

MEETING MINUTES
PERKINS TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
Monday November 17, 2025 @ 4:00 PM
PERKINS TOWNSHIP SERVICES FACILITY – BIG MEETING ROOM
2610 COLUMBUS AVENUE, SANDUSKY, OH 44870

Board Members Present: Mr. Ted Kastor
Mr. Larry Pitts
Mr. Mike Bixler

Board Members Absent & Excused: Mr. David Bertsch, Mr. Gary Gast & Mr. Spence.

Staff in Attendance: Mrs. Arielle Blanca, Community Development Director
Mrs. Casey Sparks, Planner/Zoning Inspector
Mrs. Jessica Gladwell, Administrative Assistant

I. Call to Order.

Mr. Kastor called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

II. Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. Kastor led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance.

III. Roll Call.

Mr. Kastor asked Mrs. Gladwell for a call of the roll.

Mrs. Gladwell took a Roll Call: Mr. Kastor, here; Mr. Pitts, here; Mr. Bixler, here.

IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes (Monday October 20, 2025).

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the Board's previous meeting on Monday October 20, 2025.

Mr. Pitts made the motion to approve the minutes from the Board's previous meeting on Monday October 20, 2025.

Mr. Bixler seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

V. Chairperson's Welcome and Explanation of Public Hearing & Meeting.

Mr. Kastor welcomed everyone to the meeting. He said it will be held in two (2)

parts. First will be the Public Hearing, where the Board will hear from the applicant. Then they will switch to the Public Meeting, where the Board will decide the fate of the application.

Mrs. Gladwell swore everyone in.

VI. Secretary – Read the Request for Variance Permit.

Mrs. Gladwell read the request on the proposed application.

APPLICATION #BZA2025-32 – *An application for a variance permit was submitted by Jay Berger, on behalf of Ronda Carpenter, for the property located at 2822 Sunset Lane (PPN # 32-03889.000). The variance request is to allow a 30’ rear yard setback. Article 13.3 of the Perkins Township Zoning Resolution requires a 40’ rear yard setback within the R1-B (Single-Family Residential District).*

VII. Staff Report – Planning & Zoning Department.

Using the staff report and PowerPoint visual aid as a reference. Mrs. Sparks stated that as Jessica mentioned Jay Berger with High Touch Homes applied for a variance for the property at 2822 Sunset Lane. The property is zoned R1-B. There was previously a fire on the property and now they would like to place a new manufactured home on the property. The zoning code does allow for manufactured home, and there is a specific section in regard to those standards which the applicant is meeting. The comprehensive plan calls for the lot to remain residential. Mrs. Sparks showed photos and the proposed site plan. The applicant is requesting to construct a manufactured home on the property, which will not meet the rear yard setback along the eastern side only. He is requesting a rear yard setback of 30 feet, whereas 40 feet is required. All other setbacks will be met. The applicant has communicated that if required they would remove the shed. All the trees and the stump are to be removed from the property. The house is proposed to be 1,492 square feet. The shed from the previous owner, if they need to remove that shed, they can, it is up to the board on what is needed. Images of what the home will look like were shown.

Public Works Department - Director: No issue with current application

Building Department - Chief Building Official: All appear to work and not present negative appearances to developed neighbors.

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: These properties will not have a negative impact on emergency response.

No issues or comments were received by the other departments.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **staff recommend approval for the variance to allow a 30' rear yard setback at 2822 Sunset Lane.** There was previously a single-family dwelling located on this lot that was torn down due to a fire. The proposed single-family dwelling does meet the rear yard setback of 40' along the western portion of the lot, however due to the shape of the lot the eastern side of the rear of the home does not meet the setback. The proposed single-family dwelling is approximately 1,500 square feet. Staff do not believe that the 10' rear yard variance will greatly impact on the surrounding property owners.

VIII. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-32.

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-32 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Mrs. Sparks stated that a few people came into the office regarding the variance, just asking to see what they planned on doing and no other comments or follow-ups have been made.

