

MEETING MINUTES
PERKINS TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
Monday July 21, 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
Mr. David Bertsch

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

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;
Mr. Bertsch, here.

IV. Approval of Previous Meeting Minutes (Monday June 16th, 2025).

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the Board's previous meeting on Monday June 16th,2025.

Mr. Pitts motioned to approve the minutes; Mr. Bertsch 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 #BZA2025-16 – *An application for a conditional use permit was submitted by Driven Brands, Inc. for property located at (PPN #32-00863.002, Sandusky, OH 44870. The conditional use request is to allow an automobile service station. A conditional use request was previously approved for this site; the applicant is requesting a renewal for the previously approved permit.*

VII. Staff Report – Planning & Zoning Department.

Using the staff report and PowerPoint visual aid as a reference. Mrs. Sparks stated that as Jessica mentioned a CUP request was submitted by Driven Brands, Inc for property located on (PPN #32-00863.002) Sandusky, Oh 44870. The conditional use request is to allow an automobile service station; one was previously approved for this site; the applicant is requesting renewal for the previously approved permit. The property is currently zoned as C-2 General Commercial. The applicant has applied for this application several times. The conditional use is to operate an automobile service station. The property is approximately 1.6265 acres which was formerly part of the Deehr property. Mrs. Sparks showed images of the current site. There is a little bit of change, the site plan in the staff report was the one that was submitted last year. They actually removed the car wash portion from the site and it will just be the service station now. It will be a right in right out, which they are working with ODOT on this as well. Mrs. Sparks showed images of the proposed elevations. Comments from our departments were as followed:

Public Works Department - Director: No concern with the application as presented.

Building Department - Chief Building Official: No concern.

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: The Fire Marshal has reviewed the conditional use permit request and has stated that there will be a requirement to provide a fire hydrant within 400' of each structure. Additionally, there must also be access to the buildings for Fire vehicles which meet the requirements of the fire apparatus access road section of the Ohio Fire Code.

****ODOT:** ODOT has not issued a permit yet or approved any plans for the right-in/right-out driveway and turn lane along US 250. There are only a few minor comments that need addressed on the plans before we can accept them (latest plans are attached); our remaining comments are related to plan notes and

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

standards so there should be no changes to the design. We are also waiting for a developer agreement to be signed by Driven Brands and the corrected right of way donation. A right of way donation was completed last July; however, the documents used were not reviewed or approved by ODOT so there are corrections that need to be made.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **the staff recommends conditional approval of this conditional use permit request for an “Automobile Service Station” for PPN: 32-00863.002, Milan Road, Perkins Township, OH 44870.**

Staff recommends that the BZA approves this variance with the following conditions.

1. The applicant must now submit a full set of plans to scale, 3 sets hard copy, 1 set digital, and pay for site plan review by the zoning inspector and the Chief Building Official. Through this administrative process, the application shall address the remaining site design items, as well as any other additional items necessary to display compliance with the Ohio Building Code and Ohio Fire Code:
 - a. Fire Hydrant Locations & Access by Fire Apparatus: The applicant shall work with the Perkins Township Fire Department to meet fire regulations, such as provide a fire hydrant within 400' of each structure and also provide access to the buildings for Fire vehicles which meet the requirements of the fire apparatus access road section of the Ohio Fire Code.
 - b. Access between properties: An access easement must be recorded on Permanent Parcel Number 32-00863.000 and Permanent Parcel Number for access to the subject parcel, Permanent Parcel Number 32-00863.002.
 - c. Official documentation from ODOT: Will need to provide written documentation from ODOT and the Crossings once access is approved.
 - d. Elevations: Elevations shall be approved by staff.
 - e. Site Lighting: A photometrical plan shall be submitted, to be approved by staff.
 - f. Signage: An application for sign plan approval shall be submitted and approved. This application shall include a site plan, dimensional plan, elevations, and section of the sign(s).
2. For the public utilities of water and sewer, the applicant shall work with the Erie County Department of Environmental Services to properly establish service.
3. For the public utility of stormwater, the applicant shall work with the Erie County Soil and Water Conservation District to properly manage the stormwater on the site.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

VIII. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-16.

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-16 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Chris – Driven Brands. I know you guys are familiar with this project and with the different variations. We are back for a couple reasons; we want to do it right and we want to proceed/ Since the last time it came before you, we got out of the carwash business, we have sold off that entity. So, the proposal in front of you is for a quick oil change business – Take 5. It relieves a lot from the site to make everything easier and reauctioned and the intensity of the uses on site. The layout is basically the same with the proposed access the same. As staff noted we do not have the ODOT approval yet, we are still finalizing the access agreement which is to loop around the other property; which is another reason why were back, we feel confident that we are close enough to executing that agreement and having that recorded and finalizing ODOT approval that we will be able to move forward in short order. Chris stated that he is not the one who negotiates directly with that, but our real estate manager felt confident enough about where that is to move forward. We have the exhibits and the legal description for that easement written, I know we owed the land owner a couple of items ourselves which are being written up now, so we feel confident we will have that in short order and our goal is to move forward with approval and building approval and ideally start work before the cold sets in, which we understand is up in the air depending on how things go. Everything in front of you should be what you saw before, but if there are any questions Chris stated he'd be happy to help.

