

**CAUCUS PRIOR TO STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING &
BUILDING CODE APPEALS
Meeting of
February 26, 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) **MARIO JOKIC (OWNER), Legacy Home Improvements, Agent**

Requesting a 300 SF Floor Area variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15, which permits a 400 SF Floor Area and where a 700 SF Floor Area is proposed, in order to construct an Unenclosed Patio, property located at 18202 Meadow Lane, PPN 396-09-001, zoned R1-75

Mr. Hayden – Item number one on the agenda is for 18202 Meadow Lane and it is for a square foot floor area variance for an unenclosed patio. The Code allows 400 SF and they are requesting 700 SF. We have been consistent with how we have ruled on these requests in the past and City Council has increased the square footage and we have stuck to it.

Mr. Houlé – There is a large one there now and I did not get to speak with anyone when I was there. Is that the one we are dealing with and are they going to replace it?

Mr. Hayden – I don't know and I am not sure.

Mr. Evans – We will have to ask them on the floor.

Mr. Rusnov - Mr. Kolick, does this variance fall within our four parameters?

Mr. Kolick - I can tell you what the four parameters are, but that will be up to the Board to determine.

Mr. Houlé – There is certainly no geographical issues.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Chairman, I think we all understand that from the results of COVID, people are using their properties more. We have looked at reasons where there have been extenuating circumstances, such as topography and things like that. In this case,

looking at the homes that are around that area, there is not anything that large. This is a really large deck and while we all understand that everyone would like big spaces, given that City Council has almost doubled the size of allowed decks and this is double the size of what is now allowed. I don't think that City Council would back us up on something like this unless there were extenuating circumstances.

Mr. Kolick – This property also backs up to a home on Bonnie Lane and does not have common area behind it.

Mr. Houlé – There are quite a few other structures in the back yard already, which would add to my concern about adding another huge structure.

Mr. Hayden – We will get some answers on the floor.

2) ROBERT CROSS (OWNER), Ken Cross, Agent

- a) Requesting a 692 SF Floor Area variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15, which permits a 400 SF Floor Area and where a 1092 SF Floor Area is proposed in order to construct a Shed; and
- b) Requesting a 3.25" height variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.04 (g), which permits a 15' height and where a 15'3.25" height is proposed in order to construct a 1092 SF Shed; property located at 18252 Hunt Road, PPN. 399-26-011, zoned R1-75

Mr. Hayden – Item number two on the agenda is for 18252 Hunt Road. They are requesting square footage and height variances. The Code allows 400 SF and they are requesting 1092 SF and a 15' height is allowed, where they are requesting a height of 15'3.25". The height is not such a big deal but it is a very large structure. I didn't have a chance to speak with the homeowner, but I am interested in knowing the use for the structure.

Mr. Evans – There is also an existing shed back there, which is large and there is a stone driveway.

Mr. Baldin – I believe they are going to tear down the existing shed and they want to construct a new one. They are not going to have a large door, just an entry door and in talking to the homeowner, this will be a hobby workshop.

Mr. Rusnov – Remember, the variance follows the property.

Mr. Evans - We should make sure that we condition it on the size of the doors, because a building that big could easily be changed to have larger doors on it.

Mr. Houlé – I still think it is too large and I believe that the existing barn is already over the square footage. Even though it is coming down, it still would not have been within the parameters. I am not as concerned about the height variance of 3" but the size for sure.

Mr. Kolick - The existing barn is used as a woodshop now but you could easily run a business out of something that size.

Mr. Evans – The 15' height shows the first-floor height of 8' and second-floor height at 6'. Based on past experience, the Board should condition it on there not being any living space in the barn and I would be curious to know what utilities they are running out to it. We would want to make sure that it does not become a living space.

Mr. Hayden – We will talk to the homeowner on the floor.

3) SHEETZ/Chuck Stewart, Agent

- a) Requesting a Canopy Sign variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (f), which permits one (1) Canopy Sign and where two (2) Canopy Signs are proposed; and
- b) Requesting a 3.08 SF Sign Face Area variance (per sign) from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (f), which permits a 10 SF Sign Face Area and where a 13.08 SF Sign Face Area (per sign) is proposed; and
- c) Requesting a Wall Sign variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (c), which permits two (2) Wall Signs and where five (5) Wall Signs are proposed to construct a new Sheetz, property located at 21034 Royalton Road, PPN 392-16-002, zoned MS – Motorist Service and GB – General Business

Mr. Hayden – Item number three on the agenda are sign variances for Sheetz located at 21034 Royalton Road. This is very similar or identical to requests that we have had in the past, which we have granted. Including a little bit of overage that we have had on the square footage of the signs, we have set a precedent for this and I didn't have any additional issues.

