anyone will tell you that a double loaded street is the most dangerous. I don't mean to sound like I am from a bad movie but unfortunately where their homes were once a field and behind them was once a field. Everyone wants to maintain the greenspace that they see in front of them and that is something that you are used to hearing, and they are just not. It was represented that these would be dinky houses but obviously they will not be dinky houses on some of the largest lots in the neighborhood. If I have missed something that you are concerned with, please don't let me walk away with out addressing it.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Sutcliffe, in listening to some of the comments, some of the questions were that they would like to get together, so that they understand what you are proposing. Would you be willing to do that, to sit down with the homeowners and explain what you are doing and why you feel it will not negatively impact them? I think this could possibly address some of the comments that we are hearing here tonight.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I would like to ask the Board, is that an abuse of rights of the property owner? They have the exact same rights of their property that these people have for their properties.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Sutcliffe, there have been many times before this Board that the developer of a lot has met with various homeowners and have been able to assuage their comments and concerns. I am only asking, if you are willing to do so, if not that is okay but just tell us you are not. Maybe you could take care of some of their concerns by addressing them outside of the meeting. We can always table this for the next meeting to hear it, if you are willing to do so. I am only asking if you are willing to do so because that is what I am hearing from some of the people and maybe you can explain what you are doing and it may remove some of their concerns. I am only suggesting this to you.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Mr. Kolick, I will once again repeat myself, in saying every question they are asking is not a BZA question. To answer your question, we will gladly talk to them but I think the proper discussion is prior to the next meeting, which is the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Kolick – Except, it goes beyond that because some of the concerns, as you know, under this Board are safety concerns and that is part of this Board's jurisdiction. The aesthetics and the effect on the neighborhood, that is part of this Board's concerns and is part of the four requirements for a variance. One is, that they comport with the comprehensive plan and the intent of the Code. If you look at the Zoning Code, the intent for residential is to decrease noise, and that you do not affect the aesthetics, so those are concerns that this Board has to have as well. I am not saying that they are legitimate, but I am saying that those are concerns that this Board has to take into account, in order to make a determination. Maybe some of those concerns could be alleviated by you meeting with the homeowners and you can give them your card and set up a meeting. If you would like to do it up here we could probably expedite that or it could be done at their club house and I think maybe you could take care of some of their concerns.

Mr. Rusnov – It is your call, but if you could give us a yes or no?

Mr. Sutcliffe – I appreciate that but I think a yes or no doesn't get me the legitimacy that Mr. Kolick had in expressing his comments, so to equally address them.

Mr. Rusnov – Can you give us a yes or no, on whether you want to or can meet with them?

Mr. Sutcliffe – I will meet with them, but I think it is appropriate for the Planning Committee, which deals with these questions. I think I have addressed the safety concerns by saying it is half the traffic than on any other street and I have addressed the nature concerns. The concerns are very much issues that do not deal with the variances and I think that I addressed them all. I understand that is difficult for yourselves to be put in a position to tell these people that their issues do not fall in the venue of the variance Board, but it is a reality. I do realize that I will be addressing everyone on these issues at the Planning Commission meeting. I will gladly meet with these people to repeat what I have already told you and I will talk about what we are building there because it is in our best interest, of course to match their product but that is not part of the variance.

Mr. Kolick – I think that it is Mr. Sutcliffe, understand that if you look at the Code it says that it does not run contrary to the intent and objectives of this Zoning Code. If you look at the intent of the residential district, this is what our Code reads, (a) To regulate the bulk and location of buildings in relation to the land in order to obtain proper light, air, privacy and usable open spaces on each zoning lot appropriate for the district (b) To regulate the density and distribution of population in accordance with the objectives of the comprehensive plan to avoid congestion and to maintain adequate services; (c) To provide protection from noxious fumes, odors, dust, excessive noises, invasion of abnormal vehicular traffic and other objectionable influences; and (d) To protect the desirable characteristics of existing residential development, the promotion of stability, the most desirable and beneficial use of the land and bringing about the eventual conformity with the adopted or officially accepted Comprehensive Plan of the City. Those are standards that this Board has to take into account and I am not saying that your proposal runs contrary, but these are concerns that they are raising here before us and I am just wondering if it will be worthwhile for you to meet with them. If you don't want to that is fine too and if we want to refer this to the Engineering Department and to Safety to get the Police to address that issue, that is fine.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Thank you, for reading me the Zoning Code but the Board that I am in front of, the Board of Appeals is secondary.