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. Bertsch motioned to close the public hearing and open the public meeting;
Mr. Bixler 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.

Mr. Kastor stated that the Deehr property has been vacant for some years, so this is a great opportunity to develop that.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

XI. Board Motion and Second to Approve, Deny, Modify, or Table Application #BZA2025-16 – Roll Call Vote.

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

Mr. Bertsch motioned to approve BZA2025-16; 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 #BZA2025-18 –An application for a variance permit was submitted by Harvey Studer, Sr. on behalf of Sandusky Church of God for a property located at 1018 West Bogart Road, Sandusky, OH 44870(PPN #32-68009.000). The request for the variance is to allow an electronic message board sign within an R-1 Single- Family District. Article 28.11 of the zoning code states electronic message boards are not permitted in the R-1 Single Family Residential districts. Article 28.11(1)d also states that the illuminated side of sign shall not be located within five hundred (500) feet of residential 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 the property in question is on W Bogart Rd. which is currently zoned as R-1 Single Family Residential; surrounded by other Single Family Residential properties. Mrs. Sparks showed pictures of the existing site and sign. She noted that it is a changeable copy sign, the applicant is looking to request a digital message board. They are looking to use the existing post; so, the size of the sign will not vary by much in size. This is about a 2-acre parcel. Staff recognize that a lot of the churches within the Township, which we've seen a similar variance last month or the month before at a church that is zoned with residential zoning regulations as in regards to an accessory structure. A lot of these churches are in Residential areas; they operate as obviously gathering spaces, so we do sympathize that they are kind of bound by a residential code where it's not a single-family dwelling. We did go through some of the other churches in the area to look at their signage. These are 3 sites that are zoned as R-1 as well and this is the type of signs that they have and none of them are digital message boards.

Public Works Department - Director: No issue with the proposed application.

Building Department - Chief Building Official: No issues.

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: No comment.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **staff recommends denial of this variance request to allow digital message board within a residential area.** Staff recognize that most of the churches within the Township are zoned as Single Family Residential, however most of them do not have digital signage. This property is located on a 2.0-acre parcel and surrounded by all residential properties.

If the Board considers approving this variance Staff believes it is important to condition that the signage is dimmed during the evening hours to assure that there is minimal impact on the surrounding residential properties.

XIV. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-18

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-18 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Harvey Studer- Sandusky Church of God. We just want to rebew our sign, we are tired of changing it by hand. I recommend you come out in the winter and change it with me, while the letters are frozen. We just want to upgrade it, I talked to both neighbors immediately on both sides of us. It would bother the neighbor on the left-hand side the most because his bedroom windows face the church, which we already have security lights and he tolerates all of that and is okay with it. I talked to him about the sign, and he had no problems with it, as long as it wasn't strobing at night and he didn't mind if it was on if it was dimmed or not bothering him. Both side neighbors know we are just trying to go digital, I know faith and all the churches you showed don't have it, well it's their choice. We decided that we want one and were willing to pay the price for it, a lot of people read our signs and comment on it and we feel like it does what we want it to do and to be a help for the community and advertize our meetings and stuff.

Mr. Bertsch asked if the current sign was lit.

Mr. Studer stated that it was, it doesn't change colors or anything. The church has been there for 65 years; so, we were there before any of the houses were there, we can't help that they moved in; it was farmland. We would just like it to be for your consideration, it's what the church has been wanting to do and has already raised half the money to do it.

Mrs. Sparks asked if they knew how often they would change the sign.

Mr. Harvey stated that it goes off a computer program, there would be different messages throughout the day and advertisements as far as meetings and sayings; things like that.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Bertsch asked that then they could avoid the flashing and the strobing.

Mr. Harvey stated that yes, they would be able to go down to 75%. We could go down to 25% to light, and at night we could do a dark background. We are being very considerate to the neighbors, we don't want to be a bother to them but we don't want to shut it off at night either.

Mr. Bertsch asked if we had ever had any issues with the Fair signage, I feel like that's a similar situation.

Mrs. Sparks stated no.

Mr. Harvey stated that he did his own research, Meadow lawn has one around their school, Furry School has one which has houses right up on the school and there is more distance around our sign than that sign. High school has one, they are flashing theirs all night long.

Mr. Bixler stated that he would only be worried about setting a precedence which it sounds like it already has.

