

**Board of Zoning and Building Appeals**  
**CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS**  
**AGENDA OF OCTOBER 23, 2025**  
**7:00 PM**

---

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Regular meeting minutes of September 25, 2025

**PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT**

**OTHER REPORTS OR CORRESPONDENCE**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

PPZ2025-0382 Andrew Bennie, 51 Cadet Drive, PPN 07-00-022-105-014

Proposal consists of constructing a breezeway roof connecting house and detached garage. Property is zoned R-1 Residence District. Requests:

1. A 10-foot variance for setback of a detached private garage from a dwelling. Applicant shows 0 feet, code requires 10 feet, Section 1294.03(a).
2. A 270-foot variance for area of a detached private garage. Applicant shows 946 square feet, code allows 676 square feet, Section 1294.03(d)(1).

**ADJOURNMENT**

**NORTH RIDGEVILLE BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS  
MINUTES OF  
REGULAR MEETING – THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2025**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Chairwoman Masterson called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 7:00 PM.

**ROLL CALL:**

Present were members Brad Weaver, Planning Commission Liaison Frank Toth, Vice-Chairman Paul Graupmann and Chairwoman Linda Masterson.

Also present were Council Liaison Cliff Winkel, Chief Building Official Guy Fursdon, Planning and Development Director Kimberly Lieber, Assistant Law Director Toni Morgan and Deputy Clerk of Council Tina Wieber.

Member James Cain was excused.

**MINUTES:**

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Toth to approve the August 28, 2025 meeting minutes.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 4    No – 0

**PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT:**

Chairwoman Masterson asked if there was a Planning Commission Report.

Planning Commission Liaison Toth noted that at the Planning Commission regular meeting of September 9, 2025 the Commission took action on the following items:

**PPZ2025-0366: Panda Express, 32429 Cook Rd, PPN 07-00-003-102-104, -045, -046**

Applicant: Phillip Meador, Heights Venture Architects, 5741 Legacy Dr, Suite 320, Plano, TX 75024.

Owner: BOBKOB 32425 LLC, 4343 Thorn Ridge Circle, Cleveland, OH 44135. Proposal consists of constructing a new drive through restaurant. Property zoned B-3 Highway Commercial District.

**PC ACTION:** Approved by a vote of 4-0 with the following conditions:

1. Lots are consolidated.
2. Engineering will coordinate the sidewalk alignment along the frontage.
3. The easement on the adjacent parcel currently used for truck traffic will be coordinated with the property owner.

**PPZ2025-0372: Kaitlyn Culp, White Rose Ballet Academy, 6287 Lear Nagle Rd, Unit 4, PPN: 07-00-008-115-067**

Owner: Liberty Parkway HRD LLC, 25255 Center Ridge Rd, Westlake, OH 44145. Referral from Director of Planning and Development for similar use determination. Property is zoned I-2 Light Industrial District.

**PC ACTION:** Approved *Indoor Fitness and Training Facility* as a similar use by a vote of 4-0 with the condition that the following definition shall be included with the use: "*Indoor Fitness and Training*

*Facility*" means a building or portion thereof used primarily for participatory physical activity, fitness or instructional training, whether operated for profit or not-for-profit. Examples include, but are not limited to, dance studios, yoga studios, martial arts schools, gymnastics centers, fitness studios or indoor sports training facilities. This use is distinct from *Commercial Recreation, Indoor*, which refers to facilities intended primarily for entertainment, amusement or spectator-based activities.

**Ordinance 2025-110: An Ordinance amending Sections 1268.02, 1270.02, and 1272.04 of the North Ridgeville Zoning Code to update use regulations for automobile service stations and gasoline stations.**

(Introduced by Councilman Abens; First Reading on 07-21-2025; Council referred to Planning Commission and Building and Lands on 07-21-2025; to Building and Lands on 08-18-2025)

**PC ACTION:** By a vote of 3-0, Planning Commission requested that Council provide an extension of their review period. Abens abstained.

