The March 15, 2000 meeting of the Olmsted Township Board of Appeals was called to order at 8:00 p.m. Present were Chairman James Bolander, Edward Lege, Larry Maser, Alla Workman and Martin Streulau. Also present was secretary Tammy Tabor. Mr. Bolander asked the audience to stand for the pledge of allegiance. The secretary read the minutes from the September 15, 1999 meeting of the Board of Appeals. Corrections, in the fourth paragraph, change the sentence to read, Mr. Maser moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Mr. Maser moved to approve as corrected. Seconded by Mr. Lege. Roll call. Ayes, Mr. Lege, Mr. Maser, Mr. Bolander.

Abstentions, Mrs. Workman, Mr. Streulau.

Appeal #00-5831
Mr. Dale Wilson was sworn in. Mr. Wilson explained that he would like to construct a conforming board on board fence along the side lot lines at the rear of his home. Along the back line of his property he would like to construct a solid wall fence that faces the Ohio Turnpike. The reasoning for this type of fence would be to lessen the noise from the turnpike. Mr. Bolander asked if trees planted along that area would help. He stated that according to the regulation, the height of the fence should not exceed 6 feet above the natural grade. Mr. Bolander stated that the mound that is at the rear of the property is not considered the natural grade. Mr. Wilson stated that there is also a pond on the property that they would like to enclose. Also, Mr. Wilson stated that there are lights from the Turnpike that glare into his home. The secretary read a letter from a resident on Oakridge Drive stating no objection to the construction of the fence. Mrs. Workman moved to approve Application #00-5831 as submitted providing that the side lot line fence is within the 25% vertical surface remain open. Seconded by Mr. Streulau. Roll call, all approved.

Appeal # 00-5823
The secretary read the public notice for appeal #00-5823. Mr. Russell Sibert was sworn in. Mr. Sibert would like to construct a 50 x 60 foot accessory structure on his property. Mr. Bolander asked how high the proposed structure would be. Mr. Sibert stated that the height would be 20 feet at the peak. Mr. Bolander stated that the allowable size for Mr. Sibert’s lot is 710 square feet. Mr. Bolander asked why Mr. Sibert needed such a large area. Mr. Sibert stated that he has 2 recreational vehicles, a boat, a tractor and a classic car. Mr. Bolander stated that there are many residents who need to store large vehicles at alternate locations other than their property. Mr. Sibert stated that he is replacing a structure that he tore down last year, and the new structure will look nicer than the old one. Mrs. Workman stated that she is not comfortable with the size and height of the proposed structure. Mr. Bolander asked what the hardship would be if he was denied this structure. Mr. Sibert stated that he would need to store his vehicles somewhere else or outside. The recreational vehicles would be covered with a tarp and the tarps frequently blow off of the equipment. Mr. Bolander stated that he was also uncomfortable with the size of the proposed structure. Mr. Sibert stated that the old structure was 20 feet x 40 feet. Mr. Sibert stated that he has already purchased the structure and it has been delivered to his property and is ready for construction. His existing garage is 22 feet x 22 feet and is attached to the dwelling. Mr. Bolander stated that if the structure is attached to the dwelling there are no size restrictions. The board suggested alternative ways to store the equipment.
Mrs. Workman asked who lives at the Sharp Road address. Mr. Sibert stated that his daughter and son-in-law currently live at that location and he lives in North Ridgeville. Mr. Bolander asked why the recreational vehicles cannot be stored at his home. Mr. Sibert stated that North Ridgeville would not allow him to store the vehicles in the front of his yard and he would have to cut down some trees to access the back yard. Mr. Sibert showed pictures of the North Ridgeville property to the Board.

Mr. Strelau moved to disapprove application #00-5823. Seconded by Mrs. Workman. Roll call. All approved.

Mrs. Workman moved to adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call. All approved.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Tammy Tabor, secretary

James Bolander, Chairman Date 4/19/00
The Olmsted Township Board of Appeals meeting of April 19, 2000 was called to order at 8:00 p.m. Present were Chairman James Bolander, Edward Lege, Alla Workman, Martin Strelau and Lawrence Maser. Mr. Bolander asked those present to stand for the pledge of allegiance. Mr. Bolander introduced the board members.

The secretary read the minutes from the meeting of March 15, 2000. Mrs. Workman moved to approve the minutes as read. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call, all approved.

Mrs. Workman asked whether signs were being proposed for the township, notifying residents that the Township is a Zoned Community, Permits are required. The secretary stated that she would again request that signs be created for the main roads into the Township.

Lippert appeal
The secretary read the public notice for the appeal. Mr. Lippert was sworn in. Mr. Bolander asked what the proposed height of the fs. Mr. Lippert stated that the sides would be 6' high and the height at the peak would be 11'. The proposed structure proposed is 12 x 24 feet.

Mr. Bolander asked why the Lippert's needed such a large building. Mr. Lippert stated that he has a lawn mower, ladder, toboggan, generator, snow blower and patio furniture that he would like to store in the shed. Mr. Lippert stated that he currently has an 8' x 10' shed that he would like to replace with the larger shed.

Mr. Bolander asked if extending the garage would be possible. Mr. Lippert stated that the design of the house and windows at the back of the house would not allow extension of the garage.

Mr. Jim O'Malley is the Lippert's neighbor on the north. Mr. O'Malley asked if the structure would be used for anything other than storage, such as car repair or a home business?

Terry Pastva, a neighbor in the development, stated that she has a 10x12 foot shed and it is not nearly large enough.

Mrs. Lippert stated that she has a neighbor that has a 12x20 foot shed, would they be able to request the same size. She asked how that can be researched. Mr. Bolander and Mr. Lege explained that what this board is here to do today is the application presented to them. What has happened before cannot be commented on. Mrs. Tabor stated that the address files are public record and she could come in during regular zoning hours to look at additional files.

The board discussed other options for storage and extending the garage to provide a conforming structure.
Mr. Bolander asked Mr. Lippert if a smaller structure would be acceptable. Mr. Lippert stated that he would require at least 22 feet to accommodate his extension ladder. Mr. Bolander asked if a compromise was possible. Mr. and Mrs. Lippert stated no.

Mr. Strelau moved to deny application as presented. Seconded by Mr. Lege. Roll call, all approved.

Mr. O’Malley asked if this would have been denied if he had not made any comments.

Mr. Bolander stated that his vote was not changed by any of Mr. O’Malley’s comments. Mrs. Workman stated that her vote was not altered by Mr. O’Malley’s comments.

Mr. Maser moved to adjourn at 8:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Tabor, secretary

James Bolander, Chairman 6/21/00
The June 21, 2000 meeting of the Olmsted Township Board of Appeals was called to order at 8:02 p.m. Mr. Bolander asked the public to stand for the pledge of allegiance. Mr. Bolander introduced the board members and reviewed the procedures for the audience. Present was Chairman James Bolander, Edward Lege, Larry Maser, Alla Workman and Marty Strelau.. The secretary read the minutes from the meeting of April 19, 2000. Mr. Maser moved to approve as read. Seconded by Mr. Lege. Roll call, all approved.