Mr. Kastor asked if we had received any correspondence for this request.

Mrs. Sparks stated that we had not.

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. Pitts made a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting; Mr. Bertsch seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

Mr. Kastor stated that a couple points that he had were valid, they were there before the houses. Most signage you see now a days are going that route. They do offer a clean appearance if they are operated correctly.

Mr. Pitts asked how far off the property line would it be.

Mr. Studer stated that its around 35 ft from the property line.

Mr. Kastor stated that it is commendable that the applicant did reach out to the neighbors to give them heads up, instead of just getting a letter in the mail saying they want to put a digital sign next to you.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Studer stated that they want to make it look nice and put some landscaping around it and a few flag poles to decorate and make it look nice and upgrade the front of the church, and we feel the sign is a big part of that.

Mr. Kastor stated that he knows the staff doesn't have much control, but the fairgrounds, their rendering showed some landscaping area, and they put some big boulders in front of it, you know it protects the sign, technically it looks a little rough, again he stated he is not sure if we can control that.

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 #BZA2025-18 – Roll Call Vote.

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

Mr. Bertsch motioned to approve BZA2025-18, as submitted and with the stipulation of being accommodating to the neighbors; Mr. Bixler 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 #BZA2025-19- *An application for a variance permit was submitted by Adam Snyder for a property located at 6006 Beatty Lane, Sandusky, OH 44870 (PPN#32-02927.000). The request for the variance is to allow an accessory structure to exceed the square footage of the first floor of the main building and to allow the second accessory structure to exceed 196 square feet in area. Article 13.6 (1) of the Zoning Resolution states that no accessory structure shall exceed the square footage of the first floor of the main dwelling. Article 13.6(10) states that no more than two (2) accessory buildings can be erected on a lot, one of which can have an area equal to or less than the main floor of the primary residence. The second cannot exceed 196 square feet in the area and must be subordinate to the principal use.*

XIX. Staff Report – Planning & Zoning Department

Using the staff report and PowerPoint visual aid as a reference, Mrs. Sparks stated that as Jessica noted the property in question is located at 6006 Beatty Lane. The zoning of this property is R-1, it is a unique property, it is adjacent to Commercial, PUD & other residential, on the other side is our cemetery and directly adjacent is property owned by Perkins Township. Mrs. Sparks showed photos of the existing site explaining there is an existing garage on the site along with another accessory structure on the side that will be removed, per the applicant, if this was approved. The proposed setback of the accessory structure is 25', the applicant did not indicate the rear yard setback however staff believes based on the information provided it should not be an issue to meet the 20' rear yard setback. The applicant has indicated that the height of the accessory structure will be 14' in height in email staff received 6/23/25. The proposed size of the building is 2400 square feet; per the Erie County auditors' site the square footage of the first floor is 1,408 which obviously the accessory structure is bigger than that so that is where the variance comes into play. There is also a detached garage which is over 192 square feet, which is again where the second variance comes into play. After discussion with the applicant this afternoon, he wanted to place the accessory structure a little closer to the property line, which he is here, and he can speak to. The issue at hand is that if he didn't want to meet the setbacks, unfortunately we would have to come back next month because we did not advertise that, we advertised for exceeding the square footage of the single-family dwelling, and the square footage of the accessory structure. From a staffing perspective, we would probably want to speak to him regarding that.

We did receive the one comment from our building official; he did notice the size of it was substantial and he wanted to make sure the incidental to the single-family dwelling required by the zoning code and not used for business or auto repair. We did go out for a visit this afternoon and there were a few cars out there getting worked on, so again we just want to make sure this is for non-commercial use, just for storage. Again, just something we would want to address with the applicant. The total square footage of the home is 3033 square feet including the basement. The applicant also indicated a proposed side yard setback of 25'. The applicant has indicated that this would be utilized for maintenance detail and storage of vehicles.

Public Works Department - Director: No issue with the proposed application.

Building Department - Chief Building Official: Concern regarding the purpose of the use, will this be used for auto repair business?

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: No comment.

The applicant has indicated that they would prefer to be closer than 25' from the

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

side property line, however the application indicated that the rear and side yard setback will be met.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **staff recommend approval of this variance request to exceed the square footage of the first floor of the main dwelling and to allow the second accessory structure to exceed 196 square feet located at 6006 Beatty Lane.** Staff recognize that this property is zoned as Single Family Residential and other surrounding properties have accessory structures on their property. Staff believe it is important to clarify with the applicant the use of accessory structure to ensure that this building will not be utilized for commercial use. If he is requesting not meet the side or rear yard setbacks, we would have to have him come back next month due to what was being advertised to the surrounding property owners and staff moved forward with that application due to that being what we received.