**OTHER REPORTS OR CORRESPONDENCE:**

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**PPZ2025-0380: Wendy's 34273 Center Ridge Rd, PPN: 07-00-017-130-031**

Applicant: Custom Sign Center, Inc., Nathan Ervin, 3200 Valleyview Dr, Columbus, OH 43204. Owner: Rini Realty Company, 924 Westpoint Parkway, Suite 150, Westlake, OH 44145. Proposal consists of signage. Property is zoned B-3 Highway Commercial District. Request:

1. A 26.98 square foot variance for area of building signs. Applicant shows 103.65 square feet, code allows 76.67 square feet, Section 1286.11(a)(1)(A).

Application was read.

Chairwoman Masterson asked if there was a representative for the application.

Edward Brenot, 650 Blossom Dr, Amherst, OH 44001, was sworn in.

Chairwoman Masterson asked Director Lieber for her administrative review.

Director Lieber explained that the proposal was for a sign package for the recently renovated Wendy's on Center Ridge Road and that the proposed signage exceeded the code allowances. She stated that signage was allocated based upon the building frontage or the unit frontage and there was two square feet of signage for every linear foot of building width. She mentioned that in this case, the skinny part of the building was what was facing Center Ridge Road and was 38 feet 4 inches wide and that doubling that meant that they would be allocated 76.67 square feet of signage. She discussed that earlier this year, as part of the renovation, Wendy's applied for and obtained a permit to install signage up to that allocated amount, but they were now before the Board so that they could add some additional signage to the building that could not have been accommodated without a variance. She stated that they were proposing to add, as they could see the word Wendy's and then the cameo, which was the base, so they were proposing to add two of those cameos onto other sides of the building that currently just had the Wendy's sign and then they were also adding a Dave sign by the drive through. She commented that it looked much bigger in the photo than it was compared to the cameo.

Mr. Brenot stated that he had pictures of what it looked like before and after and that it was really just

the same as what they had previously. He explained that they were just looking to put the face back up on the sides and then the Dave cameo that was referred to, it used to be like a shoot that they would deliver through and they covered that years ago but that sign was just old and yellow and faded and they just wanted to put a new face up.

Chairwoman Masterson asked if it would be okay if Director Lieber finished.

Mr. Brenot apologized for interrupting.

Director Lieber stated that she was just wrapping up and was just explaining what the additions were to the sign package, but generally a rather small addition to their current sign compliment.

Chairwoman Masterson asked the applicant if he wanted to discuss his application.

Mr. Brenot stated that they were looking to replace what they already had there with the full rest of the sign.

Chairwoman Masterson asked if there were any comments questions or concerns from the audience.

None were given.

Chairwomen Masterson asked if there were any comments questions or concerns from the Board.

None were given.

Chairwoman Masterson stated that her only concern was that they had specifically revised the building codes so as not to have that and asked if there was a reason that the building department thought that that would be a good asset.

Director Lieber stated that the current allocation matched that which was allowed previous to the sign code update and that as the applicant indicated, the signage that they were proposing was fairly in line with what they previously had on the building. She discussed that it was a building that was an out parcel in a plaza, which was a little bit different because they have traffic that could circulate around the entire building or come at it from different angles. She discussed that there was not one entrance from Center Ridge and that patrons could come from any which direction, so having signage on multiple sides of the building made sense and sometimes could create the need for some additional signage, especially when the frontage was the narrow part of the building facing the road. She explained that that was how they measured that signage allocation and that if the building were turned on a 90-degree angle, they wouldn't need a variance. She stated that there were some factors that were a little bit more unique to that building or that site than an average commercial property.

Chairwoman Masterson stated that she understood where the City was coming from and that the Board always looked for practical difficulties and Director Lieber stated the practical difficulty of the building being the narrow front of the building facing the road. She stated that they had been a very good, long-term employer and business owner in the city. She asked if Council Liaison Winkel had anything to add.

