

**CAUCUS PRIOR TO STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING &
BUILDING CODE APPEALS
Meeting of
October 22, 2025**

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

Administration: Assistant Law Director Daniel Kolick

Assistant Building Commissioner: Steve Molnar

Recording Secretary: Mitzi Anderson

The Board members discussed the following:

1) **SHEIBAN JEWELERS, Brilliant Electric Co., Agent**
(TABLED AT OCTOBER 8, 2025 MEETING)

Requesting a 2'- 9.5" ground sign height variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (e), which permits a 5' ground sign height and where a 7'- 9.5"ground sign height is proposed in order to install a ground sign, property located at 16938 Pearl Road, PPN 393-34-138, zoned GB General Business

Mr. Hayden – Item number one on the agenda is for 16938 Pearl Road. This request for Sheiban Jewelers was tabled at our meeting on October 8, 2025. They were to go back and measure their existing sign. Mr. Kolick, please give us your comments regarding their original sign request.

Mr. Kolick – The Building Department went back to review the original sign, they applied for a variance in 2007 for a 3' height variance and the BZA denied the request, but they agreed to grant a 1' height variance for the sign. However, the prior Building Commissioner did not include the base of the sign in his calculation and he allowed them effectively to install an 8' sign. It was our fault because our Building Department approved it thinking that it was in compliance with the decision of the Board and now he wants to go even higher.

Mr. Rusnov – We can approve the sign with the same size of the existing height of the sign.

Mr. Hayden – That is what we discussed at the last meeting, but we did not know the exact height of the sign.

2) BRYAN & CHRISTINA ICE (OWNER)

Requesting a 10' side yard variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.29 (b)(1), which requires pool equipment to be located in the rear yard, whereas the pool equipment is proposed to be located 10' into the side yard, property located at 12469 Saddlebrook, PPN 392-01-053, zoned R1-100

Mr. Hayden – Item number two on the agenda is for 12469 Saddlebrook. This request is for a side yard variance, which requires the pool equipment to be located in the rear yard. There are some topographical issues here, which includes the shape of the lot.

Mr. Houlé - There is also a retention pond located behind them.

Mr. Kolick – This is the first one I can recall that we ever approved in allowing them to locate things in the side yard. Is there somewhere else on the lot where it could be moved to? It is something to look at because it will not be the only one that you will get.

Mr. Baldin – It is unfortunate that we did not receive this before it started.

Mr. Kolick – The pool is in compliance and a permit was issued for the pool but not the pool equipment. You may start receiving request for sheds in the side yard and anything else. If the pool is moved beyond the rear line, this would not require a variance, as long as he is 15' off the side line and 15' off the rear.

Mr. Baldin – A lot of the homes built in the City have their air conditioning units and heat pumps on the side of the house.

Mr. Kolick – You are correct, we allow air conditioning units and heat pumps, but we have never allowed pool equipment.

Mr. Baldin – The pool equipment could be in line with the other equipment

Mr. Rusnov – I think he is trying to make the point that we do not want to set a precedent.

Mr. Baldin – I realize that; however, the pool is in the ground already. Are you going to have him tear out an \$80,000 pool?

Mr. Rusnov – No, but he can locate the pool equipment in the back of the house.

Mr. Kolick – There was a permit issued for the pool because it was in compliance with the Code.

Mr. Baldin – When I viewed the site, I was shocked at the size of the patio. I asked our Secretary to check if there was a permit issued because of the size of the patio and where it is located on the boundary lines

Mr. Hayden – We will address our concerns with the homeowner in just a couple of minutes.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Chairman, we do have approval from the Homeowners Association.

The Board members approved the minutes for October 8 2025.

**STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING & BUILDING CODE APPEALS
MINUTES OF MEETING
October 22, 2025
7:00 PM**

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

Present:

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

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 October 22, 2025 meeting of the Strongsville Board of Zoning and Building Code Appeals to order. May we have a roll call please?