Mr. Evans – Based on what we did for the new Sheetz on Royalton Road, this is pretty much in alignment with that one. Obviously, they have been successful because they are going to take out a building and gas pumps and put in a new building with new gas pumps.

Mr. Baldin – I did not see any real problems and we gave variances to the new Sheetz on Royalton Road. This was the first Sheetz that they put up in our City and now they want to demolish it and construct a new Sheetz.

Mr. Houlé - Is the square footage of the other signs alright? It says we allow 150 % of the square footage and it seems like the sizes are way over, even though those are not being asked for as variances.

Mr. Rusnov – They are inline with the other variances we granted for Sheetz.

Mr. Evans – I think those are done a little bit differently because of the way that the signs are.

Mr. Baldin – When they are on the floor, they can shed a little light on this.

The Board members approved the minutes for January 29, 2025.

**STRONGSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING & BUILDING CODE APPEALS
MINUTES OF MEETING
February 26, 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 February 26, 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.

Mr. Hayden - Before us we also have minutes to approve from our meeting on January 29, 2025. We discussed this in caucus and there were no corrections or changes and we will file those 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) **MARIO JOKIC (OWNER), Legacy Home Improvements, Agent**

Requesting a 300 SF Floor Area variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15, which permits a 400 SF Floor Area and where a 700 SF Floor Area is proposed, in order to construct an Unenclosed Patio, property located at 18202 Meadow Lane, PPN 396-09-001, zoned R1-75

Mr. Hayden – Item number one on the agenda is for 18202 Meadow Lane. If we can have a representative step forward and state your names and addresses for the record.

Mario Jokic, 18202 Meadow Lane, Strongsville, Ohio

Chelly Jokic, 18202 Meadow Lane, Strongsville, Ohio

Mr. Hayden - You were here during Caucus and heard some of our comments around the variance request. Please take us through the project and the need for the variance. You heard our comments around some of these things that we have to look at when we are granting variances, please take us through this.

Mr. Jokic - We built a concrete patio already and received a permit for it. It is a little hard for us to sit there in the rain, so we want to cover it, because it is open and not enclosed and we are removing a shed and leaving one shed. The neighbor put their garden on my land and I did not say anything about it. We received a permit for the fence and had a survey done and that is how we know. They are on my land but I moved the fence because we have a little kid and a dog so, I had to enclose the yard.

We were looking at all of our neighbors and we are good with everyone. Some of them have already built a lot more than we have and I am sure the Board knows that. We are asking for 700 SF because we would like to cover the concrete. Pat Walsh who lives by the cemetery, put in 2000 SF, has anyone seen that?

Mr. Hayden – He put in 2000 SF of what?

Mr. Jokic- He put in 2000 SF of a covered patio in his back yard and I installed monuments in the cemetery and I saw it. There is a pool there that is not even 3' from the fence, but when I had to install my shed I had to move it 5' off the property line. There are no neighbors here complaining about this and we think that we have a big yard. The roof is not going to affect anyone around and that is why we are requesting it. This will be professionally done and the roof will be at the same level as our roof and it will look nice, it will have the same level and steepness.

Mr. Baldin – Mr. Jokic, how long have you lived there and were those other structures already there, or did you put those in?

Mr. Jokic - We have lived there for 13 years and the other structures were done four to five years ago.

Mr. Baldin – You have a shed, chicken coop and a screened in patio.

Mrs. Jokic - We bought a gazebo from Lighthouse Pools but it is not a structure.

Mr. Baldin – It is the one that sits back on the right-hand side.

Mrs. Jokic – It is a four-post metal gazebo that we bought at Lighthouse Pools.

Mr. Baldin – You have three structures in the yard already and a hot tub. The Board has to look at all of that because you are only allowed so much in a yard.

Mr. Hayden – We need to consider those other structures, we have had some request over the last six months that we have not moved forward on because it did not fit within our purview and I am struggling because I am not sure that this does. The Board has had a few requests within the last 180 days that we have not approved.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Jokic, you have an existing 700 SF patio and you would like to put a roof over the whole 700 SF?

Mr. Jokic – Yes, we have stamped concrete and we would like to go one foot over.

Mr. Baldin – We have run into this quite often, people want to go over the size of the concrete because of the rain runoff.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, the only ones that I know that have been granted are for ADA requirements or something of that nature. The others have had to conform to the Code with 400 SF.