Mr. Kolick – If you look at the last condition that this Board has to be concerned with is the intent and objectives of the Zoning Code and the intent and objectives of the Zoning Code are residential and they are concerns of this Board. As far as going to the Planning Commission, that is not a public forum and this is the only forum that these people will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I agree, but your Board of Zoning says that you are to decide and interpret provisions, which require impartial adjustments of conflicting interests and to grant variances from the strict letter of this Code in instances of unnecessary hardship. Such a Board is herein established to achieve, among others, the following purposes. It lists all of the reasons that I am here today, if there wasn't a need for the BZA it would not exist.

Mr. Kolick – I am not denying that the Board has the authority to do it, I am just telling you that the standards and the items they are bringing up are within the purview of the Board to look at when they make that decision. Before you, you have three choices, you can act on it if you feel that you have enough information; you can table it as a Board and ask for a review of the location of the drive; and

you have 90 days from the date that they filed the application to decide the variance. I do not want to hold this up, I want it to move, but if you don't feel you have all of the information that you need, then you can refer it for a review. Mr. Sutcliffe, have you done or had any engineering studies regarding the location of the driveway, as far as where the curve comes around the street?

Mr. Sutcliffe – We have completed three-dimensional engineering, so that we know that it will work.

Mr. Kolick – Please bring that up to the City and that will be helpful within itself. You can share it with these people as well, if you feel compelled to do so.

Mr. Sutcliffe – As you know, we gave that to the City already and submitted it for the last Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Kolick – I haven't heard anything from our Engineering Department about the location of the drive and tonight is the first time I have heard anything about the safety of the location of the drive.

Mr. Sutcliffe – The drive, do you mean the street that is being added as a stub?

Mr. Kolick – Yes, the street that is being added. I did not realize that the houses are going to sit sideways on the lot.

Mr. Sutcliffe - The stub is exemplified on the drawings that we submitted here.

Mr. Kolick – This Board will hear from our Engineering Department and Safety Department if that is what you want to do.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I am confused, isn't the stub street on the plat we submitted to you?

Mr. Kolick – We do not have an engineering study regarding the impact of that street, if any.

Mr. Sutcliffe – The only thing that is being projected, so far is the stub turn around to handle the driveways.

Mr. Kolick – I understand; however, the stub is coming into the street where after the S-curve comes in and that is what the people are complaining about. I am not saying that it is a traffic hazard, but it may be something we need to explore.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I guess I am confused because we are adding two families of traffic on a street that was designed to handle double sided traffic.

Mr. Kolick – You are adding a street that goes to the north and I agree the City has requested that you do that. Ultimately there would be more than two houses going on to that street and once the street is in you can't stop it.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I can't ask you to make a decision about something that is not even in front of you, a future street that you do not even have in front of you. I am somewhat confused because this has turned from a variance meeting into a Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Kolick – No, this Board needs to have all of the information in front of them in order to judge whether or not you meet the standards.

Mr. Sutcliffe – What information is missing?

Mr. Kolick – I told you, the information that these people gave us here tonight.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I have offered my responses to that.