IX. Board Motion to Close Public Hearing and Open Public Meeting – Roll Call Vote.

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

Mr. Bixler motioned to close the public hearing and open the public meeting; Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

X. Discussion from the Board.

Mr. Kastor asked if the Board members had anything they would like to discuss regarding this application.

XI. Board Motion and Second to Approve, Deny, Modify, or Table Application #BZA2025-32 – Roll Call Vote.

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to approve or deny the variance.

Mr. Pitts motioned to approve BZA2025-32;

Mr. Bixler seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

The Request for a Variance Permit was **approved**.

XII. Secretary – Request for Variance Permit.

Mrs. Gladwell read the request on the proposed application.

APPLICATION #BZA2025-33- *An application for a variance permit was submitted by Mark Raber, on behalf of Matt Cox, for the property located at 2015 East Perkins Ave (PPN #32-04627.000). The variance request is to allow a 14'5" side yard setback for an accessory structure. Article 17.3 of the Perkins Township Zoning Resolution requires a 30' side yard setback within the C-2 (General Commercial District).*

XIII. Staff Report – Planning & Zoning Department

Using the staff report and PowerPoint visual aid as a reference, Mrs. Sparks stated that as Jessica noted that a variance application was submitted by Mark Raber on behalf of Matt Cox for the property located at 2015 E Perkins Ave. The variance request is to allow a 14'5" side yard setback for an accessory structure. The property is zone C-2 General Commercial. It is a medical office currently. The comprehensive plan calls for the lot to remain commercial. The applicant is proposing to place the accessory building within the rear yard directly behind the existing building. He thinks it would look better, the current building actually doesn't meet the C-2 side yard setbacks; so he would place it just in line with the current building, behind it. The current structure does not meet the required setback of 30 feet in the side yard. The applicant is planning on storing items associated with the business, so they want to ensure they are able to access these items. The applicant said it will also be aesthetically pleasing at this location. The area is located at the southwest portion of the property adjacent to commercial building, the accessory structure will be 1,440 sq. ft; which is smaller in size to the existing medical office.

Public Works Department - Director: No issue with current application

Building Department - Chief Building Official: All appear to work and not present negative appearances to developed neighbors.

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: These properties will not have a negative impact on emergency response.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

No issues or comments were received by the other departments.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **staff recommends approval for the variance to allow for a 14' 5" side yard setback for an accessory structure located at 2015 East Perkins Ave. with the following condition:**

1. **The applicant shall obtain all building permits for the accessory structure.**
2. **The accessory structure shall only be used for storage for business; no human habitation is permitted, no renting out. Just for storage for the business itself.**

Staff recommend approval of the side yard variance for the accessory structure, understanding that the building will be utilized for storage of equipment associated with the business. Staff recognize that this accessory building is proposed to be 1,440 square feet which is larger in size, but it is smaller than the existing structure. The existing building is 1932 square feet per auditor's website. Staff do not believe that the accessory structure will have an impact to the surrounding properties.

XIV. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-33

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-33 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Matt Cox stated that the presentation was good. As Mrs. Sparks stated that the setback currently how the building sits, what he wants to do is the 20ft setback of existing structure, he is okay with that it lines up at the end of the driveway as it stands now. He stated that he was going to use the northeast corner and start the additional structure from there, so it goes in line. As Mrs. Sparks stated, rotating into that area could be done to meet setbacks but he would be afraid people would be going over there thinking it's the office, when it's not.

Mr. Bixler asked Mr. Cox if he had any problems with the conditions the zoning department put on.

Mr. Cox stated that no he didn't, due to it being commercial he actually has spent a year and a half to find a builder who could do it in a timely manner and meet all the code and requirements. It is Mark Raber from Homestead Builders- he's reputable so there shouldn't be any problems there. He stated that no one is going to be living there, it's truly for the maintenance of the property and the extra chiropractic equipment that is currently being stored in his garage and other random locations.