Mr. Houlé – The square footage for that was just recently raised.

Mr. Hayden – Mr. Jokic, one of the things that we are mindful of is not setting a precedent moving forward. If we were to grant this variance, the next person may come in and see that 700 SF was approved; therefore, I am going to ask for 800 SF and then it just continues on.

Mr. Jokic – I understand but if my neighbor can have 2,000 SF, why can't I?

Mr. Hayden – Do we know what property that is and is the square footage accurate?

Mr. Evans – I don't know about the size of the square footage but when I looked at it on Google before going out to see it, it was huge and that stood out in my mind.

Mr. Rusnov – Were there permits issued?

Mr. Evans – They will have to look at it.

Mr. Baldin – He is saying there was a pool built there last year that is only 3' from the fence, that is totally illegal.

Mr. Jokic – He got a permit.

Mr. Hayden – Is it an above ground pool?

Mr. Jokic – No, it is an inground pool.

Mr. Evans – We did not look at that.

Mr. Jokic – There is another house on my side that has a huge pool and doesn't have the distance from the fence.

Mr. Hayden – We will have to take a look at those. However, with those particular situations, if they did not apply for a permit that would not have been something that would have come in front of this Board.

Mr. Jokic – I can't believe that someone would build a 2000 SF structure without a permit.

Mr. Hayden – It happens, but you are doing it the right way.

Mr. Jokic – That project is probably worth about \$150,000.00.

Mr. Hayden – City Council increased the square footage at the beginning of last year, they permitted up to 175 SF and they increased it to 400 SF. When you constructed the patio, we only allowed 175 SF at that time for an unenclosed patio.

Mr. Kolick - We always permitted the patio, we did not permit an unenclosed structure over the patio with that amount of square footage. There is nothing wrong with the patio that I know of.

Mr. Hayden – At the time, if you had inquired what we allow for an unenclosed patio, it would have been significantly less than what it is now because they approved the increase last year.

Mr. Kolick – The increase was passed on January 16, 2024.

Mr. Evans – One of the options for the applicant, would be to take a look at whether or not they could do a cover over part of the patio. I think we have had only one other person that opted to do that and the rest of them said that they did not want to do it. One of them did and I think they were successful at doing it. As our Chairman explained, we have the four reasons for granting a variance and the reasons do not include, I want something bigger. The neighbors that you have referred to, our Building Department will look into those, because none of us remember issuing any variances for those. Which tells us that they probably did not get a permit because if they had they would have had to come to this Board. Your request is very large and much bigger than what City Council permits, it does not fall within our reasons for granting variances. Your best option may be to go back and talk to Legacy Home Improvements to see if they could build a roof over part of the concrete pad. That would be an option that you would have and it would give you some coverage. You could do the 400 SF without a variance and if you went to 450 SF because that was the right way of doing it because of the size of the patio, that might be something we could look at. However, the 700 SF is not going to fall within the reasons that we grant variances.

Mr. Rusnov – You should go back to the drawing board to see if you can conform a little bit better than you are now. You can request to table this so that you do not have a big delay and go over this with your contractor to see if you can or want to do this. Also, you can put it to a vote today.

Mr. Jokic – What if I bring in the permit from my neighbor?

Mr. Hayden – It is a good question; however, it would not weigh on our decision with this particular project. When we look at projects, we review each one individually.

Mr. Jokic – I just can't understand why my neighbor is allowed 2000 SF, over my 700 SF?

Mr. Rusnov – If the Code was a couple hundred SF and he built 2000 SF, it does not make sense to us that the City would have granted them a permit.

Mr. Jokic – That is why I can bring the permit, to let everyone know what is going on and in the future you may be able to fix this.

Mr. Hayden – Certainly, the Building Department can look into this. As far as this particular job, we are focused on what you have requested. As Mr. Evans stated, you have a couple of options; you can request to table the request, which means you would postpone this to maybe the next meeting. That would give you time to talk to Legacy Home Improvements. Mitzi, when would they have to let you know to get on the next meeting agenda?

Mrs. Anderson – They would have to inform me by early next week.

Mr. Hayden – If you have a chance to talk to Legacy Home Improvements, you can let Mitzi know by early next week, then you could be place on our next agenda. If not, it would be the meeting after that and that would be one option. The other option, as Mr. Rusnov stated, is that we could vote on it this evening, but, you have heard some of our comments and it may be worth taking the extra time to talk with your contractor.