Council Liaison Winkel stated that he did have some experience having buildings with multiple sides

and when you have multiple sides of the building, the allowable square footage added up fast. He stated that if it was just two sides, this would probably be fine because nothing else would be there but when you had these multiple sides, it just added up quickly. He discussed that to him a practical difficulty with any building that had multiple sides was that it would look very modest when looking at it from the street, but it would add up really fast because of the sides and that was something he understood himself.

Chairwoman Masterson asked Assistant Law Director Morgan if she had any comments, questions or concerns.

Assistant Law Director Morgan stated that she would echo that and also their frontage was their skinniest side and that worked against them.

Chairwoman Masterson agreed that the practical difficulty was that they had a unique situation and as Director Lieber stated, were in a parking lot of a very large complex with multiple situations. She stated that she was generally not a fan of variances, especially because if they were to grant the variance, it went with the property, and when they left as a business owner, the variance would stay. She said, however, she didn't see anybody disagreeing with it.

She asked if there were any other comments, questions or concerns.

None were given.

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Toth to approve the 26.98 square foot variance for area of building signs.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 4      No – 0

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 PM.

---

**Linda Masterson**  
*Chairwoman*

---

**Tina Wieber**  
*Recording Secretary/Deputy Clerk of Council*

---

Thursday, October 23, 2025  
**Date Approved**

# Board of Zoning & Building Appeals Application



SEP 18 2025

## SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

Board of Zoning and Building Appeals meetings are held on the fourth Thursday of each month at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers at City Hall. Applications must be filed with the Building Division at least 20 days prior to the date of the Board hearing at which the request will be considered. To be processed, applications must include:

1. Completed and signed application with application fee;
2. Ten (10) sets of dimensioned site plans, building details or other drawings and information depicting the request; and
3. Narrative of the request relative to standards of approval for variances or rationale for appeal.

## PROJECT INFORMATION

51 CADOT DR N. RIDGEVILLE OHIO  
Location address

07-00-022-105-014  
Parcel number

RESIDENTIAL  
Current zoning

BREZZO WAY ROOF TO GARAGE  
Appeal or variance (attach supporting documentation)

## APPLICANT/AGENT INFORMATION

ANDREW BENNIE  
Name/Company

51 CADOT DR. N. RIDGEVILLE OHIO  
Applicant address

440-541-8044  
Applicant phone

papabennie@gmail.com  
Applicant email

## PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION

ANDREW BENNIE  
Name/Company

51 CADOT DR. N. RIDGEVILLE, OHIO  
Property owner address

440 541 8044  
Property owner phone

papabennie@gmail.com  
Property owner email

## AUTHORIZATION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Andrew Bennie  
Applicant signature

Andrew Bennie  
Property owner signature

I hereby authorize the City of North Ridgeville, including Board of Zoning and Building Appeals members, to view the premises and consent to their entry onto the property for the purpose of observing site conditions related to review of my application. The materials I have submitted depict the property lines accurately and in accordance with the plat map to the best of my knowledge. I understand that any approval granted is based upon the presumption of accuracy of these plans and that the City has no obligation to independently survey or otherwise determine the accuracy of plans, drawings or other documents. In the event a discrepancy is found to exist, I will take such action as may be needed to provide the correct information. I acknowledge and accept that the representations made in this application and at the public hearing constitute the basis for the decision by the Board. Any misrepresentations, whether knowingly made or not, may result in revocation of the Board's decision. Statements made by an applicant/agent are deemed to be statements of the owner for the purpose of the Board's decision.