The secretary read the public notice for a lot split and consolidation application submitted by Steven Babson. Mr. Babson was sworn in. Mr. Bolander explained that any construction on the proposed lot would need to come before the Board of Appeals since the lot would be non conforming if approved as submitted. Mr. Babson replied that he understood that. The other lots in the development are all created with 75 foot frontage.

Carolyn Hinderman, Oxford Park Lane, owns property across the street from the proposed lot. Mrs. Hinderman came forward to review the plot plan. Mr. Bolander explained that there would be no change to the lot width as it is on Oxford Park. The consolidation would increase the depth of the lot. Mrs. Workman asked if property surrounding the proposed lot change was available to increase the width along Oxford park to create a conforming lot. Mr. Babson explained that it is not available as it would create more non conforming lots and the property to the west has a structure near the rear of the lot. Mrs. Workman moved to approve application 00-5856 as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Strelau. Roll call. All approved.

The secretary read the public notice for application # 00-5917. Mr. Gus Schulz was sworn in. Mr. Bolander explained that the property owner would need to sign the application even if Mr. Schulz would be representing the owner. Mrs. Hegedus, owner of the property, signed the application and was sworn in. Mr. Bolander asked what is the reason for the appeal since the garage size is conforming? Mr. Bolander asked what the dimensions of the lot are, and the proposed height of the structure? Mr. Schulz stated that the height would be approximately 11 feet The structure is conforming, however the lot is 60 feet wide by 690 feet deep. Mr. Art Curtis, Cook Road, stated that he felt that the lot is too small to accommodate a garage of that size. He would not like alot of noise or mechanical work to be done in the garage.

Quanita Dale, 26425 Cook Road. Does not feel that Mrs. Hegedus would be revving her car engine and creating alot of noise. With the placement of the garage behind the house, there is enough room on the property to accommodate the garage.

Mr. Maser moved to approve application # 00-5917 as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Lege. Roll call, all approved.

The secretary read the public notice for application # 00-5904, requesting approval to allow billboards along the Ohio Turnpike. Dr. Kriener, representing the Board of
Education was sworn in. Mr. Calabrese, attorney for the Board of Education was also sworn in. Mr. Bolander asked what the size of the billboards would be. Mr. Calabrese presented the board with a computer generated picture of a billboard on the School Board property. The billboards would be 14 feet by 48 feet and erected on a pole 40 feet above the ground. Mrs. Workman asked if the billboards would be lighted. Mr. Calabrese stated that they will be illuminated. Mr. Calabrese stated that the signs will be placed a minimum of 500 feet apart along the school board property. Mr. Lege asked how far from the property lines will the billboards be placed. Mr. Calabrese stated that they would like to place the billboards right along the property lines to allow maximum use of the land.

Mr. Bolander asked if the billboards will be 2 sided. Mr. Calabrese stated that the billboards are 2 sided. Mr. Bolander asked if the School Board has any discretion over what is advertised on the billboards. Mr. Kreiner stated that the company cannot advertise any thing that a minor cannot use or posses, such as alcohol, cigarettes, adult entertainment, etc. Mr. Bolander asked how bright will the signs be? Residents along the Turnpike have complained of bright lights coming from the security lighting at the bus garage. Mr. Calabrese stated that the wattage would be controlled and directed at the signs and not at the residential areas. Mr. Bolander asked how the signs would be lit. Mr. Calabrese stated that a bar of lights at the bottom of the signs would be used. Mrs Workman asked how the signs would be accessed. Would children be able to climb the signs? Mr. Calabrese stated that the signs are accessed by trucks with ladders and there are no rungs or ladders accessible from ground level.

Mrs. Workman moved to approve application # 00-5904 as submitted providing all state, federal and DOT regulations are met. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call, Mr. Strelau- abstain, Mr. Lege-no, Mr. Bolander-yes, Mr. Maser, yes, Mrs. Workman -yes.

Mr. Maser moved to adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Strelau. Roll call, all approved.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Tammy Tabor, secretary

[Signature] 10/18/00
James Bolander, Chairman  Date
The Olmsted Township Board of Appeals meeting of July 19, 2000 was called to order at 8:00 p.m. Present were chairman James Bolander, Edward Lege, Larry Maser, Alla Workman and Martin Strelau. Also present was secretary Tammy Tabor. Mr. Bolander asked the audience to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance and then introduced the Board members. The secretary read the minutes from the previous meeting.

Corrections and additions to the minutes. Change the second to the last paragraph; replace the statement “lights from the Turnpike” to read, “security lights from the Bus garage”. Mr. Maser moved to approve the minutes as corrected. Seconded by Mrs. Workman. Roll call, all approved.

Correspondence

The secretary reported that signs stating “permits are required”, have been ordered and the service department should be posting those in the Township.