Mr. Jokic – I will probably not go with 400 SF because it will look ugly because the concrete will stick out.

Mr. Hayden – As Mr. Evans stated, we had another resident last year who ran into a similar issue and they successfully did this. I am not sure what the end result was or what it looked like.

Mr. Rusnov – It is your call. Would you like for us to vote on it or would you like to go back to the drawing board? It is up to you.

Mr. Jokic – Let me first talk to the neighbor to see if he obtained a permit because he would not have built something without a permit. We would like to postpone and table this for right now.

Mr. Hayden – Okay, we will table this request.

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. We will hold this public hearing open until the applicant is ready to come back.

2) ROBERT CROSS (OWNER), Ken Cross, Agent

- a) Requesting a 692 SF Floor Area variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.15, which permits a 400 SF Floor Area and where a 1092 SF Floor Area is proposed in order to construct a Shed; and
- b) Requesting a 3.25" height variance from Zoning Code Section 1252.04 (g), which permits a 15' height and where a 15'3.25" height is proposed in order to construct a 1092 SF Shed; property located at 18252 Hunt Road, PPN. 399-26-011, zoned R1-75

Mr. Hayden – Item number two on the agenda is for 18252 Hunt Road. Please state your names and addresses for the record.

Kenneth Cross, 18298 Hunt Road, Strongsville, Ohio

Robert Cross, 18298 Hunt Road, Strongsville, Ohio

Mr. Hayden – Gentlemen you were here for Caucus and heard some of our comments around your project. Please take us through the request for the variances.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – The existing shed that is there was built in 1990 or maybe even before that. At least 1/3 of the floor joist studs, walls and floors are rotted. It is also undersized for the equipment that we have in there now, we have six different pieces of equipment in there. In my experience we need at least 8' from the center of each piece of equipment, so that you can get in there and work.

Mr. Hayden – How many pieces of equipment do you have in there?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – We have six pieces.

Mr. Baldin – Is this a hobby or are you running a business?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – No, this is not a business; however, over the years if someone asks me to build something, I may charge them. I am not actively in business and this is mostly a hobby. The original shed was built by our uncle and he did the same thing, where he built things that he donated to the church or sold at banquets.

Mr. Baldin – You would like to tear down the existing shed and construct a new one?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Yes, the existing pole barn/shed has a number of skunks and groundhogs, living under there.

Mr. Hayden – What will the upstairs space in the proposed shed be used for?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – It will be used for storage. The existing shed is higher than what is allowed by Code but at that time it was used to have equipment up there to dry wood.

Mr. Baldin – Are you planning to run any plumbing to the shed, rent as an apartment, or operate a wood working business?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – No and no business. In the future if the property is sold, someone can come in and make it what they want and possibly convert it to a garage, a garden shop or an art shop.

Mr. Baldin – That brings up an issue that we discussed earlier regarding granting a variance on a property. Sometimes we have to put on restrictions so that someone would not be allowed to do that. You currently have a man door on there right now, but someone may come in the future and put on a big garage door .

Mr. Kenneth Cross – That would be up to them, because if the building is already there, they could come back and request a garage. You have the Codes to put in a garage and you would have to add a driveway to it.

Mr. Baldin – We would put conditions on the variance, so that would not happen.

Mr. Evans – Our problem is that people in the past have said that they are not going to do that and either they do it or they sell the property and someone else does it. We would condition this so that the door opening that you are proposing would be the ones that are locked in on this and they would not be able to put a garage door on the building. The reason is, we do not want that to become a livable facility or a second rental unit. The six foot above could be altered later to create a living space or a garage that they could put cars in. Either one of those things would be a problem, because the building was not intended for that use. I also mentioned in Caucus, when you apply for a variance and you have conditions on the property that do not meet current Building Code, we require that the current Building Code be met in order for us to grant the variance. Therefore, the stone driveway that you have now would have to become a permanent hard surface driveway, in order for us to grant the variance.

Mr. Kolick – That probably is not correct in this case, because the doors that they have on it don't meet our minimum size to replace a garage door.

Mr. Hayden – I think he is saying if it was converted.

Mr. Kolick – That is why they have a 400 SF requirement, so that these things do not get converted in the future. We are not able to go out there and monitor this in the future.

Mr. Evans – What I am saying, is for the driveway for their house.

Mr. Kolick – I thought you were talking about the garage.

Mr. Evans – No, we have always required them to meet City Code at the point of granting a variance and it is a stone driveway from the house to Hunt Road.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Why is that not grandfathered?