Mr. Bertsch stated that if we were to approve these variances and those conditions, he still wouldn't be able to move forward with construction due to set back requirements.

Mrs. Sparks stated she believes he could, the existing lot, is substantial in size. She stated that he had the area to meet the setbacks, it would have to be a min of 20ft from the side and 20ft from the rear. Per the code if you get an accessory structure of this size, that is the setbacks required, its anything over 1,500 square feet must meet those. He was meeting that, if he chooses to not meet that, then tis something that needs to be brought back.

XX. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-19.

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-19 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Adam Snyder – 6006 Beatty Lane; The reason I am here is I want a garage in my back yard. The property line issue she's regarding is the northern property line, the reason I want to be closer is so there isn't 20ft of grass that I have to mow and maintain. The north is an empty set of woods. As far as the neighborhood is concerned, they could care less about it. He stated that he understands as far as the size that is communication oh his part, the size of his boat is 31.5 foot long, so that is why it has to be 40ft. 35ft is not a size that I could order, it's an odd size.

Mr. Bertsch stated he had a few questions. Mr. Bertsch asked Mr. Snyder if he was proposing to move the building into the setback, so you would need a variance.

Mr. Snyder stated he guessed, I wasn't aware of that at the time. He meant to say that upfront, from when I first applied for it, he wanted it to be within that line. He stated he guessed he could put it in the middle of the yard, like aesthetically it wouldn't make sense. Just based off the stone being 20ft from stone and grass

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

and its going to be in the dead center of the yard and won't be attractive.

Mr. Bertsch stated that as we discussed, if we approve this variance as is, this doesn't necessarily give you approval to build the building because it would be too close to the line, you understand that, right.

Mr. Snyder stated unfortunately yes.

Mr. Bertsch also asked Mr. Snyder if he was using this for commercial purposes.

Mr. Snyder stated no, all personal for cars and a boat. The cars in the back are junk. The only ones that matter are in storage or in garage.

Mr. Kastor told Mr. Snyder that he had a couple options. He stated that we could table this today, amend the current variance and add the variance for the setbacks to be closer to the property line and come back next month, or you can get approval today to put it within the setback requirements, that is up to you.

Mr. Snyder stated that it was up to the board.

Mr. Kastor stated that it is not up to the board, it's not their building.

Mr. Bertsch asked if he went for another variance, would he have another fee.

Mrs. Blanca stated that it would be a third variance and yes.

Mr. Bertsch asked if we tabled it, he wouldn't have to pay it.

Mrs. Blanca stated that he would still have to pay the fee for the third variance because it's an additional variance we're adding.

Mr. Kastor stated that Mr. Snyder originally didn't know that.

Mrs. Blanca stated that it's still another variance, so it has to be paid for; everyone has to.

Mrs. Sparks stated that he would just have to pay for an additional, it's \$25 not the original \$350.00. Just from a staffing perspective, so everyone is on the same page, if he chose to table it today; you would propose to be 3ft from the property line, so you would be asking for a 17ft side yard variance and the height would be 17'9 inches; the max is 20' so you would be fine with that and then you would be proposing a 50 ft rear yard setback, is that correct?

Mr. Snyder stated that he essentially has enough room as necessary. He measured today and has over 110 ft then 99 ft to the closest neighbor.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Bertsch stated so from a paperwork standpoint is there one that is preferable?

Mrs. Sparks stated that if he decided to have this table and add that variance on, Mr. Snyder would just have to come in and pay the additional fee and then we would re-notify all the property owners with adding the side-yard setback information that he wants. Then it would come to the august meeting and review all them together.

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

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried

XXII. Discussion from the Board.

Mr. Bertsch asked if we needed a motion to table it, if that's what we are wanting to-do.

Mrs. Gladwell stated yes.

XXIII. Board Motion and Second to Approve, Deny, Modify, or Table Application #BZA2025-19 – Roll Call Vote.

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

Mr. Bertsch motioned to **TABLE** application BZA2025-19; so the applicant can add a side yard setback variance to this application. Mr. Bixler seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

The Request for a Variance Permit was **TABLED** until the next meeting.

XXIV. Secretary – Request for Variance Permit.

Mrs. Gladwell read the request on the proposed application.

APPLICATION #BZA2025-20 – *An application for a conditional use permit was submitted by Star Inc., on behalf of Firelands Auto Real Estate V, LLC for (PPN#32-03356.011) located at the corner of N. E. Strub Road and Massey Blvd.*

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

The conditional use request is to allow for auto sales and repair for Fireland Auto Group. Article 17.2(3) of the Zoning Resolution requires a Conditional Use permit to allow for motor vehicle sales and services within a “C-2” General Commercial District.