ROLL CALL:

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

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

Mr. Hayden - Before us we also have minutes to approve from our meeting on October 8, 2025. We discussed this in Caucus and there was a minor correction and they 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) **SHEIBAN JEWELERS, Brilliant Electric Co., Agent**
(TABLED AT OCTOBER 8, 2025 MEETING)

Requesting a 2'- 9.5" ground sign height variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (e), which permits a 5' ground sign height and where a 7'- 9.5" ground sign height is proposed in order to install a ground sign, property located at 16938 Pearl Road, PPN 393-34-138, zoned GB General Business

Mr. Hayden – Item number one on the agenda is for 16938 Pearl Road. Please give us your name and address for the record.

Jack Maxwell, 4811 Van Epps Road, Cleveland, Ohio 44131

Jason Sheiban, 16394 Pepperwood Court, Strongsville, Ohio

Mr. Hayden – Were you here during Caucus when Mr. Kolick made comments regarding the original sign?

Mr. Maxwell – No, I was not present for Caucus.

Mr. Hayden – Mr. Kolick, please speak about what the Board granted in 2007.

Mr. Kolick – The applicant requested a 3' height variance to allow an 8' high sign in 2007. The Board of Zoning Appeals denied the request and granted a 1' height variance for the sign and they permitted a 6' high sign. When the sign was constructed they included a 2' high base and we did approve it. However, that should not have been allowed because it became an 8' high sign and that is the sign that currently exists. Are you requesting to go even higher than what is there now?

Mr. Sheiban – No, not at all, the sign is actually 3” shorter than the existing sign. We have to dig up the whole sign and go all the way to the bottom and the sign will start from grade.

Mr. Kolick – You are asking to go a little smaller than what you have there now?

Mr. Sheiban - Unfortunately, yes.

Mr. Baldin – At the last meeting I took measurements and thought the sign was a little taller than it should have been. I was here in 2007 and the Board did grant the variance, but at the same token I do not see any reason not to give you what you already have. I spoke up and said that at the last meeting and it seemed like you wanted more height, but now you are willing to come down a few inches.

Mr. Rusnov – You are asking to build a sign that is smaller than what you have there now?

Mr. Sheiban – Yes, correct from grade.

Mr. Houlé - If you are building a new base, can you make the base smaller and not be 7’ - 9.5” high? There is no reason not to get back closer to compliance.

Mr. Rusnov – We have already granted them the variance.

Mr. Houlé - Yes, incorrectly and in essence we are starting over again now.

Mr. Rusnov - What do you want to do, have the sign in compliance?

Mr. Houlé – I am willing to go a little higher, but I am not sure about 7’ – 9.5”. The Code is 5’ and even if you added a 2’ base, the sign would be 7’ high not 7’- 9.5” high.

Mr. Rusnov – Let’s see what they want to do.

Mr. Maxwell – One of our main concerns in having the height was losing visibility. Losing the height is taking away from it, where the Sheiban Jewelers part of the sign is being moved up to a higher elevation on the sign. This is compared to the existing one because of the hump that is there; therefore, the name is very visible.

Mr. Sheiban – I personally thought the sign was designed to be taller than what we had. However, going back and measuring from grade the sign is 3” shorter than what we had.

If we have to go shorter than that, I will just leave the sign how it is and would not even build a new sign at that point.

Mr. Houlé – The purpose of the new sign is to gain better attraction from your customers as they are driving down the road, the sign is going to be bigger. It doesn't necessarily have to be higher to get that kind of attraction.

Mr. Sheiban – It is not going to be higher than what it currently is.

Mr. Houlé – I am not saying higher than what it currently is, but higher than what we allow at 5' high.

Mr. Sheiban – What we currently have now is hidden and it is above what is currently allowed. What I would do is maintain the current sign instead of replacing it, I would not go any shorter than what we currently have, it just doesn't make sense for business. We are trying to get more visibility, not reduce the height.

Mr. Houlé – I think you would still have more visibility with the newer sign, it does not necessarily have to be the same height that it is now.

