## **Board of Zoning Appeals** September 14, 2017

Members present: Chairman, Phil Rooney; Brett Gies, George McAfee

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

Mr. Adkins introduced case and city's recommendation.

## CASE# 56339-BA-17

Address: 1843 Tiffin Avenue

Zone: C-2, General Commercial District

Filed by Panda Express, Inc., on behalf of Golden Corral Corporation, regarding new signage at 1843 Tiffin Avenue. The applicant is seeking to erect two low-profile signs on a single outlot. Per section 1161.12.8(A) of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance, outlots are limited to one profile sign.

The site is went in front of the City Planning Commission on September 14<sup>th</sup> to redevelop the former site of Golden Corral in two separate phases and was approved. The applicant is clearing the entire lot, including the building, the small pylon sign and the 40 foot high non-conforming sign. After the site is cleared, the site will be developed with two new buildings, hosting two separate entities.

The applicant is looking to demo an existing sign, which is non-conforming due to height, size and location, and replace it with two low-profile signs. Per city ordinance, the code allows for one sign per outlot. The frontage is 406 allowing for a maximum of 200 square footage of signage. The total amount of square footage shared between the two signs is 137 square feet.

Creating two lots on this site would have eliminated the need of a variance. At this time, the applicant decided not to do so.

Vu Lee, Klover Architects, 10955 Newell Avenue, Overland Park, KS 66210 Greendale Avenue, Findlay, Ohio, was sworn in and appearing on behalf of Panda Express.

Mr. Lee made his request for two signs on the property. Explained that the existing 40-foot sign needs to be removed to make the property layout work to fit the two proposed buildings on the outlot. Mr. Lee mentioned that the neighboring property agreed to allow the removal of the non-conforming sign.

Mr. Rooney asked why they did not want to split the lot to avoid having to come to the board.

Mr. Lee explained that they would have to get Golden Corral involved since they owned the property and it would have been more time consuming.

Mr. McAfee asked to review the existing sign that is grandfathered and whether it will be used or left in place.

Mr. McAfee asked to review the existing sign that is grandfathered and whether it will be used or left in place.

Mr. Lee proclaimed that there is an easement for the shopping center sign and they just cannot remove it but they are willing to allow them to relocate and reduce the sign size bring it to current standards.

Mr. McAfee asked if it would be at their cost to be removed and replaced.

Mr. Lee said yes it would and stated that with their sign being on their lot they have to apply for the variance in order to have their own sign.

Mr. McAfee asked with the amount of frontage and with what is being proposed is in-material, but there is two signs that makes for a need of the variance.

Mr. Adkins stated ves.

Mr. Richard added that with the goal of the sign code the idea is to eliminate all of the clutter in the large pylon signs along Tiffin Avenue and have the converted to low-profile signage and this will be a step in the right direction.

There were no written or verbal communications to report, nor were there any one in the audience to oppose the request.

Mr. McAfee called for a motion to approve variance request, which was seconded by Mr. Gies. The motion was approved 3-0.

Mr. Rooney called on the second case.

Mr. Adkins introduced the second case and city's recommendation.

## CASE# 56343-BA-17

Address: 1724 Carey Avenue

Zone: R-2, Single Family, Medium Density

Filed by Greg George, on behalf of Barbara Galbraith, regarding a variance from section 1122.05(A) of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance. The applicant has constructed an addition to the dwelling that is 23.9 feet from the front lot line. The required front yard setback is 25 feet.

During a final inspection of permit number 55885, for an attached garage, it was discovered that an addition to the front of the property was completed without a permit. Upon measuring the building line to the southern property line, it was discovered that the minimum set-back of 25 feet was not met and building line encroached into the set-back by 1 foot 3 inches.

Upon discovery, Mr. George was made aware by the zoning inspector of the issue of the encroachment of the building line and the work that was completed without a permit and the penalty associated which such offense. Mr. George, after he was made aware of the issue, stated that the owner was supposed to submit a site-plan with the front addition included, however, that was not the case.

Since this lot is 49.5 feet wide, it should be zoned R-3. If and when the zoning map is revised, the front setback would be 10 feet not the current 25 feet.

Mr. Rooney asked if it was only the covered front porch was in question.

Mr. Adkins responded yes.

Greg George, 418 Fairmont Drive, Findlay, OH 45840

Mr. George explained that the owner of the property went to the zoning with the wrong plan to submit with the application, then stated there were two different plans done for the project and left it up to the owner to decide which plan she wanted to use. She chose to use the project with the gable over the porch, but submitted the wrong site plan.

Mr. Gies asked if he was the owner or contractor.

Mr. George stated that he was the contractor helping with the remodel and explained that there was neighbors in the neighborhood that was going to speak on the fact that this project is helping to beautify the neighborhood.

Mr. McAfee asked the city representatives when the rezoning of this parcel may happen.

Mr. Richard responded that it is unknown what the timeframe may be for changes to happen.

There were no written or verbal communications to report, nor were there any one in the audience to oppose the request.

Mr. McAfee called for a motion to approve variance request, which was seconded by Mr. Rooney. The motion was approved 3-0.

Mr. Rooney made a motion to approve the minutes from the August 10, 2017 meeting. Mr. Gies seconded the motion. The motion to approve the minutes passed 3-0.

The meeting was adjourned.

Chairman

Secretary