XXV. Staff Report – Planning & Zoning Department

Using the staff report and PowerPoint visual aid as a reference, Mrs. Sparks stated that as Jessica noted there is a conditional use permit submitted by Star Inc. on behalf of Firelands Auto Real Estate V, LLC. Mrs. Sparks stated that the Property zoned as PUD, but the base zoning is C-2 General Commercial. Similar to the adjacent parcel, we took the property through the conditional use process as the base zoning is C-2. Automobile sales and service stations require a conditional use permit per Article 17.2(3) of the zoning resolution. The comprehensive plan calls for the lot to be commercial use. Mrs. Sparks showed images of the current site and the proposed site which we will go into more detail with the variance request. This property will have a auto service station and sales. We did reach out to all departments and there weren't any issues with the conditional use permit.

Public Works Department - Director: No issue with the proposed application.

Building Department - Chief Building Official: No issue with the proposed application.

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: No issue with the proposed application.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **staff recommends approval of the conditional use permit request to allow an auto sales and service center to be located at the NE corner of Massey Blvd and East Strub Road.** Staff recognizes that this property is zoned PUD, however the base zoning is “C-2” General Commercial which would require a conditional permit for an automobile sales and service center. Staff recognize that the general area would support similar commercial use as discussed in this report. The applicant is currently working with staff and the board regarding approval of site plan.

XXVI. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-20.

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-20 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

John Reyes 46405 Telegraph Ave – Star Inc. Stated there isn't too much to add to that, they are proposing a Honda Dealership on that corner, across from the Jeep Dealership that was just built and Toyota that Firelands Run. It is an odd L shape lot, very skinny lot; but we managed to fit as much as we could onto it. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Mr. Bertsch stated that previously we had approved a variance to go on the

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

adjacent lot (West Side of Massey).

Mrs. Sparks stated correctly that was for a conditional use permit to be used as parking as the main use.

Mr. Bertsch stated that, and this is for the East Side.

Mrs. Sparks stated that was correct, what they did for a site plan was to include both sites so we could take a look at the parking and landscaping etc. Mrs. Sparks showed the proposed building and service station/elevations and 3D image of what the building will look like.

Mr. Kastor asked if there was any buffering to the neighbor next door, which is what, Coastal Swings?

Mrs. Sparks stated that this is something we can talk about in the next; the applicant as indicated to staff that the final landscaping plan has not been submitted; this is just proposed because we are taking them through the variance application because they do not have enough trees for that site. Coastal Swings is right next door, they are proposing parking right up to the property line; but adjacent to the back half of the lot, it is just an access area/road to the carwash which will be used as a drive. So, again if that is something of concern that is something we can address with the variances for the next agenda item. The applicant and zoning have discussed where they could put some additional landscaping; but once again they have mentioned it is not the final.

Joe Shell 12165 St Chales Place; stated his wife and himself are the owners of Coastal Swings and there was some worry about the cars parked right up to the property line. He stated he didn't know if there was supposed to be a setback in those or not, but if they are applying for a variance on that. He stated he did take a quick look at the plans, and he did not see a retention pond; did I miss that? I know everyone else had had to put one in so far, and I don't want all that water coming back to my land, my already gets full and almost overflows. Also, there is a cell tower in the northwest corner of their property, and he is not sure what the specifications are if that thing falls down how close a building can be to it; someone might need to investigate that. Also, where are the utilities coming if they're underground.

Mr. Reyes stated that he could answer some of those questions. As far as the retention pond is down the road, there is a mass retention area for all of these sites; what it is made for, and that's what they're tying into. Everything is being done by a civil engineer, as we speak, all of this and the car park is being tied into the retention reservoir, you probably know, but it is down to the east there. When everything is laid out, the building setbacks and parking setbacks are indicated on the site plan. With the parking setback there was nothing indicated for the side yard setback there, the building setbacks are indicated on them. The

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

access area on the north there is a back vehicle access for the dealership itself, it is not a carwash for people to come in and out of all the time.

Mr. Shell asked if that was off Strub Rd.

Mr. Reyes stated that no, it is off the internal parking area, and it is just for the technicians when they are done servicing a car to get it washed. So, there will not be a lot of movement back there. He stated he is not sure how to address the cell tower situation.

Mr. Schell stated that he doesn't know if there are any restrictions.

Mr. Reyes stated that the cell tower company should probably address that issue. All the utilities are underground, there is site lighting for the parking area that has been designed, and the lumen has been submitted, and they are in correspondence with the township.

Mr. Schell stated that most of his questions were addressed but he still had some worry about the setbacks for those parking spaces that meet up against the property line. Across the road when they built, his cousin area had a nice buffer.

Mr. Reyes stated that it would be nice, it is a small tight lot, and it is a car dealership which is why we got approval for that. They sell lots of cars, which is why we did the initial parking across from Massey there.

Mr. Schell's wife stated that she would contact the cell tower.