XV. Board Motion to Close Public Hearing and Open Public Meeting – Roll Call Vote.

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

Mr. Bixler made a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

XVI. Discussion from the Board.

Mr. Kastor asked if the Board members had anything they would like to discuss regarding this application.

XVII. Board Motion and Second to Approve, Deny, Modify, or Table Application #BZA2025-33 – Roll Call Vote.

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to approve or deny the variance.

Mr. Bixler motioned to approve BZA2025-33, as submitted.

Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

The Request for a Variance Permit was approved.

XVIII. Secretary – Request for Variance Permit.

Mrs. Gladwell read the request on the proposed application.

APPLICATION #BZA2025-34- *An application for a variance permit was submitted by John and Jackie Ming for a property located on Galloway Road. (PPN# 32-01626.004). The variance request is to allow a 6.5' side yard setback with a total combined side yard setback of 16.5'. Article 13.3 requires a minimum side yard setback of 10' with a total side yard setback of 25' within the R-1 (Single Family Residential District).*

XIX. Staff Report – Planning & Zoning Department

Using the staff report and PowerPoint visual aid as a reference, Mrs. Sparks stated that as Jessica noted a variance application was submitted by John and

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Jackie Ming for the property located on Galloway Road showing photos of the lot. The variance request is to allow a 6.5' side yard setback with a total combined side yard setback of 16.5'. The property is zoned R-1 Single Family Residential. The comprehensive plan calls for the lot to remain residential. In 2021 this area was approved for a lot of split creating four additional lots. The parcel in question is the middle parcel along Galloway Road. Mrs. Sparks showed photos of the proposed site plan and photos of the proposed home. The applicant is looking to construct a 3700-3800 square foot home on the parcel that is 6.5' from the side yard setback and 10' from the other side yard. The home will not meet either side of the yard setback requirements. The lot is approximately 130 feet wide by 329 feet deep. The applicant stated that they have already modified the plan and attempted to purchase a small portion of the land from the neighboring properties to increase the lot width. The neighbors were not interested in selling so they have requested a variance.

Public Works Department - Director: No issue with current application

Building Department - Chief Building Official: All appear to work and not present negative appearances to developed neighbors.

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: These properties will not have a negative impact on emergency response.

No issues or comments were received by the other departments.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **staff recommend denial for the variance to allow a 6.5' side yard setback with a total of 16.5' at Parcel # 32-01626.004.**

Parcel 32-01626.004 is approximately 42,875 square feet in size, this is double the minimum lot size within the R-1 Single-Family Residential district, which is 16,000 square feet. The proposed single-family structure is approximately 3,700-3,800 square feet. Staff recognize that approving this variance will have an effect on the adjacent parcels, particularly 32-01626.003, as this property will have less of a side yard setback for any new construction on the adjacent parcels. Understanding that there is not a specific hardship other than the proposed size of the dwelling will not meet the required setbacks, staff is inclined to recommend denial for the proposed variance. We have concerns that the proposed setbacks will directly impact future development on the adjacent parcel (32-01626.003) as this lot has approximately the same dimensions.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mrs. Gladwell read in the following email from an adjacent property owner.

From: Derick & Patricia Campbell
Address: 966 Douglas Ave Apt 216
Date: November 13, 2025
Subject: Opposition to Variance Request – 6.5’ Side Yard Setback (Article 13.3, R (Single Family Residential District))

Dear Members of the Zoning Board of Appeals,

I am writing as the owner of the property located within 200 ft of the Ming property located on Galloway Rd. (PPN#32-01626.004).

I am submitting this letter in opposition to the requested variance that would reduce the required side yard setback from 10 feet to 6.5 feet as specified in Article 13.3 of the Perkins Township Zoning Resolution.