OFFICE	PPZ No. PPZ2025-0382	Date Received RECEIVED	ACTION
	Fee Paid \$75.00	SEP 18 2025	

**Board of Zoning & Building Appeals Staff Report**

Case PPZ2025-0382  
 Property Owner Andrew Bennie  
 PPN 07-00-022-105-014  
 Property Address 51 Cadet Drive  
 Zoning R-1 Residence District  
 Applicant Name Same  
 Applicant Address Same  
 Project Breezeway roof connecting house and detached garage  
 Meeting Date October 23, 2025  
 Report Date October 7, 2025

REQUESTED VARIANCES	CODIFIED REFERENCES
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A 10-foot variance for setback of a detached private garage from a dwelling. Applicant shows 0 feet, code requires 10 feet, Section 1294.03(a).</li> <li>2. A 270-foot variance for area of a detached private garage. Applicant shows 946 square feet, code allows 676 square feet, Section 1294.03(d)(1).</li> </ol>	<p>1294.03 DETACHED PRIVATE GARAGES</p> <p>(a) As used in this section, "detached private garages" means garages which are not attached to single-family or two-family dwellings and are of frame construction or of construction similar to single-family or two-family dwellings. Detached private garages shall be located not less than five feet from the side and rear yard lot lines and not less than ten feet from other buildings located upon the same lot with a detached private garage.</p> <p>(d)(1) In all residential districts, no detached private garage shall exceed one story or fifteen feet in height for a single-family or two-family residential structure. No detached private garage shall exceed twenty-six feet in length or width or be over 676 square feet in area in any residential district zone with one-half acre or less.</p>

**Summary of Request:**

The applicant proposes to construct a breezeway between the existing dwelling and a 22' x 28' detached garage that was permitted in 2023. The roofed breezeway will span the full 22-foot width of the garage, covering the approximate 15-foot gap between the structures. The addition would add 330 square feet of roofed area to the 616 square foot building, bringing the total garage area to 946 square feet, which exceeds the allowable size by 270 square feet. Because the breezeway will connect the two structures, the garage will effectively become attached to the dwelling, triggering a setback variance under Section 1294.03.

## **Review of Duncan Factors:**

**Can the property yield a reasonable return or can there be any beneficial use of the property without the variance?**

Yes, the property can be used for its intended purpose without the variance.

**Is the variance substantial?**

Yes. The proposal eliminates the required 10-foot setback between structures and increases the maximum permitted garage area by approximately 40 percent.

**Will the essential character of the neighborhood be substantially altered or will adjoining properties suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance?**

While the proposed breezeway may not directly impact adjoining properties, approval could change the overall look and feel of the property compared to others in the neighborhood. Detached garages in this area are generally separate from the dwelling and maintain consistent spacing and scale. Connecting the garage to the house and increasing its size would blur that distinction. Allowing this could set a precedent for similar requests in the future and gradually change the character of the neighborhood.

**Will the variance adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (e.g. water, sewer, garbage)?**

No.

**Did the property owner purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction?**

Yes. The setback and area limitations have been in place for many years.

**Can the property owner's predicament be precluded through some method other than a variance?**

No. A roofed breezeway connecting the dwelling and detached garage cannot comply with Section 1294.03, as the code requires a 10-foot separation between detached accessory structures and other buildings on the same lot. The only way to comply would be to eliminate the connection or redesign the project to maintain the required separation. However, the condition prompting the variance request is the result of the owner's desired design, not a unique physical characteristic of the property.

**Would the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance?**

The applicant states that the breezeway is intended to provide additional covered storage and protection from the weather. However, no information has been submitted to demonstrate a practical difficulty in complying with the code or to justify the variance under the Duncan factors. The intent of the setback and area limitations is to maintain spacing between structures and prevent oversized accessory buildings on residential lots. Granting this variance based solely on personal preference, rather than a unique property condition, would not align with that intent.

SEP 18 2025

REASON FOR BUILD - TO STORE MATERIAL  
UNDER ROOF BUT MAINLY ~~FOR~~ TO GO  
FROM HOUSE TO GARAGE OUT OF  
WEATHER. CODE SAYS ADDING ROOF TO  
GARAGE MAKES IT PART OF HOUSE BEING  
TO CLOSE TO <sub>1</sub> LOT LINE. CURRENT SETBACK IS 22 FT  
REAR

Andrew Benning

FOR LING