Mr. Evans – It is not grandfathered when it comes to this Board for a variance consideration. The City has always required us to upgrade whatever may be deficient in the Building Code, to make it what it is currently and that would include a driveway.

Mr. Houlé – It is currently grandfathered in until you request adjustments or variances, then you would have to conform to the Code.

Mr. Robert Cross – You are saying in order for this to be granted, I would have to run a concrete driveway from the street.

Mr. Evans – A driveway from the street to your house.

Mr. Robert Cross – That has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Evans – Correct it doesn't, but unfortunately this goes back 20-25 years ago, because the City wanted people to upgrade to the current City Code requirements, that have stone driveways, septic tanks or sewers and this forces the issue when someone wants a variance. Because you are here for a variance, it means the City has the opportunity to bring properties up to the current Code.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Does that also mean sidewalks?

Mr. Evans – Only if there are existing sidewalks on neighboring properties, would it be required to put in a sidewalk. I don't believe the other properties that are contiguous to you have sidewalks.

Mr. Kolick – Mr. Chairman, we require that upgrade, but only if they have added to their house, then they would have to put the concrete driveway in; however, this is a separate structure. We do not require them under the law to put in a concrete driveway, but if this was going to be a garage we would because they would have to have it all the way from the road out to the garage. Also, we would not require them to put in a sidewalk at this point.

Mr. Rusnov – This is what we have brought up over the last 10-12 years, that the code needs to be revised because the vast majority of the Code was written between 1978 through the mid 1980's.

Mr. Kolick – The Code has been revised, Mr. Rusnov.

Mr. Rusnov – Not the entire Code.

Mr. Hayden – What is the square footage of the existing shed that you will be taking down?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – The existing shed is roughly 16' x 30'.

Mr. Houlé – I measured it out and thought it was about 1000 SF.

Mr. Evans – It is on the drawings as 16' x 28'.

Mr. Hayden – So, the existing shed is approximately 448 SF. Does that sound about right?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Yes.

Mr. Hayden – Understanding with the equipment you have, that your current situation is tight. Is there any reduction you can do to the size that you are requesting?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Do you have any suggestions?

Mr. Hayden – Closer to Code.

Mr. Kolick – What you are requesting is almost triple the size that is allowed under the Code. The other problem you run into is when you have a structure this large the neighbors come and they want things built and you are working on items. Then Council starts to get phone calls that there is too much noise and that is why Council limits it to 400 SF. If there is a topographical problem or some other reason to do it, I think that is what the Board needs to be looking at.

Mr. Baldin – Can you live with something smaller?

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Maybe, 2' smaller on each side, which would be 22' x 38'.

Mr. Kolick – City Council just revised this from 175 SF to 400 SF, so they have already allowed double what they used to allow.

Mr. Rusnov – City Council has already increased the size. There is no reconciliation here, you will have to figure out what you can live with and get with the Building Department to see how much you can give or you can take your chances for the vote tonight.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – That is why we are here because I talked to the Building Department and submitted drawings for the variance requests.

Mr. Hayden – Mr. Cross, I am inclined to stick to the Code on this, especially with City Council's increase not long ago. As we start to get above that, it just goes back to setting a precedent and that is something we have to live with moving forward. I would want to see this at 400 SF.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Do you go by the Ohio Building Code of 2014?

Mr. Kolick – This is not a Building Code matter it is the Zoning Code, which is a separate matter. We are not looking for a variance from the Building Code. The Zoning Code permits up to a 400 SF for an accessory structure. If you meet certain conditions they could grant a larger size but we have never granted to my knowledge anywhere near this size and I have been with the City for nearly 53 years.

Mr. Hayden – There are two options, you could table the request and go back to see what square footage you could live with, if you stuck to Code your request would be about 58 SF less than what you have now and you are already tight, I understand that. The second option is for us to vote on your request and we could see what happens.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Let's table it for now. The way everyone is talking I doubt if it is going to pass, no matter what.

Mr. Hayden – Given the recent increase by City Council and we have been very careful not to go outside of those parameters to set a new precedent because of the new increase. We have been pretty consistent with that over the last year.

Mr. Evans – Mr. Chairman, the only other thing that I would suggest is if the request was to replace the existing building because of the deficiencies that you have cited. It is bigger than what is allowed, that might make a difference to the Members of this Board. You are replacing a building that has been there for a long time with the same footprint.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – I don't understand you, I'm sorry.

