

**NORTH RIDGEVILLE BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS
MINUTES OF
REGULAR MEETING – THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022**

CALL TO ORDER:

Chairman Kimble called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance at 7:00 PM.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Member Neil Thibodeaux, Vice-Chairwoman Linda Masterson and Chairman Shawn Kimble.

James Cain and Planning Commission Liaison Steve Ali were absent.

Also present were Chief Building Official Guy Fursdon, Planning and Economic Development Director Kimberly Lieber and Deputy Clerk of Council Tina Wieber.

CORRESPONDENCE:

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

PPZ2022-0135: Michael & Pamela Provenza, 8724 Orchard Grove Ct, PPN 07-00-011-103-195

The applicant is proposing a 6 foot high 100% closed fence. Property is zoned R-1 District.

Requests:

1. A 2 foot variance for fence height. Applicant shows 6 feet, code permits 4 feet, Section 1294.01(h)(2)(A).
2. A variance for a 100% closed fence. Code requires fence to be at least 50% open when located between the building and street line, Section 1294.01(h)(2)(A).

Application was read along with comments from Chief Building Official Fursdon.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was a representative present.

Michael Provenza, 8724 Orchard Grove Ct, North Ridgeville, OH 44039, was sworn in.

Mr. Provenza stated that he had an unusual lot that was very close to Root Road. He explained that in order to get any real use out of his back yard they had planned to put a privacy fence up and included with the application was a picture of a six foot enclosed white vinyl privacy fence. He mentioned that they were proposing to put that up against Root Road and that it would not extend past the landscaping mound that they had. He stated that it would come up on the side street about half way up the house with a twelve foot setback and then over. He explained that they felt it would be unobtrusive and would give them a little bit of privacy and also help with managing their dogs which was why they were requesting the variance.

**BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING – THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022**

PAGE 2

Chairman Kimble stated that the reason the Zoning Board existed was for odd situations that the zoning code didn't address and that a house that was surrounded by three streets was very unique to say the least. He mentioned that he thought the plan was well thought out. He added that the whole intention of a fence in the front yard is a possible visual obstruction that could be a safety issue. He stated that he didn't see any way that that would be a problem with what he had proposed and designed. He asked if there were any questions or comments from any Board members.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson stated that the Chairman said it very well that that situation was the reason the Board existed. She mentioned that it was a very unique situation and that they had met all the requirements. She remarked that the applicant had met every obstacle that had been created.

Chairman Kimble asked if there were any other questions or comments from any other Board members.

None were given.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was anyone from the public that wanted to speak on behalf of the matter.

No discussion was offered.

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Thibodeaux to approve the variances for two foot fence height and a 100% closed fence.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 3 No – 0

PPZ2022-0137: Marlis Cook, 9424 Island Rd, PPN 07-00-013-000-476

The applicant is proposing a 5 foot fence. Property is zoned R-1 District. Requests:

1. A 1 foot variance for height of a fence located in the front yard. Applicant shows 5 feet, code permits 4 feet, Section 1294.01(h)(2)(A).

Application was read along with comments from Chief Building Official Fursdon.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was a representative present.

Marlis Cook, 9424 Island Rd, North Ridgeville, OH 44039, was sworn in.

Ms. Cook explained that after serving 24 years in the military and finally coming home, her mother asked if she would build a house next to her so she did. She stated that her mother gave her the property next to her house and it was quite a large lot. She remarked that on the drawing

it showed where her mother's house was which was at 9410 and Ms. Cook's house was set back 160 feet from the road. She mentioned that she had the same reason as the previous applicant that she would like to be able to manage her dogs a little better and would like to have room for them to run all the way around the house. She added that what was not shown on the drawing was that at the back of the house she had about ten feet of back yard and then it was all woods, so the dogs couldn't just run amuck in the woods. She added that there really wasn't any yard for them to run in. She explained that she was requesting a one foot variance for a five foot fence to the front of her yard where it would meet her mother's fence for her backyard and that it wouldn't protrude where most people's backyard fences would be. She mentioned that it wouldn't be any closer to the road. She added that it was a chain link fence so she wasn't requesting a variance for that. She stated that it was right in line with everyone else's, not to go any closer than anybody else's backyard fence.