The secretary read the public notice for application # 00-5936, submitted by Mr. Jim Mulgrew. Mr. Mulgrew is requesting approval of an existing structure that was built without a permit and exceeds the requirements for accessory structures. Mr. Mulgrew was sworn in. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he had the house with an attached garage placed further back on his lot to accommodate a side entry garage. However, the side entry garage does not allow easy access for his vehicles. Mr. Mulgrew stated that it takes a lot of maneuvering to park his cars in the attached garage. Mr. Mulgrew built the detached garage to allow him to park his truck in. Mrs. Workman asked if there is a divider between the garage doors on the attached garage. Mr. Mulgrew stated that there is a divider between the doors of the garage and when backing in or out of his garage his tires go off of the driveway. Mrs. Workman asked if Mr. Mulgrew’s truck is larger than an average vehicle. Mr. Mulgrew stated that the vehicle is a short bed Chevy truck. The board discussed if the driveway could be extended to the side lot line. Mr. Mulgrew stated that the driveway is five feet from the property line and cannot be extended. Mr. Bolander asked how tall the accessory garage was. Mr. Mulgrew stated that the height is approximately 12 ½ feet. Mr. Bolander stated that the size of the structure is 2974 square feet. The structure exceeds what is allowable for Mr. Mulgrew’s lot. Mr. Mulgrew stated that all he uses the structure for is parking his truck. Mr. Bolander asked if the measurement of 16 x 32, does that include the covered patio off of the garage. Mr. Mulgrew stated that is not included in the measurements of the building. Mr. Bolander asked when Mr. Mulgrew discovered that it would be a problem parking in his garage. Mr. Mulgrew stated that when the concrete was poured. Mr. Strelau stated if the intent was to house a vehicle, the structure far exceeds the size necessary. The truck is 20 feet long. Mr. Mulgrew also installed a pool and can use the rest of the area for pool storage and a changing room. Mrs. Workman stated that a permit was not issued before constructing the building. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he built the structure at the same time that the home was being built and was unaware that he needed a separate permit. Mr. Bolander asked if there were permits issued for the pool and the patio that was poured. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he had applied for the permits for the pool and fence but had not completed the permit procedures before constructing. He has currently received permits for the pool, fence and patio. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he was the contractor for the projects. Mrs. Workman asked what Mr. Mulgrew’s occupation was. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he is a cement finisher in the summer, however his occupation is a teacher. Mrs. Workman asked if Mr. Mulgrew was familiar with zoning regulations. Mr. Mulgrew stated
that he works out of the union hall so he does not deal with permit procedures. Mr. Strelau stated that there was an amendment to the original application for the dwelling, why was the accessory structure not included in that amendment. The secretary stated that the permits were submitted by Shore West for the construction of the home and Mr. Mulgrew was responsible for the accessory structure. Mr. Mulgrew stated that the accessory structure was under construction at the same time as the house. Mr. Bolander stated that no accessory structures are to be built until the main dwelling is complete. Mr. Bolander asked if the cement in front of the garage is parallel to the property line. Mr. Mulgrew stated that the driveway is along the property line all the way up to the garage. Mrs. Workman is questioning whether a hardship does exist. Mr. Bolander stated that Mr. Mulgrew created his own hardship by changing the garage to a side entry garage. Mr. Bolander asked if any neighbors were present that had comments on the issue. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he also has letters from some of his neighbors. Mr. Scott Carlisle stated that the side entry garage is more appealing, however he also cannot pull a car into the garage. Mr. Carlisle also stated that he doesn’t have a problem with Mr. Mulgrew’s garage. Another of Mr. Mulgrew’s neighbors stated that he doesn’t have a problem with Mr. Mulgrew’s building. The structure is attractive and matches the home. Mr. Bolander asked how the resident would feel if every home had an additional garage of that size in the development. The resident stated that if they were all constructed like the Mulgrew’s, he would not mind. Mrs. Workman asked that if Mr. Mulgrew’s structure was approved, wouldn’t he want to be allowed a structure of the same size? The resident stated that he would not. There was not any indication before he was living in the house that there would be any difficulty in the side entry garage. Mr. Bolander stated that the entire development may request accessory structures if Mr. Mulgrew’s was approved. Mr. Strelau stated that the structure is very attractive and well maintained. Mr. Strelau said that he was considering whether he would approve a proposed structure of this size versus an already existing structure. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he was unaware that there were restrictions on accessory structures.

Mr. Maser moved to approve as submitted. There was no second to the motion. Mrs. Workman stated that she would like to see if there is a hardship. Mrs. Workman would like to look at the property again before rendering a decision. Mr. Strelau said he would like to table the application until the next meeting.

Mr. Strelau moved to continue the public hearing until the next regularly scheduled meeting on September 20, 2000 at 8:00 pm. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call, all approved.

Floor Discussion

Mr. Bolander requested a letter to the Zoning Commission regarding clarification as to how many garages and or accessory structures are permitted on a property. Mrs. Workman stated that she will be attending classes on Wednesday evening through December. She will resign if the board would like her to. All members agreed that it would not create a problem if Mrs. Workman would miss 3-4 meetings due to school. Mr. Strelau moved to adjourn. Seconded by Mrs. Workman. Roll call, all approved.

Respectfully submitted,
Tammy Tabor, secretary

James Bolander, Chairman 10/13/03
Date
Vita-Mix Variance request # 01-6155

Mr. Bolander stated that any decision must be contingent on the parcel being rezoned to
industrial property. Mr. Doug Smith and Mr. John Barnard were present representing the Vita
Mix Corporation. Mr. Smith and Mr. Barnard were sworn in previously. Mr. Smith stated that
Vita Mix would like to build a structure on the Vita Mix property that would be 35’ from the
property line on the north side. Mr. Bolander asked if there would be a parking area from the
building to the property line. Mr. Smith stated that the parking area would be on the east side of
the structure. The area will be 65’ from the structure to the plum creek. Mr. Bolander asked what
the height of the building would be. Mr. Smith stated that the building would be approximately
the same height as the existing buildings and would be approximately 32 feet at the peak. Mr.
Strelau asked if there would be a fence between the building and the property line. Mr. Smith
stated that a retaining wall would be built on the site and the fence would be above that.
Mr. Strelau asked how many employees would be at the site. Mr. Smith stated that 110 are
currently at the Olmsted Township site and 35 employees that are at rented space in Berea. The
purpose of the expansion is to bring all employees to one site.

Mr. Bolander stated that another variance request is for a 12 foot fence and the maximum
permitted is 8 feet. The building setback requires 50 feet from residential property and the
request is for 35 foot setback. The conditional use requested is to allow for outdoor storage. If
this is considered warehousing, it is permitted within industrial zones. Mr. Strelau stated that he
considers this request to be outdoor storage of pallets and cardboard to be discarded and recycled.

James Jocke, 8575 Usher Road, asked if the plan submitted by Vita Mix shows any easements to
the property. Mr. Jocke believes that the proposed building will encroach on an easement held by
First Energy. Mr. Jocke stated that outdoor storage of combustible materials will be a hazard to
the neighborhood. Mr. Bolander stated that the materials proposed for outdoor storage would be
wooden pallets, cardboard and plastic containers. Mr. Bolander asked Mr. Barnard how close to
the property line these items would be. Mr. Barnard stated that they would be enclosed by a solid
fence and would be approximately 18 feet from the property line.

Mrs. Workman asked if the property owner to the west is aware of the 10 foot building setback.
Mr. Barnard stated that Mr. Hajduk is the property owner and has submitted a letter to the board
stating that he is aware of that setback and has no objection.

Mr. Bolander asked Mr. Barnard if the building would encroach on the utility easement. Mr.
Smith stated that they were unaware of an easement on that property.

Mr. Lege moved to approve application # 01-6155 allowing the construction of a building no less
than 10 feet from the property line on the west and 35 feet from the property line on the north and
40 feet from the property line on the north east. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call, all approved.
Vita Mix application #01-6178 request for conditional use and height variance for fencing
Mr. Doug Smith and Mr. John Barnard were present representing Vita Mix. Mr. Strelau asked if
the fence requested would be at a consistent height of 12 feet above the parking lot. Mr. Strelau
asked where along the property line the fence would be. Mr. Barnard showed on the map that the
fence would begin at the first pole barn and end at the proposed structure along the north side if
the property. Mr. Barnard stated that the fence could be continued further down the property if
requested. Mr. Strelau asked how wide the pavement would be between the building and the
fence. Olmsted Township Fire Chief has requested 30 feet of paved surface. Mr. Barnard stated
that the purpose of the fence would be to keep children out and obstruct the view from the
neighbors. Mrs. Workman asked why the 12 foot height is requested. Mr. Barnard stated that the
pallets and racks for storing the cardboard for recycling is 12 feet high. The height would allow
for total coverage of the storage area. Mrs. Workman asked if any of the surrounding residents
had a preference to the height of the fence. Mr. Bohrmann, Usher Road, stated that he had no
preference to the fence height. Mr. Jocke also had no preference in regard to fence height.