Mary McPeak 1004 E Strub Rd. Stated, she is immediately next to the Jeep Dealership; she stated that she couldn't see from here. The access and egress aren't coming to Strub Rd – it's coming off of Massey, Correct.

Mr. Reyes stated that was correct; nothing is coming off Strub.

Mr. Bertsch stated that the site plan that was up there with the dashed lined is the setbacks, those parking spots are within that setback area.

Mrs. Sparks stated that those setbacks are building setbacks, not parking.

Mr. Bertsch stated the area proposed to drive vehicles back to the carwash is that East of that setback area, in that zone.

Mrs. Sparks showed the drive and where the carwash is, its only for workers to take cars back.

Mrs. Sparks stated that the parking setback is 10ft from a residential zone, does not require from commercial property; but again they are lacking some

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

landscaping so that might be something the board wants to discuss with the applicant for that application.

Mr. Bertsch stated that this is just for conditional use.

Mrs. Sparks stated that it was correct, this is just for the automobile sales and service station.

Mrs. McPeak stated that she wondered about the lights being on all night. Is that for shopping at night or security.

Mr. Reyes stated that both are correct, people drive around at night looking for vehicles, and of course security.

Mrs. McPeak stated that since she heard them with the church, was there any way they could dim the lights after a certain time or midnight, can some things be dimmed somewhere. Right now, her bedroom is facing her neighbors, so it is not on the driveway side. But then they mentioned dimming the lights at the church, that might be something nice.

Mrs. Sparks stated that the applicant did submit a photometric plan that is in your packets, they are proposing 0-foot candles near the property, but there is a point that is a little higher there- that is facing Menards, but it does show 0-foot candles around the property line.

XXVII. 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.

XXVIII. Discussion from the Board.

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

XXIX. Board Motion and Second to Approve, Deny, Modify, or Table Application #BZA2025-20 – Roll Call Vote.

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

Mr. Kastor motioned to approve BZA2025-20; Mr. Pitts seconded the motion.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

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

XXX. Secretary – Request for Variance Permit.

Mrs. Gladwell read the request on the proposed application.

APPLICATION #BZA2025-21- An application for a variance permit was submitted by Star Inc., on behalf of Firelands Auto Real Estate V, LLC for (PPN#32-03356.011) located at the corner of N. E. Strub Road and Massey Blvd. The variance request is to exceed the maximum number of parking spaces permitted. Appendix B of the Zoning Resolution states that no more than one hundred and ten (110%) of the parking required under Appendix B is permitted.

APPLICATION #BZA2025-22- An application for a variance permit was submitted by Star Inc., on behalf of Firelands Auto Real Estate V, LLC for (PPN#32-03356.011) located at the corner of N. E. Strub Road and Massey Blvd. The applicant is proposing not to meet the minimum requirement of one (1) tree per ten (10) parking spaces as required in Article 25.15(1-2) of the Zoning Resolution.

APPLICATION #BZA2025-23- An application for a variance permit was submitted by Star Inc., on behalf of Firelands Auto Real Estate V, LLC for (PPN#32-03356.011) located at the corner of N. E. Strub Road and Massey Blvd. The applicant is not meeting the requirement set forth in Article 21.15 1(e) of the Zoning Resolution that requires facades greater than 100 feet to incorporate wall plane projections or recess.

XXXI. Staff Report – Planning & Zoning Department

Using the staff report and PowerPoint visual aid as a reference, Mrs. Sparks stated that as Jessica noted there were three variance requests submitted by Star Inc. on behalf of Firelands Auto Real Estate V, LLC for the property located at the corner of N.E. Strub Road and Massey Blvd. The site is currently zoned as PUD. Mrs. Sparks showed photos of the current site and proposed site along with elevations and 3-D photos.

Mrs. Sparks explained all three variances as:

Variance 1:

***Proposed parking:
Customer: 26***

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Employee: 59

Dealer: 128

Subtotal: 223

Per Appendix B the required parking for this site would be 148 spaces, one space per 400 square feet of floor area and one for each employee. Per Appendix B the applicant is not required to exceed 110% of the required parking. The applicant has stated that these additional parking spaces would be utilized for vehicle sales, as their hardship.

Variance 2:

Article 25.15(1-2) of the Zoning Resolution requires one (1) tree per ten (10) parking spaces, the applicant would be required approximately 22 trees for the site. The site plan provided indicates a total of 11 trees, through discussions with the applicant this is the preliminary landscaping plan. Staff has recommended that the applicant add additional trees to the interior parking areas. The applicant has provided screening along East Strub Road, Massey Blvd, and Lake Crest Parkway.

Mrs. Sparks did state that she thinks its important to note that they are proposing landscaping along Lake Crest, Massey Dr & E Strub as well.