Chairman Kimble asked if she had some sort of gate for her driveway.

Ms. Cook stated that she had a gate proposed and it should have been in the packet.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson explained that it wasn't with the packet.

Ms. Cook stated that the vendor would be Great Lakes Fence and there would be several gates. She discussed that one would be across the driveway.

Chairman Kimble remarked that it seemed to be a plan that made perfect sense. He stated that she had a very unique situation as far as her home was back off of the road and she was intentionally lining it up with the rear yard fence of the adjacent house. He mentioned that he thought it would blend in just fine and fit into the area. He asked if there were any questions or comments from any Board members.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson asked if there would be a new fence ordinance in place.

Director Lieber stated that the fence ordinance was recently updated a couple months ago and the write-up was based on that ordinance.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson stated that the applicant had a very unique situation.

Chairman Kimble asked if there were any other questions or comments from the Board.

None were given.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak on the matter.

No discussion was offered.

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Thibodeaux to approve the one foot variance for

fence height.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 3 No – 0

PPZ2022-0138: Molly Gallagher, 4950 Main Ave, PPN 07-00-007-103-070

The applicant is proposing a home addition. Property is zoned RS-2 District. Requests:

1. A 4 foot variance for depth of rear yard. Applicant shows 21 feet, code requires 25 feet, Section 1262.04(b)(2).

Application was read along with comments from Chief Building Official Fursdon.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was a representative present.

Molly Gallagher, 4950 Main Ave, North Ridgeville, OH 44039, was sworn in.

Ms. Gallagher stated that she purchased her home three years ago and although she had three dogs, it was not for the dogs. She added that she had two teenage boys and was just looking for an expansion on the pre-existing structure for space for the boys. She mentioned that it would be another family room. She explained that the lot was an interesting shape and that it was like a "7". She stated that as far as space for expansion, right to the left side of the number ten on the drawing, there was a skinny plot of land and then there was a whole bunch that went all the way back but it didn't make sense to build out that way. She added that at her neighbor's fence line there weren't any properties for two hundred feet or more.

Chairman Kimble mentioned that at first glance it did seem to be a reasonable request. He stated that he didn't believe it was going to alter the yard or neighborhood in any sort of a way and clearly it was something that was behind the house and that driving down the road it wouldn't even be visible. He added that someone would really have to try to look for it. He mentioned that there weren't any issues from a safety standpoint and that it made sense. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson asked if there was anything currently anything under the white area of the drawing that said the number ten.

Ms. Gallagher said, no.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson said she was concerned that there were no drawings or plans on what Ms. Gallagher planned on doing.

Ms. Gallagher stated that there were drawings that she submitted with the application with the square footage so that from the neighbor's fence line it would essentially be fifteen feet out.

**BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING – THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022**

PAGE 5

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson asked if she submitted building permit items.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated that she did.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson mentioned that she didn't see any plans so she was a little confused.

Chairman Kimble asked if that what was on the screen was the plan that was submitted or if she submitted something else.

Ms. Gallagher stated that there were drawings from an architect that she had submitted.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson asked if there were two different submissions to the Building Department or did she submit a plan for approval.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated that she submitted for a house with an addition. He discussed that the white area showed the addition and she showed a plot plan showing that she was requesting a 21 foot rear yard requiring a four foot variance.

Chairman Kimble remarked that it showed all of the dimensions, which was the important part from the Boards' standpoint. He stated that he agreed that usually they would have received everything that was typically submitted but that they did have all the information that was pertinent to that particular case. He asked if there were any other questions or comments from any other Board members.

Member Thibodeaux stated that he agreed that on the street, the way it was scaled (inaudible)

Councilman Boose asked if those with a microphone could speak into them because the audience was having a hard time hearing and thanked them.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was anyone else that wanted to speak on behalf of the matter.

No discussion was offered.

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Thibodeaux to approve the four foot variance for the depth of the rear yard.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 3 No – 0

PPZ2022-0141: Kirk & Renee Grose, 34606 Lorain Rd, PPN 07-00-014-103-095

The applicant is proposing a detached garage. Property is zoned R-1 District. Requests:

**BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING – THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022**

PAGE 6

1. A 5.4% variance for lot coverage. Applicant shows 15.4%, code allows 10%, Section 1294.03(e)(4).

Application was read along with comments from Chief Building Official Fursdon.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was a representative present.