Mr. Kolick – I understand that and if you want us to act on it then I will tell the Board to act on it. If you are comfortable with it then you know what to do with it.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Here is what I will tell the Board and it is from my words and not from any words being put into my mouth, we will meet with these people as a condition prior to going to the Planning Commission. To discuss and handle our issues, we will prepare a report that goes to the Planning Commission dealing with their concerns that are non-variance related. I have built over 1,000 homes for people and I have respect for their needs post move in. I will promise when I meet with them that I will do what I say and say what I do, because that is what we do. We are asking for simple 5' variances and I respect Mr. Kolicks representation of protecting the public, we too have to do the same. I just don't

think that this is the forum, but I will make that condition that I will meet with them, address their issues to them personally, prior to going to the Planning Commission. I really sincerely do what I say.

Mr. Kolick – I understand, but this Board makes their decision beforehand, before they have the input and these people get back to us and how do we know where they are at with it because this Board will never know. It will be after the decision the Board has made.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I have heard everything, I do respect what they want to see and I do want to meet with you people. They don't have to believe that, but I am putting it as a condition. If you approve this, I will not move this to the Planning Commission without speaking with the people that showed up to the meeting. I will hold that meeting here if you offer the space for it, Mr. Kolick, and we will gladly do that here.

Mr. Hayden – Our public hearing is still open and before I close it, are there any other comments speaking against the granting of the variance?

Mr. Kafantaris – I just want to make it clear, if Mr. Sutcliffe is agreeing to meet with us, I would like something in writing, because I learned my lesson and was promised that houses would never be built across the street from me and I didn't get it in writing. Now that it is a possibility, I would like at least a commitment to guarantee it. From what I understand, after this forum we will not have another shot at this.

Mr. Hayden – That would be a condition that we cannot impose.

Mr. Evans – The applicant is under oath and has told you that he will meet with you. That is what you need and it is in writing because it will be in the minutes.

Mr. Kafantaris – I just wanted to make that clear.

Mr. Vitanza – It is clear that Mr. Sutcliffe and Drees Homes came here with the ambition of just getting a clearance for the variance and not hearing and understanding or even talking to any of the residents. Do they have to? No, of course not, but I think it is in their best interest to at least explore that, when he learned that he potentially might not receive that approval, and the Board is in charge of that. You could tell that he wanted resolution, opposed to hearing what

we had to say and I appreciate you standing up on our behalf because this seems to be our only shot to say our piece. There are a lot of variables and we wanted to make sure the Board actually heard them.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, at this point, if you feel you want additional information on the safety concerns, regarding the road coming in then you should table the request and refer it to our Engineering Department and our Safety Officer and see what they have to say. If you feel that you have sufficient information to act on it, then go ahead and act on it. We can table this and you have 90 days from the date that the application came in. During the meantime, he can meet with the people if he so desires and if he doesn't then so be it.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Chairman, while you are contemplating that, let me address a couple of things that people have said. It is our job to review the Code and determine whether or not there should be a variance granted. Our job is not to enforce the Code but ours is to review the Code and determine whether something should be done. Individuals who own property can request whatever they want and you will find that development around your area will still continue because at some point the wooded property will be sold and developed. This street that has been proposed to come in, if you go back and look at all the promises by the Lipovits and all the processes that have taken place, I can tell you that every development in this community has seen the process where the developer and sales people have all promised things that did not materialize. This Board has dealt with a lot of those casualties and have tried to resolve them the best we can. If you are concerned about the way the houses are going to face, if you would google Yorktown Oval, which is in Strongsville and is in High Point, that is a street that was added just like this. Where the side of the house faces the front of other houses and you can actually see what that will look like. I would also encourage Drees Homes to meet with them prior to when we have this on our next agenda, that may not be the normal course but I think that you would be able to resolve the concerns and have a clean path going forward. You have to understand there could be 2,000 SF house across from you and could go in today without a variance. I really and truly don't think that is what you want to do; however, it may not be Drees Homes and it may be someone else who will develop it and it may not be to your liking. You have an opportunity and you have to look at it glass full; glass half empty and I know that the wild life in the area is