Variance 3:

The service building the applicant is proposing currently does not meet the requirements set forth in Article 21.15(e). The Zoning Resolution states that facades greater than 100 feet are to incorporate wall plane projection and recess. The functionality of the service center would not be possible with this type of design.

Public Works Department - Director: No issue with the proposed application.

Building Department - Chief Building Official: No issue with the proposed application.

Police Department - Chief of Police: No comment.

Fire Department - Fire Marshal: No issue with the proposed application.

Based on the evaluation of the standards, **staff recommend approval of these variances for PPN #32-03356.011.** Staff recognize that the additional parking spaces are needed for vehicle sales, per the applicant the final landscaping plan is not completed, and additional trees can be added to the interior of the site. Lastly, staff recognize that the design of the service building is based on the functionality for the customers. Staff also recognize that this façade faces Lake Crest Parkway not along East Strub Road.

XXXII. Chair Opens the Public Hearing for Application #BZA2025-21,22 & 23.

Mr. Kastor opened the public hearing for Application #BZA2025-21, 22 & 23 and asked if anyone was present to speak on behalf of the application.

Mr. Reyes stated that the parking variance; as we stated before, we are looking for relief of that variance as this is a car dealership and sales are paramount to getting as many parking spaces as possible for sales, which is also why we want to park across the street. He stated that talking more about parking spaces adjacent to the neighbors, might need parking there because it is so right, there is also a utility easement that made us adjust the tie plan to push the parking in so we could work within that easement which constricted that parking layout, which is a reason why we got so close to the property line.

Mr. Kastor stated that the intent of the zoning code for C-2 commercial, I get where they're outlining parking required for commercial business and I understand why they put in the landscaping close, but when we approve a conditional use for a automobile dealership it taxes those two things which I kind of understand why they're struggling with the trees and landscaping because it's an auto dealership. Strub road from our perspective is mixed we have a Church Auto Dealership, school, indoor golf, and residence which is not planned development; but it is what it is. Mrs. McPeak understands that. Mr. Kastor stated that it's commercial business against a commercial business; you don't get that buffering commercial versus commercial, I mean really, he could have parking against your parking with what 3ftm doesn't have to provide any buffering. It's really a tough area; we are trying to consider everyone's concerns.

Mr. Pitts stated that the 220+ parking spaces, does that include across the street?

Mrs. Sparks stated no, that is just this site. The breakdown is as follows.

Proposed parking:

Customer: 26

Employee: 59

Dealer: 128

Subtotal: 223

Mr. Shell stated that they are over by 75 spaces, wow that is a lot of spaces, and well over the 110%. He stated that he realized it was for cars and not all

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

customers or employees, he asked if they had any room to the west of the service or if they were up to the property line.

Mr. Reyes stated that no, it's not to the property line, there are a few.

Mr. Shell stated so you could throw some parking spaces over there.

Mr. Reyes stated that we've maxed out this space as far as we can.

Mr. Kastor stated that their current location is Route 4 & Perkins Ave.

Mr. Reyes stated yes.

Mr. Kastor asked if they would be closing that.

Mr. Reyes stated yes

Mr. Kastor stated that you are moving your business from the City to Perkins Township.

Mrs. Gladwell stated that they are in Perkins Township right now.

Mr. Bertsch asked if they would approve the variances separately.

Mrs. Sparks stated that he could.

Sherry Fisher – in between all of that on Strub road. She mentioned when you tell them they have to have so many trees – what is that definition. Does it have to be – is there a definition of a tree.

Mrs. Sparks stated that there is not a tree section or specify the type of tree. But they must submit the height of the tree at planting.

Mrs. Fisher stated that if you go back to Sam's Club, they have all those trees but half of them is dead.

Discussions regarding trees and the number for internal and perimeter continued.

Mr. Reyes discussed the elevation issue, in regard to the ordinance, it asks for 3% in or out of the elevation per lineal foot. We are mostly looking at the service

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

elevation facing Lake Crest, it's the biggest one, it is 220 ft. so that translates to a 6ft indent on the face of the building and that needs to be done with the 44ft whether that's broken up for the 44. The hardship with the service building is a plan rectangle as you can be to have to come in and out 6ft in 6ft depth which is why we are asking for the variance there.

Mr. Kastor asked if that was a recent change for C-2

Mrs. Sparks stated no it was not a recent change.

Mr. Kastor stated that up and down 250 there is a bunch of strip retail with straight fronts, how did those gets passed.

Mrs. Sparks stated that she had no idea.

Mr. Reyes stated that they are coming up with 10 to 12 ft of split face masonry and the siding of that to get the variation on the façade as well.

Mrs. Sparks stated that the main façade that is not meeting this is along Lake Crest, which is not visible to Strub Road, just customers that go by.

Mr. Pitts asked if there were any plans for signage on that.

