

PERKINS TOWNSHIP BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MEETING

Held By: Perkins Township Board of Zoning Appeals

Place: Perkins Township Service Facility, Meeting Room, 2610 Columbus Avenue

Date: May 15, 2023

Time: 4:00 p.m.

Board Members Present: Mr. Kastor
Mr. Larry Pitts
Mr. Bixler
Mr. Bertsch

Board Members Absent & Excused: Mr. Gast & Mr. Spence

Staff in Attendance: Mrs. Casey Sparks, Planner
Mrs. Jessica Gladwell, Administrative Assistant

I. Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Kastor called the meeting to order and lead the Board and staff in the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Roll Call

Mr. Kastor asked for roll call to be taken.

Mr. Kastor, here; Mr. Pitts, here; Mr. Bixler, here; Mr. Bertsch, here.

III. Minutes

Mr. Kastor asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 24, 2022, meeting. Mr. Pitts made the motion and Mr. Bixler seconded.

Roll Call: Mr. Pitts, Yes; Mr. Bixler, Yes; Mr. Bertsch, Yes; Mr. Kastor, Yes.

IV. Chairperson's Welcome and Explanation of Public Hearing & Public 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 in everyone that signed in.

V. Reading of the Request

APPLICATION #BZA2023-11 A variance application submitted by Janotta & Herner on behalf of Foursite Holdings LTD for the property located at 482 Crossings Road (Parcel # 32-03964.000). The variance request is to allow the predominate building material to be prefinished metal siding, whereas Section 25.15(b) of the Zoning Resolution prohibits prefabricated metal panels as a predominant building material.

APPLICATION #BZA203-12 A variance application submitted by Janotta & Herner on behalf of Foursite Holdings LTD for the property located at 482 Crossings Road (Parcel#32-03964.000). The variance request is to allow for a flat roof, whereas Section 25.15(f) of the Zoning Resolution prohibits a flat roof on a single-story building.

VI. Staff Review

Mrs. Sparks stated that they combined the presentation for both applications.

As Jessica stated Janotta & Herner, on behalf of Foursite Holdings LTD, has applied for two variances for the property located at 482 Crossings Road (Parcel 32-03964.000). The current zoning is "C-2" / General Commercial District. The proposed Development: Office/ Storage facility. The subject property is zoned "C-2"/ General Commercial.

The applicant has applied for two variances for this property.

1. A variance request to allow the predominate building material to be a prefinished metal siding. Section 25.15(b) prohibits prefabricated metal panels as a predominant building material.

2. A variance request to allow a flat roof on a single-story building. Section 25.15f of the Zoning Resolution prohibits a flat roof on a single-story building unless concealed by a parapet by at least three feet but not more than ten feet above the roof capped with a three-dimensional cornice treatment.

The applicant is planning to construct a 6,000 square foot office and storage facility for his business. The property owner purchased the property in 2019 and has made substantial investments within the area by extending the private road into this area, which will allow future development to occur within this area.

The Fire Department stated that per Ohio Fire code Section 507 the fire hydrant must be located 400' from the structure. The proposed hydrant is located outside this distance.

Hoty Enterprise, Inc. submitted a letter in support of the variances requested.

Staff recognizes that this property is not directly located on the main 250 commercial corridor, nor is it directly adjacent to a residential area, as such the variation from the required building materials will not be as visible within the location.

Staff does recognize that the building is utilized for storage and office. Staff would support a variance to permit the metal siding to be the predominant material for the north and west facades as they do not face the public right of way. The south and east elevations as it would set a precedent for future developments within area. Due to the location staff would not be opposed to a flat roof but would encourage other architectural enhancements.

Staff would recommend approval of the variance with the following conditions:

1. All signage and building permits shall be submitted and approved through the Community Development Department.
2. A revised plan shall be submitted showing the predominant material for the east and south elevations is not metal siding and is that of an approved material per Zoning Resolution.
3. The applicant shall work with Erie County Soil and water to ensure all stormwater permits are issued.
4. A revised site plan shall be submitted for staff approval providing additional architectural elements to compensate for providing the variance for the flat roof.
5. All signage and building permits shall be submitted and approved through the Community Development Department.