Kirk Grose, 34606 Lorain Rd, North Ridgeville, OH 44039, was sworn in.

Mr. Grose stated that they had outgrown the garage they currently had. He mentioned that it was over thirty years old. He added that they wanted to put everything that they had inside. He stated that since they had outgrown it he figured that they might as well do it to where they had enough space to put everything that they had inside. He mentioned that the garage was built thirty plus years ago and was in the wrong spot in the yard. He discussed that if he moved it over to the corner of the yard, it would be buried back in there and it would open up the whole side of the yard where it was so the neighbors behind him would have all that where it would be cleared then and it would be all grass.

Chairman Kimble asked if the shed was 50 by 50.

Mr. Grose stated that was correct. He explained that that was what he was looking into. He mentioned that he wanted to go before BZBA and see if he could get the variance. He added that he had talked to Guy a couple times. He stated that he wanted to put it on that side of the yard.

Chairman Kimble asked the Chief Building Official if the lot was 6% larger he would not even need to be there for the variance. He stated that he would be allowed to build that size of a shed.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated that if the yard were a little bigger that would be correct.

Chairman Kimble remarked that he had a nice size piece of property that was unique from the standpoint that it was on a lot and he believed he had to take into consideration for his neighbors behind him and that looking straight out there would be more grass and would be moving it as out of the way as possible. He asked if it was correct that he intended per his drawing to have a separate drive going to Lorain Road not Honeycut Grove.

Mr. Grose stated that was correct. He mentioned that there was an apron off of Lorain Road there now.

Chairman Kimble asked if there were any questions or comments from any Board members.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson stated that it was a very small variance request of 5.4%.

Chairman Kimble remarked that he agreed and that driving by he didn't believe someone would notice 5.4%.

Member Thibodeaux stated that Lorain Road had large properties and a few houses down there was a barn and that he didn't believe it would impact the site.

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Thibodeaux to approve the 5.4% variance for lot coverage for the detached garage.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 3 No – 0

PPZ2022-0143: Culver's Restaurant; 216 Dirt Holdings, LLC, 32574 Lorain Rd, PPNs 07-00-003-101-010, 07-00-004-109-043

Applicant: Lora Martinson, Springfield Sign, 4825 E Kearney St, Springfield, MO 65803

The applicant is proposing a sign package. Property is zoned B-4 District. Requests:

1. A 30 square variance for building signage. Applicant shows 138 square feet, code allows 108 square feet, Section 1286.05(c)(2).
2. Two pole signs (second pole sign is a freeway-oriented sign). Code allows each business one pole sign. 1286.05(c)(1).

Application was read along with comments from Chief Building Official Fursdon.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was a representative present.

Chris Hampton, 32574 Lorain Rd, North Ridgeville, OH 44039, was sworn in.

Mr. Hampton discussed that the lot was more narrow than usual, so due to building design for the parking lot and drive-thru lane between the parking spots and all that, they had gone with a more narrow building than they usually would have, which was why they were asking for a sign variance on that one. He added that normally that would be fine. He explained that those buildings were designed architecturally and aesthetically for the signs that they were asking for. He stated that if they went smaller it would be like (pointed to a sign on the wall and then another larger sign on the wall) and stated that it wouldn't look right. He mentioned that they had done their rock work and that was what it was designed for. He stated that they felt that reducing the size on the building wouldn't look good. He added that if you were to look at the main elevation sign, that was the biggest sign, and the other three would be the same size.

Chairman Kimble stated that he agreed and had been by the property many times. He remarked that the proposed size that he had for the first part of the application did seem to make sense and that by no means did anything jump out and say that it was too big for the space. He explained that in his opinion, if they made it smaller that it might look as if they didn't build a big enough sign. He added that that portion made perfect sense to him. He stated that he did have questions regarding the second part of the request to have two pole signs. He asked him to explain that variance request.