Mr. Strelau moved to approve application # 01-6178 to permit a conditional use for outdoor
storage of cardboard to be used for recycling and wooden pallets, and a fence not to exceed 12
feet in height. Mr. Strelau also included that under Olmsted Township Zoning Resolution section
530.08, the conditional use is not transferable in the event that the property is sold and must be
renewed in one year. Seconded by Mrs. Workman. Roll call, all approved.
Mr. Smith asked what the 1 year condition meant. Mr. Strelau explained that the conditional use
could be renewed at the end of 1 year, provided that the applicant adheres to the conditions
specified in the approval of application # 01-6178.

Floor Discussion
Mr. Bolander stated that Tom Schultz from the Cuyahoga County Planning Commission has
reviewed DiSanto Enterprises plan development and asked if the Board had any comments on a
walk that would go through the development and out to the soccer field to the south. Mr.
Bolander stated that his response was that if the walk was unobtrusive and not a straight sidewalk
from the development, it would probably be acceptable.

Mr. Strelau suggested that the applications be reviewed by the board for complete information
and definite need for variances before being brought before the board.

Mr. Maser moved to adjourn. Seconded by Mr. Bolander. Roll call, all approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Tabor, secretary

James Bolander, Chairman Date

12/19/01
The regular meeting of the Olmsted Township Board of Appeals was called to order Wednesday October 17, 2001 at 8:00 PM. Present was Chairman James Bolander, Alla Workman, Martin Strelau and Larry Maser.
Mr. Bolander asked the audience to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Strelau moved to approve the minutes of August 8, 2001 as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call, all approved. The secretary received correspondence including but not limited to, letter from a concerned citizen regarding accessory structures and a response from Mr. Nelson regarding clarifications to application #01-6248.

Krofta Variance # 01-6236
The secretary read the public notice for application #01-6236.
Vince and Jill Krofta were sworn in. Mr. Bolander asked why the structure would need to be that tall. Mr. Krofta stated that because of the design of the roof, there would be a second floor, the structure exceeds the height limit for residential zones.
Mrs. Workman asked what the second floor would be used for. Mr. Krofta stated that the second floor would be used for storage. Rather than a larger structure he built a taller structure. Mrs. Workman asked if this was built without a permit.
Mr. Krofta stated that the accessory structure is currently under construction. Mr. Krofta stated that he was unaware that permits were needed for construction of out buildings. Mrs. Workman asked when the building was constructed. Mr. Krofta stated that during the past summer construction began. Mr. Krofta stated that he is unable to finish construction since the zoning inspector told him to stop.
Mr. Bolander asked what the building would be used for. Mr. Krofta stated that the building would be used for storage. In the future it could be used for agriculture. Mr. Krofta stated that he currently has berry bushes planted and may grow trees in the future. Mrs. Workman asked what the larger building would be needed for. Mrs. Krofta stated equipment. Mrs. Workman asked how tall the doorway is. Mr. Krofta stated that the door would be approx. 8 feet. Mrs. Workman asked how they would house equipment with a small door. Mrs. Krofta stated that the upstairs would be used to store hay & straw. Mrs. Krofta stated that they have not reached the point of using the structure for agricultural. Mrs. Krofta stated they would like to receive approval for residential use, in the event the agricultural business failed, they would need to come before the Board for residential approval. Mrs. Workman asked how many berry bushes the Krofta's have. Mr. Krofta stated that approximately 200 bushes are planted on their property. Mrs. Krofta stated that they would like to plant trees in the future to sell as Christmas Trees. Mr. Krofta stated that they are not currently trying to get a variance under the agricultural use, they would like to have the structure approved for residential use. Mr. Bolander asked what they needed a building that high for. Mr. Bolander asked what the hardship is, to allow a building that high. Mr. Krofta stated that the hardship would be the expense. Mr. Bolander stated that the applicant chose the size of the structure. Mrs. Krofta stated that there are several buildings in the area that are the same height. Mrs. Workman asked if the structures have been approved by the BZA. Mrs. Krofta stated that one was approved by the zoning inspector and another had not been issued a permit. Mrs. Workman asked if that would make their structure permitted. Mr. Bolander stated that it is the job of the zoning inspector to regulate building. Mr. Bolander stated that anyone can register a complaint if they feel a resident is in violation. Mr. Bolander stated that he drove by the Krofta's home from the east, and did not see any tall non conforming structures. Mrs. Krofta
stated that they are on Stearns Road and west on Schady Road. Mrs. Krofta stated that since it is a small barn they need a second level. Mr. Bolander asked if the area was zoned agricultural. If the area was zoned for agriculture it would be possible. Mrs. Krofta stated that they have enough land and are not in a development, why can't they be agricultural. Mr. Bolander read a letter from a concerned citizen that was delivered to the zoning office stating disapproval of tall accessory structures. Mr. Bolander stated that he received a phone call from a resident stating the disapproval of this type of variance. Mrs. Krofta stated that the building is shorter than the house, what is the problem. Michelle Alai was sworn in. Mrs. Alai is the neighbor to the east of the Krofta's. Mrs. Alai stated that she does not disapprove of the structure. Mrs. Alai feels that the height of the structure is not out of proportion for the lot, the structure does not deter from the property value and is not an eyesore. Dino Alai was sworn in. Mr. Alai stated that he is a contractor and familiar with this type of structure. Mr. Alai stated that the gambrel trusses are consistent with the style of building. Mr. Alai stated that the city of Cleveland recently raised the allowable height to 20 feet.

Mr. Bolander asked if that type of roof is required on that type of building. Mr. Alai stated that no, it is the owner's preference. The look is more of a country look. Mr. Maser asked if it is possible to lower the walls of the structure. Mr. Krofta stated that the structure would need to be taken down and started over.

Mrs. Workman asked if Mr. Krofta is building the structure himself. Mr. Krofta stated yes. Mrs. Workman asked what qualifications Mr. Krofta has to build this structure. Mr. Krofta stated that he has construction experience. Mrs. Workman stated that he should have known to receive permits before beginning construction. Mrs. Krofta stated that they had a lot of hassle from the county when they were building their house. Mr. Krofta stated that he was under the assumption you did not need permits for accessory structures.

Mrs. Workman moved to disapprove application # 01-6236. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call, all approved.

Mr. Bolander stated that the applicant would be receiving notification of the Board's decision and the applicant has a right to appeal the decision through the Court of Common Pleas. Mrs. Krofta stated that several buildings are in the Township that do not conform or were not permitted. Mrs. Workman stated that issue would need to be brought to the attention of the Zoning Inspector and this Board has denied several similar issues in the past. Mrs. Krofta stated that they are only here because our neighbor has a problem with us. Mr. Bolander stated that if you have a problem with your neighbor, that needs to be dealt with between you, that issue is not before this Board. Mr. Krofta asked how would you qualify for agriculture. Mr. Bolander asked if the property would need to be rezoned. The secretary stated that no, the property would not need to be rezoned. The determination for agricultural use would be done by the Zoning Inspector, he may require documentation from the County Auditor's Office. You would need to contact the Inspector.