Mr. Kastor let's talk about the prefab, you mentioned its pre fab? It's not prefab its metal siding, on a conventional steel frame building. Were talking about light industrial district, it would seem to me that metal siding wouldn't seem to be an issue.

Mrs. Sparks stated that it's a commercial district.

Mr. Kastor stated the report states "C-2" Light industrial district.

Mrs. Sparks stated that, that is a misprint and I do apologize.

Mr. Kastor stated that you know the old racket club, which is court 1 which is also metal. It's not like you have brick structures that are architecturally pleasant to look at and youre putting this tin shed next to it. I guess I'm just questioning the staff's logic demanding they change the siding of this building.

Mrs. Sparks stated again, "I don't think we're asking them to change, I think from a staffing perspective were stating that the sides that are visible to the road, so the front entrance way and what you can see from route 2. Again, I'm not stating that you would have to completely remove that material, just the predominate would have to be something other than metal. So, you can increase the brick or If you look on

Mr. Bertsch stated that the narrative states that its block.

MR. Kastor stated that yes it's a masonry block a wanes coat.

Mrs. Sparks stated that so you can increase that. It's up to the board, if the board finds it appropriate, that's fine, this is just a recommendation from the staff.

Mr. Kastor stated that I believe this owner Foursite Holdings is Joe Keys, that's the former Hart Signs?

Mrs. Sparks stated that is correct.

Mr. Kastor stated that okay, Harts done a lot of work in the Township. You know, let's hear it from the applicant.

Kurt Thompson, 309 Grove Street, Monroeville OH.

We are proposing a structural steel building with a single slope roof, as discussed in a set back lot pretty well isolated from all adjacent properties. We have residential with a woods isolating us, and then more woods isolating us from really vision from the back of Sam's club. You would have to go back past the cul-de-sac to see a portion of the building. We feel like we have an isolated structure that doesn't have much visibility to the 250 and our opinion is that we're not asking to set a precedence for future development in this site. I think the owner would take no exception to stating that we're not going to ask for future variances without due process. I think the fact of this building is largely storage for his business to function and the reason for proposing this structure. That is why we are proposing what we are to give Joe what he needs.

Brad with Janotta Hener – the only thing I would add to that is that the expense he's putting fourth out there. He has made a very large investment to get his business out there.

Mr. Bertsch asked if the block that was exposed standard or split face?

Mr. Thompson stated split face.

Mr. Bertsch stated then that has a little bit of character to it. So, parapet, its normally there to hide any mechanicals? Is that my understanding?

Mr. Kastor stated yes, but mostly to add more architecture. I drove by today to see the clearly, and it does seem pretty isolated. The staff does bring a good point about setting a precedence. We approve this and the next person that walks through that door and has a similar structure uhm, and so you know I guess I understand the intent of "C-2" which is commercial, and you just don't want a metal siding box. But considering the location.

Mr. Thompson stated that it is more modern looking. We've added that wanes coat in there to add a little bit of architectural look. It's not your typical metal box, it has a little different look to it.

Mr. Pitts stated that the roadway that is going in?

Mr. Thompson stated that it's a private drive, I believe the cul-de-sac would be deeded back to the Township but anything from that back is private.

Mr. Pitts stated so to improve the lot, he is vested.

Mr. Thompson stated that he is well over 1 million dollars on this property. That's not even including the cost he has in that cul-de-sac.

Mr. Kastor stated that if you recall there was a TIF to improve the road that went back to Maui Sands and kind of connect to make that property prime for development. Since Maui Sands kind of went under, the TIF none of the road improvements were made, so I think this is an attempt to the Hoty's private person to develop the land back there, which I think is a good thing.

Mr. Kastor asked if and of the board have any additional questions for the applicant?

Mr. Bixler asked the cost difference from what the staff is recommending opposed to what was you're proposing.

Mr. Thompson stated that we had just received notice of this, but it would be in excess of 30,000.00.