Mr. Hayden – At the end of the day, if they did not do anything the sign would still be as tall as it is. They went back and did the things that the Board asked them to do and they are not going over what is existing and the business has been here a very long time. I am inclined to support this even though we have had some other sign request over the years, where we have asked them to replace what was there.

Mr. Rusnov – I agree.

Mr. Baldin – The design and color scheme is a great improvement. I am in favor of this, your business has been there a long time and has not caused any problems. We cannot help mother nature because everything grows bigger and coming down in one direction it hinders the visibility of the sign. Also, the green sign blends in with all of the foliage, this will be a great improvement and I do not have a problem with it.

Mr. Sheiban – Thank you.

Mr. Evans – If the variance is granted, I would ask them to take a look at the numbers on the sign to see whether or not black numbers are visible enough. In my estimation the numbers would not be visible and if they are going to put the address up, the Fire and Police Department should be able to see it. I think the black numbers on the dark brick are not going to be visible and I realize that is not our purview.

Mr. Sheiban – You are absolutely correct, I did not think about the numbers for the purpose of the Fire Department.

Mr. Kolick – Maybe you can use the color tan, like your sign.

Mr. Sheiban – We will let the design team play with it and I agree with you especially for the purpose of the Fire Department. We have two restaurants there.

Mr. Baldin – You do a lot of business, so it would be nice to have the sign and the address visible.

Mr. Hayden – We did leave the public hearing open from the last meeting. 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, I would like to make a motion for requesting a 2'- 9.5" ground sign height variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (e), which permits a 5' ground sign height and where a 7'- 9.5" ground sign height is proposed in order to install a ground sign, property located at 16938 Pearl Road, PPN 393-34-138, zoned GB General Business

Mr. Baldin - Second.

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

ROLL CALL:

MR. RUSNOV	YES
MR. HOULÉ	NO
MR. EVANS	YES
MR. HAYDEN	YES
MR. BALDIN	YES

MOTION APPROVED

Mr. Hayden – Gentlemen, this variance has been approved by the Board and Council has the ability to review this variance request.

Mr. Kolick – You will have to wait until the next Council meeting on November 3, 2025 before they can issue the permit. Please note that the height goes from the grade up, the last time they did not measure it that way for you and that was our fault not your fault.

2) BRYAN & CHRISTINA ICE (OWNER)

Requesting a 10' side yard variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.29 (b)(1), which requires pool equipment to be located in the rear yard, whereas the pool equipment is proposed to be located 10' into the side yard, property located at 12469 Saddlebrook, PPN 392-01-053, zoned R1-100

Mr. Hayden – Item number two on the agenda is for 12469 Saddlebrook. Please give us your name and address for the record.

Craig Alten, 1101 Arborcrest Drive, Hinckley, Ohio 44233

Mr. Hayden - You were here during Caucus and heard some of our comments around the location of the equipment, we are being careful that we do not set a precedent moving forward. Please talk us through on whether there is a possibility in moving the equipment or if there is not.

Mr. Alten – Cul-de-sac properties are difficult to fit in, especially with the rules and regulations for the setback requirements. It is also difficult to try and put in a pool of this size and the equipment in an area that makes sense. Obviously, the rule is that the pool has to be behind the rear building line and the permit that was approved, it was originally behind that line. It is behind the rear property line and we are looking to move it next to the side of the house, which will be 3' towards the front of the property on the side. This will be less visible in that area from the street and neighbors in that area. We feel that where it is located now it would be in the middle of nowhere and I believe it makes sense to put it on the side.

Mr. Kolick – Is there somewhere in the rear of the house where the equipment can be located?

Mr. Alten - Unfortunately, there is not based off of the retention pond, the 15' setback and the swale in the rear. Myself and the Assistant Building Commissioner went back and forth trying to find the perfect spot, the location that we figured out was behind the rear building about 10" towards the side property, which is in the middle of nowhere. You will be able to see it more from the cul-de-sac in that area compared to putting it on the side. Even the neighbors in the rear of the pool on the back of the lake are going to see it more than on the side of the house.