I respectfully ask that the Board deny this variance request for the following reasons:

1. Violation of Intent of the Zoning Code:
The 10-foot minimum side yard setback and total of 25 feet in the R-1 District are designed to preserve adequate spacing, privacy, and neighborhood character. Reducing the setback to 6.5 feet undermines the purpose and intent of Article 13.3.
2. Impact on Adjacent Property:
Allowing a structure only 6.5 feet from the property line would negatively impact on the adjacent property by reducing privacy, airflow, and natural light. It may also affect property values and create a crowded appearance inconsistent with surrounding homes.
3. Not a Unique Hardship:
To qualify for a variance, the applicant must show a unique hardship due to the land itself—not simply a desire for additional building space. Based on the lot layout and neighborhood pattern, the hardship appears to be self-created and not a result of unusual property conditions.
4. Precedent and Neighborhood Character:
Approving this variance could set a precedent for other property owners to seek similar reductions, gradually eroding the open, uniform spacing that defines our neighborhood.

I understand that every case is reviewed individually, but I believe granting this

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

variance would not be in keeping with the zoning code's intent or with the character of the R-1 residential district.

Thank you for considering my concerns. I appreciate the Board's commitment to upholding Perkins Township's zoning standards and neighborhood integrity.

Sincerely,
Derick & Patricia

John Ming- Okay, so I'm John Ming. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight. I come before you as a lifelong resident in Perkins Township. I was born and raised here. I'm proud to call this community my home. Many of you have been friends, family, classmates, or customers of our families over the years, and we appreciate that. We are here tonight because we're obviously talking about this parcel in question. So, this is going to be our forever home, and we're going to be raising our child and taking care of that elderly mother. We're requesting the side variance setback because originally this plan, like I said, if we were able to rotate this in 90 degrees, we would be able to fit this within all setback requirements of the lot. We didn't go this route because the reason we're thinking is we're respecting the privacy of both sides of our neighbors. If we were to spot a house towards the side, our front yard would be in their backyard, our backyard would be in the other neighbor's backyard, and it would look out of the face and out of character. So, as Casey had said, we had tried to modify the plan, turn the garage, and request to purchase just in time to get an additional on either side. Unfortunately, as I mentioned that they were denied. So, Let's see. I actually had a conversation with one of our future neighbors, one of his concerns was that the 6.5 feet side back of this house would cause the appearance of the neighborhood, of the area, surrounding areas, to be a little bit switched at the smaller neighborhoods. That's a valid concern. But he also expressed that, you know, I can't fathom building a home 113.5 feet long. which was most likely he is not going to be building near that length. So, if he were to build whatever home he would like, and to follow the 10-foot minimum-sized setback, there would at least be a minimal space of 16.5 feet. And then I'm not sure about the-- I don't think it would obstruct any air visibility or anything. We don't plan on any fences. there's any concerns about construction crews over the property, I would address that. Casey had also brought up that the lot is approximately 42,875 square feet. It is a lot of area, but it is more longer by far than it is width. There's lots of parcels within neighborhoods, even on the road on Bogart, for example, where there's a lot less acreage, but it's a lot more usable. Like, even the current parcel that we sit on right now, is like 148 feet wide within a residential neighborhood, which is also zoned. My question for the board, too, is because I was looking at all the zoning for all the properties along Galloway and along other roads throughout Perkins Township, and I noticed there's an inconsistency in how things are zoned. There could be a stretch of R1A, and suddenly there's a pocket and a few R1s, and then it goes back to R1A. I noticed this on Hall Road, for

