

Sheffield Lake Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes
Held April 18, 2024

The regular meeting of the Sheffield Lake Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order on Thursday, April 18, 2024 at 7:08pm with Chairman Heckert presiding.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Heckert, Harper, Springborn, Building Inspector Melbar, Law Director Graves, Council Representative Petrucci.

Absent: Piskura.

Attending: Applicants

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

February 15, 2024. *Motion by Harper/Second by Springborn to approve the minutes with any noted corrections. Yeas All.

Correspondence: None

Council Representative Petrucci report: None.

Planning Commission Member Springborn report: None.

OATH ADMINISTERED

As provided in 1353.37 of the Sheffield Lake Building Code, procedure at hearings, an oath was administered by Law Director Graves to all members of the audience who would be speaking at this meeting.

Case #24SFL-VAR003

Joe and Serena Zinsmeister, 981 Stark St. requesting multiple variances.

Nick, 266 Belmar Blvd. with Northern Hammer Works says they bought this property and they love it and want to build their dream home on it. Part of building their dream home is Joe's mother is going to move in, so the house is kind of extra-long. It is a long spread-out ranch with an in-law suite and a garage in between. Serena searched high and low for her dream home and found this layout and absolutely loves it and didn't want to change one thing about it. I think addressing the first issue is turning the driveway to the other side. I think any design would be easier with the layout this way and changing the driveway to South Ave. Trying to have it on the other side for any ranch, would be difficult. It doesn't change anything with the nature of the property. They went around to all the neighbors over there and all the neighbors were in favor of the variance being granted. The other issue is the 100ft. width. It's only 11 ½ ft. short of it. It doesn't change anything in the neighborhood and I don't think anybody would ever notice. The 30ft. setback: I think it's really just to be able to fit this dream home on there and put this new home in the neighborhood. We are only going 8 ½ ft. into that. There are plenty of homes in the neighborhood that close. It would be really hard

without these variances to build them the home they want to build. If these variances weren't granted, I think they would potentially pull the plug and look for another property. I feel these variances aren't asking for much. The owners have looked into numerous house designs and this is the one that fits them and Joe's 80-year-old mother best. It would fit very well in the neighborhood. When they bought the property, I don't think they knew all these rules. They did not know they would have a hard time fitting it on this property. The design and the fit, for the in-law suite for Joe's mother, these variances would be required. Whether the property owner's predicament could be feasibly obviated through some other method, it would require a completely different design. Without these variances, I don't see this actually working on this property. Would the spirit and intent of the zoning requirement be observed? I feel that it absolutely would be. Whether the granting of the variance requested will confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this regulation to other lands, structures or buildings in the same district? This is a unique circumstance and it would not confer any special privilege.

Serena Zinsmeister, 10 Salem Ct. (applicant) states this variance does hold great significance for my family's wellbeing. At the heart of our appeal, (inaudible) and profound commitment to care for our elderly loved ones with dignity and compassion. It took this intention that we seek permission to construct a ranch style home with the in-law suite on 981 Stark St. The house directly across is also facing the same way. We need this variance for the desire to accommodate my mother-in-law who requires care due to her advanced age and health condition. We are her primary caregivers and my family and I are dedicated to ensure her comfort, safety and quality of life. This living arrangement will keep her out of a nursing home/assisted living. The proposed design with the in-law suite is a matter of convenience. It's a reflection of our family support. I want to reassure our proposed construction will adhere to the rest of the revised zoning regulations and architectural guidelines. We are fully committed to ensure that the exterior aesthetics of the home will complement the character and style of the surrounding residents. By granting us this variance, you are not only assisting my family in fulfilling our caregiving responsibilities, but also affirming the values of compassion, respect and community that are the cornerstones of our society. Our request is not merely about building a structure, it's creating a home of love and support for our family. I request your favorable consideration of our appeal and thank you for your time and attention in this matter.

Building Inspector Melbar says the city zoning dept. has no opposition. There are a number of houses that sit on end lots that weren't well thought out. This one is. While it's tight, it will benefit the area, it's been an empty lot for a long time.

Joe Zinsmeister, 10 Salem Ct. (applicant) says we talked to the surrounding neighbors and they are great and real nice. I also talked to the owner of the house that would be in line with ours and he didn't care and said it would look great.

Law Director Graves says you mentioned the house across the street was oriented the same way you are proposing, can the inspector elaborate on other homes in the area oriented the same way so this wouldn't be out of character with that neighborhood? Building Inspector Melbar replies it's not out of character in the fact that the driveway is on South St., the front of

the house is actually on East Dr. The way yours will be, it will be fully on South. Mr. Zinsmeister describes other homes in the area.

*Motion by Harper/Second by Springborn to vote on all variances at once. ROLL CALL: Harper, Springborn, Heckert. Yeas All.

*Motion by Harper/Second by Springborn to approve all 3 variances. ROLL CALL: Harper, Springborn, Heckert. Yeas All.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: Law Director Graves says with our current planning and zoning code, I would like to talk about our notice requirements. The old code only required notice to adjoining, adjacent and abutting property owners and there are a lot of communities that still have similar language to that. By law, those are the ones considered affected property owners. When we adopted the new code, it requires notification to all property owners within 300ft. of all property lines. Since we have adopted that, the notice requirements have become quite arduous for our clerk. She is sending out in some cases, 30-50 certified letters to a lot of people who are actually quite removed from the project. I just want to get the board's take on reigning that in a little bit. Member Harper asks are you trying to take it down to like 100ft.? Law Director Graves replies 100ft. or back to adjoining, adjacent, and abutting. I really think that would be sufficient. Building Inspector Melbar agrees. All present board members agree.

CITIZENS COMMENTARY: None.

MEETING ADJOURNED: With no further business before this board, *Motion by Harper/Second by Springborn to adjourn at 7:35 PM. Yeas All.

CLERK OF COMMITTEE AFFIRMATION: This Meeting Of The City Committee Of The City of Sheffield Lake, Ohio Was Held and Conducted Under All Rules and Regulations Governing The Sunshine Laws Of The State Of Ohio As They May Apply. All meetings are recorded and available in council's office.

CLERK OF COUNCIL

Brandy Randolph

I, Brandy Randolph, duly appointed Clerk of the Zoning Board of Sheffield Lake DO HEREBY CERTIFY that this is a true and exact copy of the Minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of April 18, 2024.

CHAIRPERSON

Joseph Heckert

PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL
Rick Rosso