Mr. Hampton stated that the reason they were asking for two pole signs was because when you would be coming down Lorain Road they were just far enough to not have the bigger pole sign from the intersection. He mentioned that being between the highway on Lorain Road, when future development would come in, it wouldn't be visible from the highway and then you would have to come down Lorain Road for the people passing by on I-480. He explained that one of Culver's big deals was flavor of the day and they were proposing that sign to be able to see the sign to let motorists know that it's there and that they had to drive down farther. He stated that most of the people on the interstate would be pulling in if it's close and then leave. He stated it was an enticement.

Chairman Kimble asked what made their property so unique that it would require two pole signs that every other business up and down there that were also eating establishments did not have.

Mr. Hampton explained that most of the eating establishments were closer to the intersections than they were.

Chairman Kimble stated that there was possibly one.

Mr. Hampton stated that if you went east there were several and if you went south there wasn't that many until you went down by the intersection.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson asked if they had two pole signs.

Mr. Hampton remarked that no, they did not have two pole signs. He stated that they wanted them for the highway exposure because once it was developed behind it then they would have no highway exposure.

Chairman Kimble asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board members.

Director Lieber stated that, as they were aware, variances run with the land. She discussed that if the BZBA were to consider the variance for a second pole sign, she recommended that they specify that the sign for which the variance was being granted be the on premise sign for the pole sign. She explained that there had been some internal discussions regarding updates to the sign code that might in the future eliminate off premise signs from types of signs that might be allowed in the City. She added that if a variance were specifically granted for that off premise sign, it could run with the land and be there forever. She stated that there wouldn't be any non-conforming status or sunset where if it were removed in the future it wouldn't be reinstalled there. She discussed that if the Board intended to approve a second pole sign, one way to avoid that permanency of a sign type they might discontinue would be to specifically indicate that the second sign for which the variance was being granted be the on-site pole sign.

Mr. Hampton asked if that would be in place of the one on Lorain Road.

Director Lieber stated that the variance would be for the one on Lorain Road and the one by right would be the highway oriented sign. She explained that the write-up suggested that you can't have two pole signs. The question then becomes which sign would be the one getting the variance. She explained that the code allows both on-premise and off-premise signs currently. She added that they may be moving away from allowing off premise signs in the future. She stated that if that particular sign would be granted a variance then that variance would run with the land and that sign would be kind of grandfathered forever. She explained that if the Board, in granting two signs, specifies that the variance that would run with the land be the sign on the Culver's property itself, then if they were to discontinue off-premise signs in the future and that sign were ever to be removed, one could not be reinstalled again in that particular location. It would have to comply with the future code at the point that it was updated. She added that she would recommend the second sign be the on-premise Culver's pole sign. She mentioned that it would be the same end result if the Board chose to approve the variance they would just simply identifying which sign gets the variance and doing it strategically to avoid continuation of off-premise signs should the City change its' sign code.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated that the freeway oriented sign wasn't on Culver's property but on Ianelli's property. He explained that Director Lieber was stating that they give them the permit on the Ianelli's property but the sign on Culver's property would be given the second pole sign variance. So that if off-premise advertising signs disappear, it wouldn't be grandfathered in or be allowed to continue if Culver's was no longer there and if something else were to go in that sign would go bye-bye.

Director Lieber explained that she wasn't championing for a variance for a second sign, she just wanted to say that if the Board were so inclined to grant that variance that she would just ask that the one granted by right be the highway oriented sign and the one that got the variance be the on-premise sign.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated that it was a technicality so that the City wouldn't be stuck with that sign.

Mr. Hampton remarked that if Culver's failed then that sign would be gone and then there would not be another one if the code was changed.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson stated that they had a situation with a church that asked for two signs but the Board was very specific that when they granted the second sign that the sign went only with the building and as soon as the church came down or the church sold and was no longer a church, the sign couldn't stay with the property.

Chief Building Official Fursdon stated that was correct.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson stated that she wasn't a fan of having two signs up there. She stated that the highway sign would be enough advertising.