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

example. On the side towards Boardwalk Boulevard, before it hits Shady Lane, there's a few parcels that are zoned R1. Across the street from Hall, everything is zoned R1A, and that's irrespective of how large the parcel is, cause they're quite similar in size. North of Galloway, towards, from Hall, north of Galloway, Most are zoned R1A. And I also know some inconsistencies, and there were probably variances granted in the past to southbound parcels on Galloway before hitting Bogart Road. I'm here as a friendly neighbor. I do want to have good relations with everybody. So, if, for example, I was trying to say, if for some reason that was zoned R1A like others, this request would only be for 3.5 feet of space and I'm here to try and come up with solutions so that we can all live peacefully in one seat, because we live with each other, basically. So, they're kind of like the family, and I'm kind of stuck in the middle. So, I do want to make things work out. So, I'm wanting to be reasonable and come up with solutions to hopefully make everybody happy. So, Bill, do you mind if I call you out by name? So, for example, if it's 6.5 on your side, if halfway to 3.5 to get you to 10 feet on your side and 10 feet together. Because technically, if the minimum offset on one side is 10 feet, even if we build something smaller, we will choose arbitrarily where that 10 feet would be, whether it be on the left or whether it be on the right. So, what I'm trying to say is, can we all find a solution to work together to peacefully resolve this. By shrinking the lot in the house, if we shrink it too much more, the aesthetic appearance of the outside is completely deleted, and we want to maintain high property values for all neighbors. Like I said, we want all homes to look nice. I was just trying to maximize the width per the dimensions of the length to not make it look like it's so-- how do you say? tiny compared to the depth of the lot. Again, if you have any concerns, I'll be more than happy to address and hopefully we can find a solution that makes our life happy. Thank you.

Holly Miracle: I'm Holly Miracle, I am the lot immediately just south. South of the Mings. So that large lot there, there's actually two of us, Derek and Patricia are the oddly triangular lot. I am the acre between the Mings and the Campbells.

They split a lot. Not number one, they split.

Do you want me to read this letter? So, we have a letter for you guys. To the zoning board, we are the property owners adjacent to the Mings property. They have requested a variance of the side setback. The setback is set at 10 feet. They're requesting a 6 1/2, right, 6 1/2 setback. Both Holly and Jude, my mother, she's the other property owner for the lot, oppose this request. We did our due diligence in selecting our property for our future home, including the side setbacks as ordered by zoning. This setback and type, place and size of the lot were all part of selecting our property. The impact of the proposed variance of the immediately adjoined lot will require the neighbor to build closer to our future home and creates a narrowing of our space perception to our neighbor's home. The standards are clearly spelled out on pages 113 and 116 of the zoning resolutions. Development standards on page 115 and there is the layout of development standards to guide any potential home builder to ensure the

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

standards are met. We intend to be good neighbors to live in an area where personal property and rules are respected. This includes township ordinances that are adhered to by the community we will be joining. The approval of this variance will violate that concept. The call for this variance can be corrected by the applicant. Building company architects can assist the buyer, builder, to make appropriate adjustments to their design to accommodate the placement of their selected design within the restrictions of the lot selected and the Township ordinance regarding side setbacks. We believe that it is incumbent upon the Mings to search for other alternatives to maintain the standard setback of their home in relationship to our home. When choosing a design, potential builders need to familiarize themselves with zoning ordinances to ensure compliance with regulations and make informed decisions regarding property use and development. This is from the Perkins zoning resolution. The preamble to this document states that the standards are set to create, in quotes, orderly development where property owners can have adequate light, air, and convenience of access in relationship to surrounding properties. The Mings did indeed send us a letter earlier this month requesting purchase of 10 feet of our lot. We respectfully declined that request. This is their second attempt to adjust their lot to accommodate their desired home design by changing the setback distance. When choosing the house design, their construction company should have been aware of the restrictions for building the house on their lot. Certainly, their construction company would have that information or could have easily accessed it on the internet. An adjustment to the setback, in quotes, cannot be the owner's personal preference, end quote, but according to the zoning resolutions, a necessity. That's 7.3 section C, D&F. Variances are created as the result of hardship. We do not believe the situation falls into the hardship category. The reconfiguration of a design proposal is available to the property owner. Further, it is stated in the township resolutions that the persons required the variance must have proof of hardship created and that hardship cannot be self-created, nor can it be established on the basis by one who purchases with or without knowledge of the restrictions. It further states that any variance must be suffered by the property bely of the land in question. Within township resolutions, questions are suggested for the board to consider. Where is the long-term effect of the proposed change? Our properties will be closer, privacy will be affected, visibility will be limited, and air as well as light may be affected. In single-family homes, section R1 requires a setback to be 10 feet for a total of 2 feet surrounding each structure. Page 220, section D, the minimum width of a dwelling located on the lodge will be 25 feet. Twenty-five. The general intent and purpose of the standard require the above. Should the board deny our request to maintain the standard setback, the implications for future requests of other personal adjustments to the land restrictions may be requested. Indeed, it opens the door for other property owners to make similar land variance requests in the future. The variance will impact us, the Mings immediate neighbor, as well as the neighborhood and the township itself. We realize that the ultimate decision rests with the board, but we ask that you deny this variance for the sake of our privacy, visual space, and peace of mind, knowing that the township will stand firm on its

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

own standards.