Mr. Hayden – Will the equipment be enclosed?

Bryan Ice, 12469 Saddlebrook Lane, Strongsville, Ohio

Mr. Ice – There will be bushes, landscaping and tall trees on one side of the house, which is in between my side of the house and the neighbors. There will also be rows of bushes behind the pool.

Mr. Houlé – How far does it have to be off of the back of the house if it was placed there, 5' or is there no limit?

Mr. Kolick – I don't think there is a limit against the back of the house. It is the property lines that they would have to be off of.

Mr. Molnar – They will have to follow the manufacturer's instructions on the equipment.

Mr. Alten – The heater on the equipment has to be at least 8' from the windows on the the house because of the exhaust. That would come into play on the back side of the house if you are looking at the topo.

Mr. Kolick – Locating the equipment in the side yard opens up a big door for us because we have never permitted anything in the side yard by way of equipment.

Mr. Alten - If we moved it closer to the next-door neighbor it would literally be sticking out in the middle of nowhere and visually it would look terrible.

Mr. Baldin – It would look ugly, I am inclined to go in line with what is there now. If you are going to put in shrubbery, trees and bushes this will hide it. There really is no other place to put it, unless you put it out where everyone can see it. The only real option is to put it on the side.

Mr. Alten – There is a generator and air conditioner on that side.

Mr. Ice – All of that will be enclosed.

Mr. Alten – Covered up.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Ice, you used the term enclosed but did you mean that? You meant screening, but not enclosed?

Mr. Ice – Correct.

Mr. Hayden – Frankly, I used that term too.

Mr. Houlé - There is only 8' from the house to the pool in the rear and if you bring it out it will be much more visible, this is really a catch-22.

Mr. Evans – We do have the Homeowners Association approval.

Mr. Houlé – The only other option on the topo, would be to locate it behind the patio.

Mr. Alten – The grade on that side starts to drop down because of the pond.

Mr. Kolick – It doesn't show that it starts dropping until beyond your rear property line.

Mr. Alten – Being on site it does start dropping there.

Mr. Kolick – Okay.

Mr. Baldin – If this request is approved, it should be subject to the equipment being camouflaged or hidden.

Mr. Kolick – It should be screened.

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.

Tim Meehan, 11656 Coopers Run, Strongsville, Ohio 44149

Mr. Meehan – I am not for or against this, I would like the description of the height and size of the equipment. I live behind him and I do not know what we are talking about, so I am here to gather information.

Mr. Alten – The biggest item of the equipment is the filter and it is probably 3’.

Mr. Baldin – It will not be any higher than the heat pump that is out there now.

Mr. Alten – Correct it would be lower than the air conditioner because it is on a stand on the side of the house.

Mr. Baldin – It would actually be hidden behind the air conditioning unit.

Mr. Alten – The pad is typically 4’ x 6’.

Mr. Meehan – I am just getting information to see what equipment is going in.

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. Baldin – Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a motion for requesting a 10’ side yard variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.29 (b)(1), which requires pool equipment to be located in the rear yard, whereas the pool equipment is proposed to be located 10’ into the side yard, property located at 12469 Saddlebrook, PPN 392-01-053, zoned R1-100, subject to the screening of the equipment, which is to be approved by the Building Department

Mr. Houlé - Second.

Mr. Hayden – Thank you Mr. Baldin, for the motion and Mr. Houlé 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 – Mr. Ice, this variance has been approved by the Board.

Mr. Kolick – Be sure to provide a plan showing the Building Department what type of landscaping you will provide for the screening of the equipment.

Mr. Ice – Okay.

Mr. Hayden – If there is nothing else to come before the Board, this meeting is adjourned.

Dustin Hayden /s/

Mitzi Anderson /s/

11-5-25

Mr. Hayden, Chairman

Mrs. Anderson, Secretary

Approval Date