Mr. Evans – That's okay, if you wanted to replace the existing building as it is with the same size, but, it is larger than what is permitted in the 400 SF, Members of this Board might be inclined to allow that as a larger building and grant a variance for the additional 48 SF in order to give you the same size building. Understanding it was your uncle who built it many years ago and perhaps at this point we would make the allowance based on the fact that it was replacing exactly the same building. I understand that it is smaller than what you want, but if your decision is that you can't have less than the 700 SF we will vote on that at whatever point you bring it back to us. I am suggesting that replacing the building in the same footprint as it is now and understanding it would require a variance might be something the Board may do.

Mr. Rusnov – It is much more palatable and a reasonable excuse.

Mr. Evans – It still does not meet the four reasons for granting a variance; however, because the building conditions warrants being replaced it would be a much more reasonable request than going to 700 SF.

Mr. Kolick – I am not sure he needs a variance for the existing building because according to the drawing it is 16' x 28'.

Mr. Hayden – Because the existing building is 448 SF, if he replaces it he would need a variance of 48 SF.

Mr. Rusnov – According to the State and City Code, if you have a home that burns down, they will permit you to build the same home, even though it does not conform with the current code, you could build it on the same footprint and that is the point Mr. Evans was trying to make

Mr. Kenneth Cross – I understand, but what is the sense because the existing building is crowded.

Mr. Hayden – If the building is dilapidated and you needed to replace it, that would be an option.

Mr. Evans – You stated that you have structural problems with the current building and I was trying to find an alternative. I understand that it would be crowded but if replacing the building is the most important thing, replacing it with the like size may be the only alternative.

Mr. Kenneth Cross – Let's table it for now and we will see.

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. We will hold this public hearing open until we hear back from you.

3) SHEETZ/Chuck Stewart, Agent

- a) Requesting a Canopy Sign variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (f), which permits one (1) Canopy Sign and where two (2) Canopy Signs are proposed; and
- b) Requesting a 3.08 SF Sign Face Area variance (per sign) from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (f), which permits a 10 SF Sign Face Area and where a 13.08 SF Sign Face Area (per sign) is proposed; and
- c) Requesting a Wall Sign variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (c), which permits two (2) Wall Signs and where five (5) Wall Signs are proposed to construct a new Sheetz, property located at 21034 Royalton Road, PPN 392-16-002, zoned MS – Motorist Service and GB – General Business

Mr. Hayden – Item number three on the agenda is for Sheetz. Please state your name and address for the record.

Kayleigh Bevington, 1 Allegheny Square, Suite 402, Pittsburgh, PA 15212

Mr. Hayden – I believe you were here for Caucus and heard some of our comments regarding this project. Please take us through the project.

Ms. Bevington – I think you are familiar with this existing Sheetz, which they are tearing down and building a new structure. The carwash will remain and they will reduce it to one gas canopy and add a drive thru component. The signage being proposed is pretty standard and is similar to the other Sheetz that was recently constructed in Strongsville. The increase in signage is from them having two street facing lot lines and that is what is driving the signage number and adding in some signage for the drive-thru component, as well.

Mr. Hayden – We covered this in Caucus, as far as the number of signs and square footage, this request is similar to the new Sheetz constructed on Royalton Road. Are there any additional comments?

Mr. Evans – Mr. Chairman, we have considered the fact that the signage and the number of signs is not that much bigger, because of the drive-thru being added and the change of the building. This is in line with what we approved for the Sheetz project on Royalton Road by the ice rink.

Mr. Baldin – I agree and do not see us making any changes here that will affect anything.

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 this public hearing closed and entertain a motion.

Mr. Evans - Mr. Chairman I motion to approve a request for a Canopy Sign variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (f), which permits one (1) Canopy Sign and where two (2) Canopy Signs are proposed; and approve a request for a 3.08 SF Sign Face Area variance (per sign) from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (f), which permits a 10 SF Sign Face Area and where a 13.08 SF Sign Face Area (per sign) is proposed; and

approve a request for a Wall Sign variance from Zoning Code Section 1272.12 (c), which permits two (2) Wall Signs and where five (5) Wall Signs are proposed to construct a new Sheetz, property located at 21034 Royalton Road, PPN 392-16-002, zoned MS – Motorist Service and GB – General Business

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. Hayden – Ms. Bevington, the variances have been approved by the Board.

Mr. Kolick – Council may review this project, after that you will have to go before the Architectural Review Board.

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

Dustin Hayden/s/

Mitzi Anderson/s/

3-12-25

Mr. Hayden, Chairman

Mrs. Anderson, Secretary

Approval Date