Mrs. Sparks asked Ms. Miracle where her lot was.

Holly showed the board and audience where her lot was.

Mrs. Sparks stated that on the auditor's website, and this is why I'm asking, on the auditor's website, it doesn't show that lot is split, and it shows it's still under Derek's Campbell's, the whole parcel is under Derek Campbell. So, do you know when you split that lot off?

Holly stated that she had it in her car & said she would go and get it.

Discussions continued about the lot not being parceled off.

Mr. Kastor stated that it doesn't have any bearing on this discussion. True. So, we're talking this lot and now we have these two neighbors here, regardless in fact, is included or not. Okay. Who else would like to speak about this?

Bill Stratton & Wife Julie; Okay, we own the lot to the north. Right. All right. It's like everyone said, it has a lot, a lot of square footage. It has a lot of frontage. It's hard to find a lot 130 feet wide, in R1A in Perkins Township, anywhere. Okay, my question is, when you buy and purchase a lot and you intend on building on it, you normally draw a print to fit that lot, which was already said. That's just my theory. That's the way most contractors perform and architects, well not the architect, because he doesn't know where the building's going. But you tell him what the width is, and he usually draws it to that width. Now, if it's not fitting, I would think you would make a modification to make it fit, because that is not a narrow lot by no means. Okay, my question is on the north side, I'm on the north side, he's requesting 6 1/2 feet from that line with his building. Okay, I'm familiar with building. When it's built, it's a two-foot over dig, I don't know if it does have a basement. Could you pull the print up to the house? Sure. Please. Yeah, there. Does this have a basement? Full basement. Okay, you're talking 2 foot overdig. That only leaves 4 1/2 feet to the lot line. Now once a building's erected, here's another, how do I want to pick? It's really not an issue, but I'm foreseeing it could become an issue. How do you go to your backyard with all that square footage when it's only, If you have landscaping in, it's going to be what, four and a half feet wide on that side. Now you have the driveway on the other side, but not really because the driveway is going to be in the middle, the garage hugs. That's only 10 feet from building to the line there. Now you might be able to get something through there, but it'd be pretty tight, because you're talking overhang, landscaping, that's going to make that narrow. What they're literally doing, in my point of view, is you're shutting the whole piece of property off to the backyard for access for future buildings. What if he decides to sell this thing in 10 years, 20 years? You never know. He says it's his forever home. I've got to believe that, but things change. Those are my issues on this variance, where if you keep 10

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

and 15, the 15 is where you have the access. That's why that's made in the zoning. That's why that regulation is there, for access to your backyard.

Kevin Wolf - What if you put a fence up? You know, they couldn't, you know, they couldn't.

Mr. Stratton- The fence would shut it down too, on the wide 10 foot. You're taking 8 1/2 feet off the side sets is what you're doing. That's almost one whole side set. That's only 2 1/2 feet. Or no, I'm sorry, 1 1/2 foot from one side set, which would be the 10. That's my concern. And then the other concern is, the aesthetics of the neighborhood. This building is so wide that when the neighbors mow their grass, it's going to overpower that lot from your eye perception. The rest of the houses are going to have room on each side with yard and shrubbery and, you know. This building, in my opinion, is going to be over power by that lot.

Kevin Wolf - My name's Kevin Wolf. Kevin and Susan Wolf. I live in lot #4, and Bill lives in the back of me. I live in the house with a detention pond and a house with a grain gazebo in the backyard.

Mr. Kastor stated that's quite a landmark.