Mr. Bertch stated that would be to do block instead of metal siding.

Mr. Thompson stated yes.

Mrs. Sparks asked how far that would cover up?

Mr. Thompson stated that it would be to take block all the way up, it would kind of look goofy if you take the block up. There is natural stopping points in buildings, with this building being 16ft you don't want to go half, taking it to the bottom of windows is a stopping point, or you go full height. Otherwise, it just doesn't look right.

Mrs. Sparks stated in this image.

Mr. Thompson stated that is not the updated, when we met with Joe, there was wanes coating added.

So, this would have it basically up to the end of the windows on this side.

Mrs. Sparks stated Have you ever thought about it, again this decision is up to the board, but if you did take that up to the windows maybe would there be a cost savings adding elements to the windows to give it some more dimensions? Awnings or something like that to make it not look so industrial. If there is a cost associated with the masonry, would this be a different option?

Mr. Thompson stated that it would be an option. What you tend to run into with those awnings just running numbers, a typical awning 4ft would be a couple grand on 5 windows you're still spending 15-20 thousand dollars. It's all a balance to the owner, were trying to give him a cost-effective structure. When we talked to Joe, you can kind of see it on the renderings, his sign would be on that man door that would face the cul-de-sac. I don't think he's limited to that sign. The sign makes it look a little more broken up, not so bland.

Mr. Pitts stated that he thinks the staff has raised some good points. I know Joe has vested a lot. My feelings are that uhm try to help Perkins Township move out of the way it was in the 60's 70's just throw a building up, it'll be okay. I think that is part of the issue, at least for me. I understand where the owners come from as well, it's a delicate balance.

Mr. Thompson stated it is, trying to get something pleasing and cost effective for him.

Mr. Pitts asked if there are plans in the future to build lots or?

Mr. Thompson stated that there is not right now, I mean Joe has verbalized that he could sell or do splits, and I'm not stating that Joe can't because he can do what he wants. I would just caution putting too much stock in that, the drive back there is not public, there are wetlands. It would create problems in the future, I'm not stating that it isn't possible. Were the city main stops, the plan is to just take a water line that would serve his business. With the comments from the fire department, those comments dictate that we bring a hydrant back an additional 100 ft. That means we would have to do 100 ft line extension set the hydrant and then take the water line back.

Mr. Pitts stated that those are all good points, he appreciates it.

Mr. Bixler stated that I'm looking at you Ted and Dave you guys are experts on this building thing, I don't know much about it but can we come up with some sort of compromise?

Mr. Kastor stated yeah, I think that the thought of maybe putting some sort of canopy or something up to make it look less sterile. Over the doors or sometimes over the windows you'll see an eyebrow or some sort of architectural feature that breaks it up. Are you familiar with the Breckenridge job, Kurt? Just put some framing out, kind of like a little pergola. But then again, this board can't be the fashion police, I hate to tell an applicant this is how a building should look. I'll go back to the Wolf Inn, we all agree it's not the idea look, but he likes it, okay. So, this is a tough one because "C-2" General Commercial does talk about these feature of buildings and uhm the building is so darn isolated that I don't think people are going to drive by and be like that is out of place? You think the 30k is a deal breaker for the owner?

Mr. Thompson stated that he cant speak for Joe, they didn't have time to talk about the water line extension which is 25k, but I cant speak what would be a deal breaker. Based off the fire departments comments I doubt that is something that is going to be easily changed.

Mr. Kastor stated that that is a safety issue, and it would be harder for the board to ignore that, where this is more of an architecture. So, are you in your recommendation, if they take the masonry up on those two sides, could you live without the parapet to disguise the room since there is no roof top equipment?

Mrs. Sparks stated yes it would, and what I would say to the board again is that we just try to figure out some solutions to not make this building look so industrial. So, if the board thinks that taking the block too far up isn't cost effective to the applicant or it's not necessary, then again finding other architectural elements I think would be fine. What I would say too is that if you chose to move forward with this building, you would just indicate the reason why. So, if another building comes in, we made this approval because of X Y Z, and so on. From a staff's perspective we have to go by what the code states, we were just trying to dress up the building a little bit. We do recognize it is not 250 it's more of a secluded area. Have you thought about re-locating the sign and putting the awning over the door?