Nelson variance # 01-6248
The secretary read the public notice for application #01-6248. Mr. James Nelson was sworn in. Mr. Bolander asked why such a large building was needed. Mr. Nelson explained that he owns a recreational vehicle that is currently being stored at his parents home. He would like to park the RV at his home in the Villages of Lakeside. The Villages of Lakeside Homeowners Association
require recreational vehicles to be stored within a garage. Mr. Nelson would like to build a structure that is 35 feet x 25 feet in his rear yard.

Mrs. Workman asked what the size of the RV is. Mr. Nelson stated that the vehicle is 27 feet long, 8 feet wide and 11 feet high. Mr. Bolander asked how tall the proposed structure would be. Mr. Nelson stated 15 feet. Mr. Strelau asked how the trusses would be placed on the structure, 25 foot or 35 foot span. Mr. Nelson stated 25 foot. Mrs. Workman asked how old the RV is. Mr. Nelson stated that it is a 1993 model. The newer replacement models are at least 29 feet in length.

Mr. Bolander stated that the distance from Mr. Nelson’s current garage to the property line is 12 feet. The driveway would need to be kept at least 5 feet from the property line. Mr. Nelson stated that the driveway to the proposed structure would tie into the existing drive.

Mrs. Workman asked if the vehicle has been stored indoors before. Mr. Nelson stated that for the past 3 years he has stored the RV inside for the winter.

Mr. Bolander asked if alternative storage was investigated. Mr. Nelson stated that outdoor storage facilities are available year round, however indoor storage is usually not available all year. Mr. Nelson stated that having the garage in the rear would not detract from the curb appeal of the home.

Mr. Bolander asked how close to the neighbors the structure would be.

Mr. Nelson stated that the proposed structure would be approximately 75-100 feet from the neighbors. Mr. Bolander stated that the garage would only be 5 feet from the property to the north.

Mr. Strelau stated that the vehicle is only 8 feet wide, why is the request for a 25 foot structure. Mr. Nelson stated that he would also like to place an additional car and lawn equipment in the structure. Mr. Strelau asked if Mr. Nelson considered adding to the existing garage. Mr. Nelson stated that he was advised by the building inspector that an addition to the existing structure was not possible.

Mr. Randy Kanz was sworn in. Mr. Kanz is the property owner to the north of Mr. Nelson’s property. Mr. Kanz presented photos of the area and property proposed for the accessory building. Mr. Kanz is opposed to having such a large structure directly behind his home.

Mary Gaspar was sworn in. Mrs. Gaspar lives behind Mr. Nelson’s property. Mrs. Gaspar would not like to see such a large building in the rear of the property.

Mr. Bolander asked if the residents in attendance had any problems with an addition to the existing structure. There was no objection from the audience.

Mr. Bolander stated that he would like to see a plan that would allow an addition to the existing home. Mr. Nelson stated that he would try to match the roof line of the home. The only change would be a twelve foot high garage door.
The September 20, 2000 meeting of the Olmsted Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 8:00 p.m. Present was chairman James Bolander, Edward Lege, Lawrence Maser and Martin Strelau. Also, present was secretary Tammy Tabor. Mr. Bolander asked the audience to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. The board members were introduced and Mr. Bolander instructed the audience of the duties and procedures of the Board of Zoning Appeals. The secretary read the minutes from the previous meeting of July 19, 2000. Mr. Strelau asked to change the third paragraph, twenty first sentence, to read “Mr. Strelau stated if the intent...” Mr. Bolander stated that Mr. Lege was not present at the July 19; 200 meeting and should be removed from the roll call. Mr. Strelau moved to approve as corrected. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call. Mr. Lege-abstain, Mr. Bolander-yes, Mr. Strelau-yes, Mr. Maser-yes.

Appeal # 00-5936

Continuation for Appeal # 00-5936, requesting approval for an oversized accessory structure. Mr. Jim Mulgrew was present. Chad Arfons was recognized. Mr. Arfons stated that he is the legal council for Mr. Mulgrew and would like a continuation to allow time to prepare for Mr. Mulgrew’s appeal. Mr. Chad Arfons was sworn in. Mr. Bolander stated that the structure in question is larger than permitted for the lot size and the location and necessity of the building is in question. Mrs. Anna Mulgrew was sworn in. Mrs. Mulgrew presented a letter to the Board explaining the Mulgrew’s reasons for building the structure. Mrs. Mulgrew stated that when purchasing the home from Shore West Construction, she had inquired as to the possibility to create a side entry garage on the Mulgrew’s lot. Mrs. Mulgrew stated that they, (the Mulgews), requested the house be moved further back on the lot to accommodate a side entry garage. Mrs. Mulgrew stated that Shore West stated that the lot would be able to accommodate a side entry garage. Mr. Mulgrew asked how many Board members were on the Board of Appeals and how many were required for a vote. Mr. Bolander stated that there are 5 board members, however a minimum of 3 is required for a vote.

Mr. Maser moved to continue the public hearing for Appeal # 00-5936 until October 18, 2000 at 8:00 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Lege. Roll call, all approved.
Appeal #00-5965

The secretary read the public notice for appeal #00-5965. The variance request is submitted by Mark Madere requesting permission to construct a garage that exceeds the height regulations for accessory structures. Mr. and Mrs. Madere were sworn in. Mrs. Madere explained that they would like to use the second floor above the garage for additional storage space. The height requested would allow for a full second floor that would allow walking on the second level. Mrs. Madere stated that she has a medical condition that does not allow her to bend over easily. Mr. Bolander stated that one of the reasons stated for the height request, on the application, was to block the view of a greenhouse. Mr. Madere stated that was not the primary reason. Mr. Bolander asked if the second floor would be used for anything other than household storage. Mr. Madere stated that only personal effects and holiday decorations would be stored there. Mr. Bolander asked if Mr. Madere’s business would be conducted out of the garage. Mr. Madere stated that the business would be conducted in the basement of the house and a home occupation permit would be applied for at the time that the home is occupied.

Mr. Strelau asked if the total square footage of the structure would include both floors. Mr. Strelau stated if that is included, the total may exceed the amount allowable for the structure. Mrs. Madere stated that in the square footage of her home, any unfinished rooms are not included in the total square footage. Mr. Madere stated that in the location of the garage it would not be visible from the surrounding neighbors. Mr. Madere stated that his neighbors told him that they did not have any objections to the proposed height of the garage. Mrs. Madere stated that the approximate depth behind the garage would be 150 feet to the property line. Mr. Bolander asked if the driveway would be paved. Mrs. Madere stated that the driveway is shared with the neighbor. After a bridge crosses a ditch the Madere’s driveway crosses over to their property and the driveway is paved from there to the garage.