Chairman Kimble added that he did believe that the intent of the ordinance, what it currently was, and he understood that there could be discussion in the future but he wasn't inclined to consider weighing that into his decision about potential conversations that may or may not happen. He explained that he was considering what they currently had that day. He stated that he didn't believe Mr. Hampton had proven a hardship of why they would need the additional sign. He stated that they could choose to have that as their sign by the highway and not by Lorain Road. He stated that there was a way that they could still do it and have plenty of signage on the building and accomplish what they were looking for. He added that he didn't see what was so unique about it versus every other restaurant on Lorain Road. He remarked that at what point would the line be drawn in the sand where Starbuck's wanted to put a sign up on Ianelli's property because it was an off- premise. He stated that they could have forty five signs lined up with Victory Sports Park Café putting a sign out by the highway. He stated that he didn't feel comfortable rewording the application and he didn't believe Mr. Hampton had proven enough why he would need that variance.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson mentioned that she felt as though Mr. Hampton hadn't provided proof of hardship but that it was more desire and want and she had concerns in regards to that.

Chairman Kimble asked if there were any other questions or comments from any of the Board members.

None were given.

Chairman Kimble asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the matter.

No discussion was offered.

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Thibodeaux to approve the 30 square foot variance for signage.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 3 No – 0

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Thibodeaux to disapprove the variance for two pole signs with the second sign being a freeway oriented sign.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 3 No – 0

PPZ2022-0144: Angie's Coffee; Jason Frindt/Automation Investments LLP, 34906 Center Ridge Rd, PPN 07-00-016-101-051

Applicant: Ryan Lazuka/Aveline Holdings, LLC, 19885 Detroit Rd, #210, Rocky River OH 44116

The applicant is proposing a roof sign. Property is zoned B-3 District. Requests:

1. A 52 square foot variance for a roof sign. Applicant shows 104 square feet, code allows 52 square feet, Section 1286.05(c)(2).

Application was read along with comments from Chief Building Official Fursdon.

Chairman Kimble asked if there was a representative present.

Ryan Lazuka, Aveline Holdings, LLC, 19885 Detroit Road, Rocky River, OH 44116, was sworn in.

Mr. Lazuka explained that his coffee shop was named Angie's Coffee and the location was between the City Diner on the right and CVS on the left and it would be located in a parking lot. He stated that he would be the owner/operator and it would be his family's primary business. He mentioned that he had a computer background and had been working remotely for the last couple of years and wanted to feel like part of the community. He stated that drive-thru coffee was growing throughout the U.S. and that there were a lot of them on the west coast and were slowly working their way to the east coast. He mentioned that their architectural drawings had been passed by Planning Commission a couple weeks prior. He then showed slides that displayed the elevations of the parking lot and where the shop would be located. He added that they had extensive meetings with Director Lieber and the Planning Commission regarding the site plan. He added that the site plan had two parking lots with one being upper and one being lower. He explained that originally they wanted to be in the upper parking lot in order to have more visibility from the road but it wouldn't work with City Planning. He stated that they worked with City Planning for various meetings and they came to one spot that was the only spot on the lower lot that would work at that location. He added that it was the only spot that would work in the whole location. He remarked that they didn't want to be down there due to visibility but it was the only spot that would work. He discussed a slide that showed the upper parking lot where they wanted to be and the lower parking lot where the rectangle building was. He stated that his request for the variance was for a larger sign. He then showed a rendering of a larger sign and what was required by code. He explained that code required the sign to be fifteen feet wide and five feet tall and the sign they were requesting was twenty one feet wide and seven feet tall. He discussed the reasons for the request as being visibility from the street was greatly reduced because the coffee shop would be sitting down thirteen and a half feet from the line of sight if someone were in their car to where the location of the shop would be. He stated that they were a local business that didn't have a huge budget for advertising and they really needed to be able to be seen from the street. He discussed that it was a risk for his family and that they were putting a lot of money into it with no loans but using savings. He explained that they were trying to mitigate any risk that would be possible. He added that not being able to be seen from the street could be a big risk for the business. He stated that his hardship was that the only option was to build on the lower lot and they wouldn't have had to file a variance if they had been able to build on the upper lot. He added that the building sat down thirteen and a half feet, with four feet down from the upper lot and nine feet from the road. He mentioned that if there were traffic going westbound on the street, the people going eastbound would have a hard time seeing over the cars