Kevin Wolf - But I agree with Holly and Bill. I think from the neighborhood, I think the house is enormous. and consumes his whole property practically and I just think it's going to look different and from the view of the house it almost looks like he said something about if he downsized anymore and changed the look of the house I mean keep it keep it the same but tighten it and put the make it an L shape put the bedrooms on an L shape and narrow it and they I think it can be done by the looks of it and that you still have the same view and the picture of the house you know I know it cost more money and but I don't I down we downsized our house just to fit in our lot and it barely fits and we worked on that because I between my house and Chet's house you know it's 25 feet in between and that that looks tight to me you know I don't look you're with it either.

Jude Miracle - I had a little paragraph that I told her not to read, but it might be pertinent. Now it says that the space of the surface may seem small, okay, but I'm five feet. And when you look at five feet, that's quite a bit of space visually. And not only that, but like this gentleman said here, I was wondering also how they would get like a zero-turn lawn mower through that area once it was created. Because it really-- I have a zero turn and it's not going to be big enough to fit a lawnmower through. So, not only does the variance mean foot-wise, but it also means elbow-wise, I think. Okay, so that you have some space between the two houses. So that's just all I wanted to add. Thank you. My name's Jude Miracle. I didn't tell you who I was, but now I am.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

John Ming - Sorry. I just wanted to clarify. Initially, when you were mentioning— It's not 6.5, we were requesting template on that side. So that's what we were trying to say, if we can find some kind of a resolution, where we can have ten foot on each side, for example, as ample space to get back and forth between your concerns will be addressed. Again, like I said, if today it was zoned consistently, as most properties were R1A, it would be a 20-foot side setback. And I don't think I'm being on this one. I'm trying to find some common ground where we can meet, where we can hopefully come to some of. That's all I just wanted to say. Thank you for all your consideration. Again, our goal is to become friendly neighbors and Bill, I do plan on living here until I die. Born and raised here.

XX. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-34

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-34 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

XXI. Board Motion to Close Public Hearing and Open Public Meeting – Roll Call Vote.

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

Mr. Bixler made a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

XXII. Discussion from the Board.

Mr. Kastor asked if the Board members had anything they would like to discuss regarding this application.

Mr. Kastor - Okay, we've all been on this board a long time. This isn't our first side yard setback. So, a couple things, Mr. Ming, I compliment you, you did everything the right way. You offered to purchase an additional land, and then you were communicating to your neighbors, trying to find a resolution. We've had cases where people come in, never talk to their neighbors, and that is a different tone. So, thank you for that. But there's a lot of things to consider here. Number one, if we granted this request, and you actually built your home, what was the small side? Six and a half and 10. Six and a half feet, okay. That's a problem. If you're digging a basement, like the one gentleman pointed out, you have two feet of working room. That basement's probably down 6, 8 feet, okay. That slope's got to be one-to-one, okay, for that to be a safe excavation. You will be on your

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

neighbor's property digging your basement. That's just the way it is. The other thing is, we have approved side yard setbacks when neighbors agree. When it comes to getting a building permit, our building official, that side that doesn't meet the side yard setback, that construction must be fire rated. You must use fire rated sheathing plywood on the side of the house and the roof. Costs money. So, those are just two construction things. Normally when it comes to this, like this gentleman said, when your architect or engineer went to design that home, the first step is lot line, setbacks. Now I got to build a house within this area. So, I don't know what happened there. I mean, this is a large lot. I can't believe we're talking about setbacks on a lot this big, and so that's kind of my two cents.

Mr. Bixler – That covers it very well. Good job. Have nothing to add.

Mr. Pitts- I just think that this is sort of unique in the sense that what's already been mentioned, but also, we're at the initial stages of building for these other lots. So, it's not like you're putting an addition onto an already existing home. And there might be some movement one way or the other. I think right now, this is just difficult to approve of and really be able to meet everybody's needs, that's why we have the guidelines and the zoning and all of that and I've known you for a long time. All right. So, I think it is difficult here.