Mr. Lege moved to approve as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call. Mr. Lege-yes, Mr. Maser-yes, Mr. Strelau-no, Mr. Bolander-no. Mr. Bolander stated that a tie vote is not a majority, the application is not
approved. Mr. Madere asked why the application was denied. Mr. Strelau stated that there are other ways to construct storage space and he did not believe that there was a hardship in this case to allow for a variance. Mrs. Madere asked what other ways would be allowable. Mr. Bolander stated that a larger building or additional structures would be allowable without a variance.

Application #00-5984

The secretary read the public notice for application #00-5984. Mr. Edward Kasputis is requesting permission to allow a setback variance to construct an addition to his already existing home. Mr. John Faile was present representing Mr. Kasputis. Mr. Faile was sworn in. Mr. Faile stated that the addition is to accommodate Mr. Kasputis's family of seven children. The existing garage would be converted to a classroom and the addition would be to extend the home and include a new garage. Mr. Faile stated that the home could be built straight across to conform to the zoning resolution, however the appearance would be very institutional. If the variance was granted the home would look like a house rather than an industrial building. Mr. Faile presented drawings of the proposed structure and the allowable structure to the board.

Mr. Jack Tinter was sworn in. Mr. Tinter asked to see a plot plan that was to scale, submitted to the board. Mr. Faile stated that what was submitted was a site plan. Mr. Tinter stated that a plot plan must be to scale and include the fence line and all structures on the property. Mr. Tinter is objecting to the application. His daughter and son-in-law are neighbors of the Kasputis family. Mr. Tinter stated that the resident notice he received in the mail stated that an oversized garage was requested for this application and this is not a plot plan that was submitted. The secretary stated that the resident notice was incorrect and should read “a garage addition”. Mrs. Tabor apologized for any inconvenience or confusion this may have caused. The published notice was correct. Mr. Bolander asked for the reference in the zoning book that Mr. Tinter is referring to. Mr. Tinter stated that section 400.03 in the Zoning Resolution stated that a plot plan requiring all trees, shrubs and fences be listed on the application. Mr. Bolander stated that in the current resolution, there is no section 400. Mr. Bolander asked what page that is on, Mr. Tinter stated page 150. Mr. Bolander stated that the section refers to a request for rezoning, or amending property lines. Mr. Tinter stated page 132. Mr. Bolander stated
that page 132 states that an accurate plot plan that is applicable to the request. Mr. Bolander asked Mr. Tinter if he felt what was presented by Mr. Kasputis was not correct. Mr. Tinter stated that the aerial view presented does not show fence lines and trees that are on the entire property. Mr. Faile stated that what was presented was representative of the variance requested. Mr. Strelau stated that he felt that what the applicant has submitted is sufficient. Mr. Bolander asked what Mr. Tinter’s objection is to this application. Mr. Tinter stated that he was confused with the resident notice stating an oversized garage and the setback. Mr. Tinter stated his objection is to an oversized garage. Mr. Bolander stated that there is no oversized garage and that was explained to him. The only issue is the setback regulations. Mr. Bolander asked if Mr. Tinter realized that the only issue is the setback regulations. Mr. Tinter answered yes.

Mr. Ryan Thomas was sworn in. Mr. Thomas asked what the setback was in the resolution and what the requested setback was. Mr. Bolander stated that the request was for 49.9 foot setback and the resolution stated that on county roads the requirement is 60 feet. Mr. Bolander asked for any further questions? Being none Mr. Bolander asked for a motion from the board on application # 00-5984. Mr. Strelau moved to deny as submitted. With no second the motion failed. Mr. Lege moved to approve as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Maser Mr. Lege yes, Mr. Strelau-no, Mr. Maser-yes, Mr. Bolander-yes.

Mr. Strelau stated that he has seen some signs in the Township stating that permits are required in the Township. Mr. Bolander asked if any correspondence had been received. Mrs. Tabor stated that a letter regarding garages had been received from assistant County Prosecutor Dodrill. Also, a letter from the Zoning Commission had been received stating the Olmsted Township Zoning Commission’s opinion on the number of garages permitted in the Township.

Floor discussion

Mr. Bolander suggested that after the meeting on October 18, the Board allow time for discussion on possible changes to the Zoning Resolution and Comprehensive Land Use Plan.
Mr. Maser moved to adjourn at 10:00 p.m. seconded by Mr. Lege. Roll call, all approved.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Tammy Tabor, secretary

[Signature] 10/1/00

James Bolander, Chairman  Date
The Olmsted Township Board of Zoning Appeals meeting of October 18, 2000 was called to order at 8:00 p.m. Present was chairman James Bolander, Edward Lege, Lawrence Maser and Martin Strelau. Also, present was secretary Tammy Tabor. Mr. Bolander asked the audience to stand for the pledge of allegiance. Mr. Bolander introduced the board members and instructed the audience on the procedures of the Board of Appeals. The secretary read the minutes from the previous meeting of September 20, 2000. Mr. Maser moved to approve as read. Seconded by Mr., Lege. Roll call, all approved.

Mulgrew Appeal # 00-5936
Mr. Bolander asked Mr. and Mrs. Mulgrew to come forward to be sworn in. Mr. Chad Arfons, attorney for Mr. Mulgrew was also sworn in. Mr. Arfons stated that a hardship exists in the fact that the angle of the driveway makes it impossible to access the garage entry. Mr. Arfons stated that the Mulgrew's did not create their own hardship. The Mulgrew's relied on the builder to determine the feasibility of the side entry garage on their lot. Mr. Arfons stated that the Olmsted Township Zoning Resolution allows 875 Square feet for garages and another 1% for accessory structures. Mr. Arfons stated that the structure is an accessory structure that is used as a garage. The Mulgrew's have a 3 car attached garage and a 1 car detached garage. It is larger than the 1% allowable size. Since a portion of the structure is being used as a garage, and the definition of a garage says that a garage can be an attached or detached accessory building or a part of the principle structure. Mr. Arfons stated that if you combine the 1% for accessory structures and the 875 square foot allowable size for garages, the size is not that much greater than the size allowed in the zoning code. Mr. Arfons stated that in the testimony of the residents present, the building is not a hindrance to the neighborhood and the neighbors do not object to the size or placement of the structure. Mr. Arfons stated that this a unique hardship due to the shape of the lot and the zoning code will be upheld by the granting of this variance.

Mrs. Anna Mulgrew stated that they relied on the builder to determine the usability of a side entry garage on their lot. When they moved into the house they discovered that the garage was not very easy to pull vehicles into. Mr. Mulgrew stated that his truck was unable to fit into the garage. Mr. Mulgrew felt that they (the Mulgrews) had taken all of the precautions to create more room to accommodate a side entry garage. Mr. Mulgrew stated that the house was moved further back on the lot and the driveway was widened.

