

Board of Zoning Appeals

November 12, 2020

Members present: Chairman, Phil Rooney; Blaine Wells; Sarah Gillespie; and Scott Brecheisen.

Mr. Rooney called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.; introduced the members to the audience and the general rules were reviewed.

The following was introduced by Mr. Adkins:

Case Number: 60411-BA-20

Address: 814 Washington Avenue

Zone: R-2 Single Family, Medium Density

Filed Patsy Wooley, regarding a variance from section 1122.05(A) of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance concerning an addition at 814 Washington Avenue. The applicant is proposing an 8 X 10 addition that will be 9-feet from the Washington Avenue right-of-way. This section states that the addition must meet a 25-foot front yard setback.

The property sits approximately 9.1-feet from the Washington Avenue right-of-way, and the property to the south is approximately 30.1-feet from the Washington Avenue right-of-way. When averaging the north and south neighboring properties building lines, the addition would need to be at approximately 19.6-feet from the Washington Avenue right-of-way. The variance request is large, however, if granted, the new building line would be in harmony with the property to the north. If this parcel were never split, the building line for the parcel would have already been established with the dwelling to the north.

Mr. Ed Kumer, 814 Washington Avenue, was sworn in. He stated they rent off of his wife's mother. He stated they currently have a small porch on the front and would like to extend it by three (3) feet long and put an eight (8) feet overhang over it. He stated he has letters from three neighbors that do not have a problem with what they want to do.

Mr. Wells asked if the new deck was simply going to be 3-feet closer to the right-of-way than the existing one?

Mr. Kumer stated that was correct.

Mr. Wells asked if that would be in harmony with the neighbors to the north?

Mr. Adkins stated yes, they are at 9.1 and would be in line with them.

Mr. Wells asked if there were any other communications, other than the letters?

Mr. Adkins stated that Mr. Inbody received an anonymous phone call in which the caller stated they did not have any issues with the variance request.

Mr. Rooney asked if this is just a porch with a roof on it, or is it enclosed?

Mr. Kumer stated it is not enclosed?

Mr. Rooney asked if anyone had any questions or wanted to speak on this matter?

Mr. Wells made a motion to approve the requested variance subject to obtaining the proper permit within 60 days.

Ms. Gillespie seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the variance as requested, subject to obtaining the proper permits within 60 days, 4-0.

The following was introduced by Mr. Adkins:

Case Numbers: 60421-BA-20

Address: 1111 Breezewood Court

Zone: R1 – Single Family, Low Density (Proposed to go to R2 – Single Family, Medium Density)

Filed by Matt Burgess, regarding a variance from section 1161.03(B)(1) of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance the maximum allowable height in the front yard for a constructed fence at 1111 Breezewood Court. The applicant has constructed a 6-foot high privacy fence in the required front yard. This section states that fences in the required front yard may not exceed forty-eight inches in height and shall be fifty percent open.

The owner's contractor begun installation prior to obtaining a zoning permit and probably would have continued had the zoning inspector did not call to stop construction. Upon the homeowners then applying for a permit, it was discovered that the front end of the fence would encroach into the required front yard. The front yard abuts the dead end of Breezewood Court and runs parallel with the rear yards of the neighbors on Amelia Avenue. Being that Breezewood Court does dead end, and will never be expanded, the request is minimal.

Mr. Burgess, 1111 Breezewood Court, was sworn in. He stated they bought their house last spring. There was an existing fence in the same location that he is requesting the variance for. This spring a storm came through and knocked over the fence that was already there. He did not realize that he needed a fence permit to put up the fence in the same location and the contractor did not tell him he needed a permit. The fence also doubles as a backyard fence for the people next to him so they can keep their dogs from escaping. The fence also hides the pile of junk and debris of the neighbors, so when they look out their front window, they do not have to see the neighbor's junk. There is also a stretch of 6-foot high fencing along there and the fence they put up is right in the middle of that.

Mr. Rooney asked if there are any communications on this case.

Mr. Adkins stated there are no communications on this case.

Mr. Wells made a motion to approve the requested variance subject to obtaining the proper permits within 60 days.

Ms. Gillespie seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the variance as requested, subject to obtaining the proper permits within 60 days, 4-0.


Mr. Adkins stated Mr. Burgess already has a permit that can be amended.

The October 08, 2020 meeting minutes were approved.

The meeting was adjourned.



Chairman



Secretary