going to go away because the land can be developed. People want to move to Strongsville and they are going to develop the land and everyone wants to be in one place. This is an opportunity and you need to carefully consider what the alternatives might be because you may not like them.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, I would like to inform the people, I know you were saying that it was represented to you that the land would not be developed. I have been with the City for 53 years and sat on the Planning Commission when this originally came in and the developer did not want to set that aside as common property because he always planned on putting a development there. The City was aware that at some point in the future there was going to be a development there. We were under the impression that this was going to be when he acquired that land to the north, but there was always the plan to put the phase of the subdivision in there. It was never set aside permanently to be common property or anything else and this is in support of what the applicant is saying because that is what occurred around 40 years ago. Mr. Chairman, it sounds like you should table this and get a report from our Engineer and our Safety Officer. In the meantime, Mr. Sutcliffe you meet with the people and we can leave our public hearing open and put it on our next agenda, provided you can get with them. You do not have to meet here but we can accommodate you or you can meet somewhere else.

Mr. Baldin – As Mr. Evans said, both of us have been on this Board for a long time and this is not the first time we have heard something like this. With concerns that the woods will be removed and the children's play area will go away, but if you own the land you have a right to develop your land and eventually you are going to see homes on the vacant property. Development is happening everywhere in the City.

Mr. Sutcliffe – There is a lot of extension of power being applied here but we are not here to make waves. I would like each one of you to hear that we will meet with the residents and I will give you my card because I need one conduit and, I will communicate with you guys if you could send me your email addresses and we will find a location to meet.

Mr. Kolick – I agree with Mr. Sutcliffe, won't you give them one contact person with an email and phone number, so that you can deal with one person and that one contact person can communicate with the group.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I will be talking to you about what our intent is and it may not align with your intent, but we need to understand where each of us are coming from. I hope that you respect that time is really important to us and if you could respond quickly it would be wonderful, I appreciate that and thank you.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Sutcliffe, if you have anything else regarding the location of the road as far as the curve is concerned, by the way of reports or anything else, if you haven't already given them to the City please bring them up so that we have what we need.

Mr. Sutcliffe – My only point is that those are the things that all the Cities are asking for to get rid of those soup can looking streets and the curve is what people want.

Mr. Kolick – If you have any traffic engineering studies to show that it will not negatively impact Pin Oaks Drive because of the way that the curve is in the road, then bring it up and if you don't then that is fine. Our Engineering Department and Safety Officer will look at it too and they will make their determination and get their reports back to the Board. I am not asking them for reports on the wildlife, but just on the location of the road on where it comes in.

Mr. Sutcliffe – The road that was already approved, that people are already pulling out on?

Mr. Kolick – No, the road that you are proposing to put in and how it comes into Pin Oaks Drive.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Sure, it certainly gives the exemplification of thousands of roads that exist around here with the same curve with homes on both sides and that is quite normal. I don't know what you are asking me to do, a traffic study on the impact of curves on traffic accidents?

Mr. Kolick – No, I said if you had any traffic study showing the location of the road and how it will impact Pin Oak Drive then bring it in and if you don't fine.

Mr. Sutcliffe – There is no traffic there because it is not a through street.

Mr. Kolick - When your subdivision comes in, there will be traffic coming out of the road on to Pin Oaks Drive. Some of the concerns that I am hearing from the people is that they think it will be a safety concern. It may or may not be, I am not a traffic engineer.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I am still confused because there is no development going north of that, we are applying for a stub street for two lots. Are you asking me to do a study on a street that I don't know will exist yet?

Mr. Kolick - All I am asking is regarding the location of where the stub street is coming into Pin Oak Drive and if you don't have it that is okay.

Mr. Sutcliffe – I don't like the representation that I don't have something, because there is nothing to have.

Mr. Kolick – Fine, don't worry about it, our Engineering Department and Safety Officer will look at it.

Mr. Rusnov – Why don't we end the debate here and table it or vote on it.