Mr. Thompson stated that he thinks Joe would be open to that. That would be comparable. Maybe a 2 or 3 ft decorative awning, if you're not trying to put them over all the windows and not the doors the numbers don't add up as quickly.

Mr. Kastor stated that an awning over a door is functional too.

Mr. Pitts stated that his perspective is that it's not a view from 250 but it is a view from 2 and there are a lot of cars every day going by. I would hope people would drive by and be like oh that looks fine, not what's going on here. Something over the door, and it still has the 3ft block would be good.

VII. Staff Close Public Hearing/Open Public Meeting

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

Mr. Bertsch motioned to close the public hearing. Mr. Bixler seconded. Mr. Bertsch, yes; Mr. Bixler, Yes; Mr. Pitts, Yes; Mr. Kastor, Yes.

VIII. Discussion from Board

Mr. Kastor asked if the board had any questions for the applicant.

Mr. Kastor stated that we have discussed a lot of good options and I like Mr. Pitts thought of we like to compromise some, we don't want to cause hardships for developers but at the same time we have to protect the intent of our zoning regulations. The building exposure is a little unique.

Mr. Kastor stated he would entertain a motion or approve or deny the request.

Mr. Pitts motioned to approve Application #BZA2023-11 and application BZA2023-12 with the contingencies of moving forward with future development. That future applicants

understand the siding and the development of the private drive/water hydrant and roof parapet were all given some leniency for the developer to move forward with this project. We are requesting an architectural feature above the east door. Also, with this site being so secluded and being a remote area. Mr. Bertsch Seconded.

Mr. Pitts yes; Mr. Bertsch, yes; Mr. Bixler, yes; Mr. Kastor, I'm going to abstain since I still own stock in Janotta & Herner.

IX. Old Business

Mr. Kastor asked what all the storage units are in Targets parking lot.

Mrs. Sparks stated that while they remodel that's where they are storing their inventory and equipment for the time being.

Mr. Kastor stated that hes been seeing a lot of this pylon stick up, fabric sign. I know there is one infront of that wild bird seed place. Do we regulate those?

Mrs. Gladwell stated I think you can have one per business.

Mr. Kastor asked if we are collecting fees for those?

Mrs. Sparks stated yes, we can look into it.

Mr. Kastor stated that no I hate bothering small business' I was just asking a question.

Mr. Pitts asked for 250 the car wash going beside Culvers, the Wave. All they did was just make piles of dirt. I know they were just in here a couple months ago.

Mrs. Sparks stated yes, their conditional use permit/building permit were expired but there was a change in ownership. I know there is work planning to be done but not sure when.

Mr. Kastor asked how about that Starbucks where Rainbow Muffler was?

Mrs. Gladwell stated that just got steaked out so they should be starting soon.

Mr. Pitts stated Maui Sands?

Mrs. Sparks stated that has been to trustee meetings. I know they are working with the owners to make some sort of agreement for a plan of action. I know our code enforcement officers have met with potential buyers, I say that very loosely. When you get that much attention on a property, people come out of nowhere. I know they are in very depth conversations with the owners if they don't come up with something they will still continue to move forward.

Mr. Kastor states not only is it an eye sore, but it's also a safety concern.

Mrs. Sparks stated that the trustees have been very direct in the past few meetings.

Mr. Kastor asked about Burger King.

Mrs. Gladwell stated that she just got a records request.

X. New Business

Mr. Kastor stated anything for next month?

Mrs. Sparks stated she 2 possibly 3, a pool and a fence.

XI. Adjournment

Mr. Kastor asked for a motion for adjournment.

Mr. Bertsch made the motion and Mr. Bixler seconded. Roll Call: Mr. Berstch; Yes, Mr. Bixler, yes, Mr. Pitts, yes; Mr. Kastor, yes;