**XXIII. Board Motion and Second to Approve, Deny, Modify, or Table Application
#BZA2025-34 – Roll Call Vote.**

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to approve or deny the variance.

Mr. Kastor motioned to deny BZA2025-34, as submitted.

Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

The Request for a Variance Permit was denied.

XXIV. Old Business.

None.

XXV. New / Other Business.

Mrs. Sparks stated that as of right now we did not have any for December, but recently we have been pretty steady so she can't promise anything.

Mr. Kastor asked if the trustees were going to make any changes to the board.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mrs. Sparks stated that No, we don't have any. So for our BZA, we do not have anybody. Zoning Commission, we actually have Kula is up and she will renew. But I believe everybody here is.

I think all long terms are okay for this year.

I do, I will say, when we were looking at some of the dates when everybody was going to be missing and off, we kind of looked at some different scenarios and we kind of read our code and Dave is in Florida half of the year he had said he actually is a resident of Florida. So, the way that our code rated, we had to get legal, some legal opinions and I think we're going to have to change that section to say that you own the property, not be a resident. Because otherwise, I don't know if he's a technical resident. So, I think what we talked about with Mr. Boyle is we just kind of changed the language in our property. Well, I mean, I would love to hear your opinion, honestly. Yes.

Mr. Pitts - Me personally. It's more than. You're on the committee, I mean.

Mr. Kastor - I mean, we all enjoy Dave, but obviously he's only here for half a year, and now technically a Florida resident.

Mrs. Sparks - And I don't know that Arielle, yeah, well, I don't know that Arielle or Gary knew that until this conversation came up at last month's meeting. And I mentioned, or, and I mentioned that to her, I said, I think he said he's not a resident. But is he an alternate? So, I appreciate that, because I think that that's something that I would like to kind of go back to Gary, because we did reach out and had a conference call about it. He said, at this point, if this is what your intention is, that he would change his name. He's a legal resident of Florida, and if you guys are of the opinion that that's not really your intention, then I would like to take that back to Gary.

Mr. Kastor stated that, that indeed was his opinion.

Mrs. Sparks- February is our month, we will have probably, because you will be gone and you will be gone. So, we will need to give every intention to reach out to them and let them know that if we cannot, you know what I mean, if you cannot make it in this February meeting, then we need to reschedule to a time in which you can. And honestly, what I was going to do, we usually make the schedule in the next few weeks, because of it.

Comes out at the beginning of the year, and I was just going to have conversation with him, and if I needed to change that date in February, then we'll be back tonight. So, but I think we're okay. February is the only time, because you will be back in March, correct? Ish?

Mr. Pitts - Ish. Okay.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
11/17/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mrs. Sparks – Mike, then you are not here in March, or you are here in March.

Mr. Kastor - Because it's really not fair perhaps to delay the whole month.

Mrs. Sparks- So, I also did reach out to Sandusky, and they have recently approved something in regard to If the board members are not able to be there, a commission member can step in. So, if you know you're not going to have a quorum, then one of our trustees could step in and serve on the board to ensure that we have a quorum. Personally like that idea, and being that, you know, you still have a party that's interested in the township, and you know, I don't know that they will have as much knowledge base you guys do, but I do think that -- I thought that was going to be maybe beneficial. But I do -- I do think the only real, real issue is this February. Because everybody else is kind of shifting into it.

Mr. Kastor- Well, I'm going to get a hold of Gary.

Mrs. Sparks - Okay. And I can look at his term, but when I had asked Ariel, I was the only individual that was coming up was Dave, and that was the question, and that became again a question for his residents, and then so I don't know when Gary's is, but I can take a look. He does resign, and we will fill it in. Obviously, it's not.

XXVI. Adjourn Meeting.

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Bixler motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully Submitted,

X _____
Mrs. Casey Sparks,
Board of Zoning Appeals

X _____
Mr. Theodore Kastor, Chair
Board of Zoning Appeals

Date of Signature:

Date of Signature:

Click or tap to enter a date.