Mr. Reyes stated he didn't think so.

XXXIII. 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. Bertsch made a motion to close the public hearing and open the public meeting; Mr. Bixler seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

XXXIV. Discussion from the Board.

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

Mr. Kastor stated that there are 3 issues. We can do trees first. What is a tree is a great question. Trees are kind of sized by caliper which is the diameter of the trunk and then the height thing that comes into play.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mrs. Sparks stated that there is a minimum height requirement at the time of planting as well.

Mr. Kastor asked what that requirement was.

Mrs. Sparks stated that the minimum caliper of 2 inches and minimum height of 6ft at the time of planting. Evergreen shrubs 24 inches at the time of planting.

Mr. Kastor stated that he is speaking for himself not the board, if you were coming into the Township not doing business here, he would be a little more concerned, but you have a few other businesses in the Township. He stated that they have done a beautiful job landscaping that property and it is well taken care of. The other day he drove by, and he was jealous of the flowers. He stated that he felt like he's doing the township a favor with Test Drive being a private road which helps flow of traffic. So, to me I feel that Firelands Auto Dealership has been a good steward and neighbor and business to the township. Doesn't Honda dictate the design of the building and show room?

Mr. Reyes stated that they sure do, the rendering is pulled right from their Honda book they give us to design out of.

Mr. Kastor stated that, so these design standards are used around the country and not specifically designed for Perkins Township.

Mr. Reyes stated and showed the standard colors they give us to use.

Mr. Kastor stated Casey help us with these trees.

Mrs. Sparks stated that again, from a perimeter standpoint, they meet most of the requirements. To his point she thinks if they add more trees in the interior to the west/east side, he is stating that they will lose spots. If there is a possibility on the side adjacent to coastal swing to kind of change the angle of the parking and add additional landscaping, she thinks it would be designated to the interior, so we could find some compromise there.

Discussions about where he could add more/move landscaping and trees continued.

Mr. Kastor asked the owners of Coastal Swing if they minded any trees.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Schell stated that he loved trees.

Mr. Kastor stated that when they grow, they will be on your property and that is not going to be a problem.

Mr. Schell stated that no it wouldn't be.

XXXV. Board Motion and Second to Approve, Deny, Modify, or Table Application #BZA2025-21,22 & 23. – Roll Call Vote.

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

Mr. Bertsch motioned to approve BZA2025-22 with the provisions the applicant is going to revise to the best of his ability those trees; Mr. Bixler seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

Mr. Bertsch motioned to approve BZA2025-21; Mr. Kastor seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

Mr. Pitts motioned to approve BZA2025-23 as submitted; Mr. Bertsch seconded the motion.

Roll Call: All ayes, motion carried.

The Request for the Variance Permits were **approved**

Communications regarding the cell tower were discussed about a fall zone.

XXXVI. New/Other Business

XXXVII. Old Business

Mrs. Sparks stated that we had a digital message board sign that was approved out on Perkins Ave. We did have one resident come in they were concerned about it, we do have a combination of residential and commercial in the area. At that time, they were proposing a ground mounted sign. At the meeting Mr. Brady had indicated that at last minute the applicant talked about the possibility of utilizing the sign on site but hadn't made up their mind yet. They took some time and staff received this last week they they are no longer looking to use a ground sign but use the current standing sign they have right now and put the digital message board sign there. We did have the BZA meeting coming up and we thought of the better option but to come here and get the board's opinion. Mr. Brady is here to discuss what the applicant is requesting.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Brady stated that the message center went from 3*7 to 3*8 foot on the taller pylon style sign. The motivation from switching to the ground mounted to the monument was the visibility of the sign right to the west.

Mr. Bertsch asked if the sign was bigger than what was there currently.

Mr. Brady stated that it's shorter by nine inches, the sign itself is still designed in code, the variance is still the setback variance it proposed a monument sign.

Mrs. Sparks stated that the variance was for the digital message board sign within a residential area. What staff wanted to do was make sure since the design of the digital message board is different it went from a ground mounted to a free-standing monument sign and that staff was okay.

Mr. Kastor stated that really this isn't a BZA decision, the variance monument vs. pylon has no effect on the variance.

Mrs. Sparks stated that if they wanted her opinion from a staffing standpoint, she stated that she thinks because it's a different request from the residents, we wanted to make sure you were okay with it.

Mrs. Blanca stated that it was brought to you today, there is nothing to vote on we were just bringing it to you because changes were made because they were discussed making changes.

Mr. Bertsch asked if the proposed size doesn't violate anything, so it's just a courtesy thing.

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
7/21/2025 MEETING MINUTES**

XXXVIII. Adjourn Meeting.

Mr. Kastor entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Bertsch motioned to adjourn the meeting; Mr. Bixler 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.