The Board members reviewed original and amended plot plans submitted for the Mulgrew's home. Mrs. Mulgrew stated that the angle of the driveway is the problem with entering the garage. Mrs. Mulgrew stated that the reason for the home to be moved back on the lot was to provide a cushion of room to access the garage and turn around. Mr. Strelau asked if the contractor mentioned any problems with the driveway design. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he was the subcontractor for the driveway. Mr. Arfons stated that the attached garage is 650 square feet. The detached garage is 482 square feet. Mr. Arfons stated that the total square footage is within the limits of 875 square feet and 1% of the total lot size. Mr. Arfons stated that the structures size is not a great departure from the zoning code. Mr. Mulgrew stated that he would provide all
information necessary to receive permits for the structure. Mr. Strelau asked if there is a
definition between what area is used for vehicle storage and what part is used for
accessory storage.

Mr. Trefney, Dogwood Lane, was sworn in. Mr. Trefney stated that the structure is
attractive and does not have any adverse effect on the neighborhood. The driveway on
the cul de sac is a unique problem for side entry garages. Mr. Terry Emerine was sworn
in. He stated that he has driven into and backed out of the driveway and has found it to
be difficult. Mr. Emerine stated that the building does not distract from the
neighborhood.
Mr. Scott Carlise was sworn in. Mr. Carlisle stated that he has no objection to the
Mulgrew’s garage. He stated that he also has trouble using his side entry garage.
Mrs. Hula, Dogwood Lane, was sworn in. Mrs. Hula stated that the garage on the
Mulgrew’s property is attractive and is not an eyesore.
Mr. Tim Bihn was sworn in. Mr. Bihn stated that the structure is visible from his property
and does not have any objection to the structure.
Sue Kralley, Laurel Lane, was sworn in. Mrs. Kralley stated that she would rather have
Mr. Mulgrew’s truck parked in the garage than sitting outside in the driveway.
A resident was sworn in, asked if any of the board members have attempted to drive
into the driveway. The resident asked if all structures in the Villages of Lakeside would
be given the amount of attention that this one has. the resident also asked if all
structures in the township would be subject to this much attention. Mr. Bolander stated
that the structure was built without permits and the board would be deciding if a
variance would be granted. Mr. Bolander stated that any structures brought to the
attention of the zoning inspector would be reviewed for compliance.
Mrs. Bihn was sworn in. Mrs. Bihn stated that she likes the structure, it is attractive and
adds value to the neighborhood.

Mr. Maser moved to approve Appeal #00-5936 as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Lege.
Roll call, all approved.

Mr. Bolander stated that the applicants have contributed to their hardship. All of the
blame cannot be put on the builder. Mr. Bolander stated that he will not consider this to
be a precedent setting decision. If a resident is interested in constructing, it is advisable
to see the zoning inspector or any of the zoning board members for information or with
any questions as to what is allowable.

A resident asked if an applicant was to request a side entry garage what responsibility
does the township have regarding the feasibility. Mr. Bolander stated that the buyer is
responsible to find out what is permissible and if there is a discrepancy the buyer is
responsible. Mr. Strelau stated that the restitution lies with the builder not the
Township. The Township is only responsible for the setback regulations and the use of
the land.
Moyse Appeal # 00- 6013

Mr. Strelau stepped down from discussion on this appeal due to a personal relationship with the applicant.

The secretary read the public notice for appeal #00-6013.

Mr. Geoffrey Moyse was asked to come forward and be sworn in. Mr. Moyse stated that he would like to construct a garage on his property. Currently Mr. Moyse has no garage on the parcel and currently has one home on it. Mr. Moyse provide photos of the surrounding properties to be included as part of his application. Mr. Moyse is requesting a variance to allow a height variance. Mr. Moyse stated that according to the Olmsted Township Zoning Resolution he is permitted 875 square feet for a garage and 210 square feet for 1% accessory structures. Mr. Moyse stated that to allow a 12 foot garage door to allow access for a van the variance would be for a 19 foot peak on the garage.

Mr. Moyse stated that he owns the lot to the east of the parcel requested for the variance. Mr. Moyse stated that there are no peculiarities of the properties surrounding the area. Mr. Moyse stated that the surrounding area is a mixture of ‘hodge podge’ structures that are not all within the same building design. Mr. Moyse stated that the structure would be used to house some historic vehicles that are in the process of being restored. The vehicles are currently being stored at what was his father’s residence before he died. The property is to be sold and Mr. Moyse would like to have a garage to place the vehicles in so as not to violate other Township regulations. Mr. Moyse stated that the structure would be built so that the structure would be the same design as the property to the east. Mr. Moyse stated that he did not create this situation. In the Township the zoning has been changed over the years. The front part of the structure would be 15 ft high and the rear portion would be higher to accommodate a twelve foot door to allow parking a van inside.

Mr. Bolander asked what type of van. Mr. Moyse stated that the van is an Econoline 350 with a box on the back. It is higher than a regular van. Mr. Moyse stated that he does not use the van on a regular basis and wanted to park the van so it would not have to sit outside. The door of the garage would need to be 12 feet high, a 10 foot door would be too short.

Mrs. Anderson is a neighbor of Mr. Moyse on Bagley Road and wondered if she could see some pictures of the proposed building. Mr. Bolander invited any member of the audience to come forward and review the application.

Mr. Bolander asked what type of material would the driveway be. Mr. Moyse stated that it would be asphalt or concrete. However, the weather may prohibit driveway construction until next spring.

Mrs. Anderson was sworn in. Mrs. Anderson stated that she owns the property directly west of Mr. Moyse’ property. Mrs. Anderson stated that she has an evergreen line along her driveway abutting Mr. Moyse’ property. Mrs. Anderson stated that she feel that there should be a 30 foot buffer zone. Mrs. Anderson stated that with the parking from
Razzles Mr. Moyse has so much on the lot now. Mrs. Anderson stated that the garage
would not be far from her lot. Mr. Moyse already has so many things at Razzles now, he
has motorcycles and a lot of noise and they are open late. Mrs. Anderson stated that the
garage will be very close to her property now. The house does not have a driveway
because the parking from Razzles uses the driveway to the home.

Mrs. Mihalic of Stearns Road was sworn in. Mrs. Mihalic asked about the houses on
Stearns Road. She stated that she does not live in a hodge podge house. Mrs. Mihalic
said that Mr. Moyse wants to put a driveway through his property on Stearns Road and
connect it to Razzles parking lot on Bagley Road. Mrs. Mihalic stated that there is a lot
of noise from Razzles and it is open late. Mrs. Mihalic stated that she cannot sleep with
her windows open on the weekends. Mr. Lege stated that the garage will not be behind
her house nor will a driveway. Mr. Lege stated that this garage will be on the parcel to
the west of the parcel that Razzles is located on. Mrs. Mihalic’s rear property line will be
at least 200 feet away from the proposed garage sight.