going the opposite direction if there was traffic there. He stated that the code was based on the frontage of the building and their building was very small. He stated the building was only twenty six feet wide and felt that they were kind of penalized because their building was so small. He added that he would argue that because their building was so small it needed to be able to be seen easier from the street. He stated that an effective sign was just as important as having a larger store. He mentioned that they would have a larger store if they had allowed customers to come in but the whole concept was drive-thru only and that was why they made it that small. He then showed elevation views and street views on the slides. He discussed that with a larger sign you would be able to see most of the sign. He stated that if there were cars parked in the parking lot or traffic coming from the opposite way, it would be hard for people to see the smaller sign. He discussed that they found that the United States Sign Council had been around since 1998 as an industry leader performing on-premise sign research and their guidance was a result of over twenty university level studies. He discussed that they had an equation that they had to figure out how big your sign should be and that the equation was based on safety. He stated that their belief was that a sign should be a certain size and if it wasn't big enough people would have a hard time seeing it from the street and it could actually cause safety concerns and accidents. He added that they put their variables into the equation and it came out to what they would recommend was a one hundred twenty four foot sign and they were only asking for a one hundred and four foot sign. He stated that one of the questions in the variance application was if it would impact neighbors and they would say no, because it was on the lower lot and there would be no line of sight impedances of both neighbors on either side. He stated another question was if the variance was substantial and they felt it wasn't, based on the comparison drawing as to what code allowed and what they were asking for.

Chairman Kimble stated that Center Ridge Road was higher than where the shop would be located and that they did have a visual line of sight issue. He added that in looking at what the code allowed and what they were proposing from their awning on the side it was essentially one letter additional from the awning on the side. He stated that it was a creative way to fit something into a space that had been empty for a long time. He asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board members.

Member Thibodeaux mentioned that although the sign was larger with the design, you could still see through it and you would still be able to see it from the roadway.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson asked Director Lieber if everything was approved by Planning Commission.

Director Lieber stated that the whole project was approved but signage was through upon the condition of BZBA's approval of the sign.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson asked if they asked the applicant to move from the upper parking lot to the lower parking lot.

Director Lieber discussed that specifically to circulation concerns and also stacking for the drive-thru window that at the upper level significantly cut down on the number of vehicles that could be lined up. She stated that they had used Dunkin Donuts as the not to do scenario. She explained the upper level didn't support that site and in looking at every configuration that seemed to be the one that permitted full on-site traffic circulation access to the lower parking spaces in and out and also had enough cueing for the vehicles that they would anticipate.

Chief Building Official Fursdon asked that if they were in the upper lot if they would still meet the front setback requirement.

Director Lieber stated that they would but it would be tight but they would have met it.

Vice-Chairwoman Masterson stated that she appreciated that there wouldn't be any stacking in the road. She added that she appreciated the applicant relocating from the upper lot into the lower lot.

Chairman Kimble asked if there were any questions or comments from the Board members.

None were given.

Chairman Kimble asked if anyone from the public had any questions or comments.

Dennis Boose, 6405 Denise Drive, North Ridgeville, OH 44039, was sworn in.

Mr. Boose mentioned that he was at the Planning Commission meeting and that they did vote to approve it. He stated that the recommendation then went to City Council and City Council voted to approve it as well. He added that he could appreciate someone going into that business because in his real life he financed people to do that. He explained that he understood all of the things that went into that. He stated that to choose North Ridgeville and then to choose a space and to have the hurdles that the City had to do to make sure that it was in the right spot and to change that, speaks volumes to the ownership. He remarked that obviously they had done their homework by the presentation that they gave. He stated that he thought it was a reasonable request and he would ask that the Board consider it.

Moved by Masterson and seconded by Thibodeaux to approve 52 square foot variance for a roof sign.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried.

Yes – 3 No – 0

Discussion was had regarding Board members attendance and notification of missing meetings as well as procedures regarding receiving member packets when email is down.

**BOARD OF ZONING AND BUILDING APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING – THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2022**

PAGE 14

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10 PM.

Shawn Kimble
Chairman

Tina Wieber
*Recording Secretary/Deputy Clerk of
Council*

Thursday, November 17, 2022
Date Approved