Mr. Hayden – It does sound like we have a plan moving forward, so we will go ahead and table this item and we will hopefully see you on the agenda on the 29th.

Mr. Kolick – Try to meet with the people before the meeting so that we may act at that next meeting.

Mr. Sutcliffe – Of course.

3) DANIEL E. BAUER (TRUSTEE), Titan Construction and Repair, Agent

- a) Requesting a 45' rear yard setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 50' rear yard setback from an abutting residential district and where a 5' rear yard setback from an abutting residential district is proposed, in order to construct a 720 SF accessory structure

- b) Requesting a 20' side yard setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 25' side yard setback from a non-residential district and where a 5' side yard setback from a non-residential district is proposed, in order to construct a 720 SF accessory structure, property located at 14000 Pearl Road, PPN 393-18-013, zoned MS – Motorist Service

Mr. Hayden – Item number two on the agenda is for a rear and side yard setback variance for an accessory structure. Please state your name and address for the record.

Jesse Andrade, 424 Pearl Road, Brunswick, Ohio

Mr. Hayden – You were here for caucus and heard some of our comments around the variance.

Mr. Andrade – On parcel 393-18-006, there was a structure there that was used for storage but obviously they sold that to the City for the proposed fire station. We will need a side setback variance of 20' and a rear setback variance of 45'.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, to the applicant, what will be stored in the building?

Joe Gerycz, 1309 Fixler Road, Wadsworth, Ohio 44281

Mr. Gerycz – I am the General Manager at the dealership and basically what will go in the building are wheels and special tools to work on cars but nothing combustible.

Mr. Kolick – I understand you need this, because the City took your old building for the new fire station and we said that we would work with you. What is the Fifth Third Building being used for?

Mr. Gerycz – Currently we do not use it for anything.

Mr. Kolick – Is there a plan to demolish it eventually?

Mr. Gerycz – I don't want to speak on behalf of Mr. Ganley or any of the other parties of the Bauer Estate but I think when that changes hand there will be a plan to expand.

Mr. Hayden - Thank you for that information, during caucus we did discuss that there is a retention basin behind this so there is a minimal impact to the residential area. Also, it will be adjacent to the fire station and it will be next to the parking lot and this will be a small impact to the surrounding areas.

Mr. Hayden - This is a public hearing, is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak for the granting of the variance? Is there anyone in the audience that wishes to speak against the granting of the variance? Hearing none and seeing none, I will declare the public hearing closed and entertain a motion.

Mr. Houlé – Mr. Chairman, requesting a variance 45' rear yard setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 50' rear yard setback from an abutting residential district and where a 5' rear yard setback from an abutting residential district is proposed, in order to construct a 720 SF accessory structure and; (b) requesting a 20' side yard setback variance from Zoning Code Section 1258.11 (a), which requires a 25' side yard setback from a non-residential district and where a 5' side yard setback from a non-residential district is proposed, in order to construct a 720 SF accessory structure, property located at 14000 Pearl Road, PPN 393-18-013, zoned MS – Motorist Service

Mr. Evans – Second.

Mr. Hayden – Thank you Mr. Houlé, for the motion and Mr. Evans for the second. May we have a roll call please?

ROLL CALL:

MR. HOULÉ	YES
MR. EVANS	YES
MR. BALDIN	YES
MR. RUSNOV	YES
MR. HAYDEN	YES

MOTION APPROVED

Mr. Hayden – This variance has been approved by this Board.

Mr. Kolick – This request will have to be reviewed by the Architectural Review Board and Planning Commission, so if you get in contact with Mitzi she will follow through with the proper steps.

Mr. Hayden – Just a point of note, Mr. Jablonski at 14938 West 130th Street has withdrawn his request for a variance.

Mr. Hayden – If there is no further business to come before this Board, this meeting is adjourned.

Dustin Hayden/s/

Mitzi Anderson/s/

1-29-25

Mr. Hayden, Chairman

Mrs. Anderson, Secretary

Approval Date