Mr. Bolander asked if the garage will be used for the rental property. Mr. Moyse stated
that the tenants would like to use the garage to store lawnmowers and storage. Mr.
Moyse will primarily use the garage to house historical vehicles and his van.

Mr. Moyse stated that he has no current plans for the property on Stearns Road. The
property has a duplex residential home and is used for rental property. Mr. Moyse
stated that he has no plans for a driveway to connect his property on Stearns to the
parcel on Bagley Road. Mr. Moyse stated that he created a gravel pad for the tenant to
park his vehicle on.

Mrs. Mihalic stated that she doesn’t think that Mr. Moyse needs another structure on his
property. Mr. Moyse stated that a garage is permitted on the property. He is only
requesting a variance to allow a taller structure. Mrs. Mihalic stated that she has never
seen the tenants on Stearns Road do anything to the property without the owners
permission.

Mr. Anderson was sworn in. Mr. Anderson stated that his house is not hodge podge.
Mr. Anderson stated that the proposed garage will be larger than the house. Mr.
Anderson stated that trucks will be pulling in and out all the time and bringing in parts.
Mr. Moyse stated that the garage will be used only to store historical cars. Mr. Anderson
stated that it will be a place to sell cars. Mr. Anderson stated that Mr. Moyse has a
garage already behind the saloon. Mr. Bolander stated that the use of the garage is
strictly for storage. Mr. Bolander asked how Mr. Moyse would access the garage. Mr.
Moyse stated that the entrance would be from the west for the rear access and there
would also be a door on the front. Mr. Bolander stated that the garage must be
accessed from the driveway on the same parcel. Mr. Bolander stated that the garage
could not be accessed from another parcel. Mr. Moyse stated that he would grant an
easement from his property on the east to access the side entrance to the garage.

Mr. Lege asked if there is a garage on the Razzles property. Mr. Moyse stated that
there is a garage behind Razzles but not very close.
Mr. Mihalic was sworn in. Mr. Mihalic stated that he asked Mr. Moyo if he was planning a driveway behind the Stearns Road homes and he stated that not at this time, possibly in the future. Mr. Moyo stated that he has no plans for a driveway. Mr. Moyo stated that Mr. Mihalic wanted a commitment at that time. Mr. Moyo stated if, since the entire area was rezoned to retail business, a developer wanted to come in and purchase the property he may sell. Mr. Moyo stated at this time he has no plans for any changes.

Mr. Lege asked how many vehicles needed storage. Mr. Moyo stated 3 vehicles and parts for those cars and then room for the van. Mr. Bolander stated that the structure is 375 feet over the allowable size and a height variance. Mr. Bolander stated that he has not seen any residents in favor of the proposed structure. Mr. Bolander asked if the Razzles parking lot was up to the property line or over the property line on the west side? Mr. Moyo described on the drawing where the parking lot is. Mr. Bolander asked what the zoning is? Residential or commercial. Mr. Moyo stated he believed the parcels to be retail business.

Mr. Moyo withdrew his application and will construct a garage within zoning regulations.

Floor discussion.

Mr. Bolander would like to see some changes in the zoning resolution regarding garages and accessory structures. How much square footage is permitted and how many garages are permitted. Also, the definition of a garage should be explained better. Mr. Lege stated that he would like a better definition of accessory structures. Mr. Bolander stated that 1% of the lot size is quite small in comparison to other communities. Mr. Bolander also stated that the height requirement is very restrictive.

Mr. Lege moved to adjourn at 10:35 p.m. Seconded by Mr. Maser. Roll call, all approved.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]
Tammy Tabor, Secretary

[Signature]
James Bolander, Chairman

Date 12/20/00
The December 20, 2000 meeting of the Olmsted Township Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order at 8:00 p.m. Present was Chairman James Bolander, Edward Lege, Larry Maser and Alla Workman. Mr. Bolander asked the audience to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. The board members were introduced and procedures of the Board of Zoning Appeals were read. The secretary read the minutes from the previous meeting of October 18, 2000. Mr. Maser moved to approve as read, seconded by Mr. Lege. Roll call, Mr. Lege- yes, Mr. Maser-yes, Mr. Bolander-yes.

Siefke variance request
The secretary read the public notice for application # 00-6031, submitted by Jeffrey Siefke. Mr. Bolander asked Mr. Siefke to come forward and be sworn in. Mr. Bolander asked what the proposed height of the building would be. Mr. Siefke stated the height would be approximately 19 feet high at the peak, the walls are 12 feet high. Mr. Bolander asked how far from the side lot lines would the structure be placed. Mr. Siefke stated that the structure would be 19.7 feet from the property on the north side and 15.3 feet on the south side. Mr. Bolander asked what the driveway would be made of. Mr. Siefke stated that the driveway is made of gravel and would extend that to the new structure. Mr. Bolander stated that our regulations require all access to all new garages must be paved with either concrete or asphalt. Mr. Bolander asked what would be stored in the building. Mr. Siefke stated that he has a 32 foot trailer, an 18 foot boat, 2 classic cars, a truck and a trike. Mr. Siefke stated that currently all of these vehicles are stored outside in his yard.

Mr. Lege asked how far from the lot line the driveway would be. Mr. Siefke stated that the driveway would be 15 or 16 feet from the lot line. Mr. Lege asked what material would be used for the driveway since our regulations state that the driveway must be paved. Mr. Siefke stated that the driveway would be made of asphalt and would probably not be done before the building was in. He would plan on that being done in the future.

Mr. Bolander asked what type of material the structure would be made of. Mr. Siefke stated that vinyl siding, wood or brick, whatever the board would prefer. Mr. Bolander stated that the board usually requests that the structure be constructed with the same material as the main dwelling.

Russell Forkapa was sworn in. Mr. Forkapa will be assisting in the construction of this building.

Mr. Bolander asked Mr. Siefke if any other work would be done inside the structure. Mr. Siefke stated that only his own personal vehicles would be worked on. He will not be using the building for anything other than personal use.

Joe Bertran, 7141 Fitch Road, asked how the calculations were done for accessory structures. Mr. Bolander explained that a maximum of 1% of the total lot size was permitted for accessory structures.

Mr. Bertran asked when this regulation was enacted. Mr. Bolander stated that March of 2000 was when these regulations went into effect.
Mr. Bertran stated that when he built his home, he was told that there were no regulations regarding the size of accessory structures. Mrs. Workman stated that attached structures do not have maximum size limits. Mr. Bertran stated that he had a structure that is 42 x 60 feet, built with a permit.

Mr. Lege moved to approve application 00-6031 as amended to include the placement of the structure on the lot, with the driveway to be consistent with our zoning regulations within the first year of construction of the structure. Seconded by Mrs. Workman. Roll call, Mr. Lege-yes, Mrs. Workman-no, Mr. Maser-yes, Mr. Bolander-yes.

Floor Discussion

Mr. Maser moved to adjourn. Seconded by Mrs. Workman. Roll call, all approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Tammy Tabor, secretary

James Bolander, chairman 4/18/01