

Minutes of Perrysburg Board of Zoning Appeals

Meeting Held May 11, 2026

CALL TO ORDER - 6:00 PM

Vice Chair Mark Schrock called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Board members present were Christine Castellano, Logan Geib, Mark Schrock, and Bill Williams (4). Aaron Harder was absent (1). Mark Easterling, Deputy Planning & Zoning Administrator, was also present.

APPROVAL OF MARCH 9, 2026 MEETING MINUTES

Ms. Castellano moved to approve the March 9, 2026 meeting minutes as written. Seconded by Mr. Williams, and the minutes were unanimously approved (4-0).

ADMINISTER OATH

Mr. Schrock administered an oath to those who would be speaking during the meeting.

ZONING PERMIT OBLIGATION

Mr. Easterling reminded the applicants that if their request is approved tonight, they will still need to apply for a zoning permit the next day or thereafter.

NEW BUSINESS

APPLICATION 06-26

EMILY SCHOEN IS REQUESTING TWO ZONING VARIANCES TO CONSTRUCT A GARAGE AND DRIVEWAY. THE PROPERTY IS A CORNER LOT LOCATED AT 310 W. SECOND STREET AND IS ZONED R-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.61(F) ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND USES: THE COMBINED FOOTPRINTS OF ALL ACCESSORY BUILDINGS ON A LOT SHALL NOT EXCEED THE LESSER OF 5% OF THE LOT SIZE OR 4,000 SF. HOWEVER, THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MAY CONSIDER AN EXCEPTION TO THE MAXIMUM SIZE REQUIREMENT PROVIDED THAT THE REQUESTED SIZE DOES NOT EXCEED 8% OF THE LOT SIZE.

NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.51(C)(3) CURB CUTS AND DRIVEWAYS: ONLY ONE (1) ACCESS/CURB-CUT ONTO A PUBLIC STREET SHALL BE PERMITTED.

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A DETACHED GARAGE (ACCESSORY STRUCTURE) ABOVE THE ALLOWABLE 5% (544.5 SF) TO THE MAXIMUM ALLOWED (871.2 SF).

2. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO ALLOW FOR THE

CONSTRUCTION OF A SECOND DRIVEWAY ALONG THE ALLEY.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions C, D, E, and G of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The applicant purchased the property without knowledge of the accessory structure size limitation and applied for a zoning permit in good faith. The proposed 872 square foot detached garage is consistent with the scale of accessory structures in the surrounding neighborhood, presents no impact on governmental services, and represents the only covered accessory storage on the property. Granting the variance upholds the spirit and intent of the zoning code, and substantial justice would be done by its approval.

2. The Deputy Administrator recommends denial of the request for a variance to permit a second curb cut at a single-family residential property located on Second Street. The applicant proposes to construct a new conforming rear driveway while retaining an existing front-yard parking pad, which has been in a nonconforming condition since 2006, when the City required that driveways extend across the public right-of-way to the primary structure. The city code limits single-family residences to one curb cut. Compliance with that standard requires removal of the parking pad. The applicant seeks a variance to avoid that requirement.

This application request does not meet enough of the factors required to grant a variance in Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). The property retains full beneficial use without the variance, as it functions as a conforming single-family residence with street parking available directly in front of the home. The variance is substantial, given the City's approximately twenty-year policy of eliminating front-yard parking pads and enforcing the single-curb cut standard. Of all residential properties on both the east and west block faces of Second Street, only three retain parking pads, establishing that the prevailing neighborhood character is defined by single-driveway lots without front-yard parking infrastructure. Granting this variance would be an exception to that established pattern, not a continuation of it. Most critically, the applicant has a route available without any variance: removal of the nonconforming parking pad and construction of the rear driveway achieves the applicant's stated goal within the existing code, meaning that the predicament can be resolved through another method.

The Deputy Administrator further notes that the parking pad has remained in a nonconforming state for nearly nineteen years since the code change in 2006. The hardship presented is, in part, a consequence of that continued noncompliance and does not constitute the property-based hardship the variance standard contemplates. Denial would not unreasonably restrict beneficial use of the property. The applicant retains the ability to construct the desired rear driveway upon removal of the nonconforming parking pad, consistent with the one curb cut standard applicable to all single-family residences in the City. For these reasons, the application does not satisfy the minimum four conditions required under Section 1275.02(c)(3), and the Deputy

Administrator recommends denial.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 06-26. Emily Schoen was present and said that she has a unique home with a significant rear yard property slope that includes grading issues and may need a retaining wall in the future. She added that the garage will be for storage and that the front parking pad leads directly to the home. There was further discussion about the grading of the property, the topography, and whether neighboring homes are affected. Mr. Schrock asked about the advantage of the parking pad versus off-street parking, and Ms. Schoen noted the convenience of the parking pad for her family, whereas off-street parking poses a challenge with the neighbors who also utilize the street. There was a brief discussion about whether the second curb cut is precedent-setting, and Mr. Easterling noted that each request is different. Ms. Castellano asked if Ms. Schoen knew about this zoning restriction with the purchase of the property, and Ms. Schoen confirmed that they were aware.

Judith Hirsch, of 315 W. Second Street, was present and confirmed that parking is a challenge on West Second Street, as multiple neighbors on the 300-block have multiple cars and are parking in front of Ms. Schoen's house.

There was a brief discussion about Chapter 1275.02(c)(3)(A). Ms. Castellano asked about the option of removing the parking pad along West Second Street, and Ms. Schoen noted its importance for the resale value of the property in the future and included benefits for her family. Mr. Easterling clarified the definition of a parking pad.

Mr. Williams moved to approve zoning variance #1 of Application 06-26 as submitted, and found criteria C, D, G, and E of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Geib, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

Ms. Castellano moved to approve zoning variance #2 of Application 06-26 as submitted, and found criteria A, C, D, and F of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 07-26

WEST SIDE MONTESSORI IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 13587 ROACHTON ROAD AND IS ZONED INS (INSTITUTIONAL USE).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.42 FENCES, WALLS, STRUCTURAL SCREENS, HEDGES, AND SCREEN PLANTINGS

INS ZONING:

- 4' MAXIMUM IN FRONT YARD
- 4' MAXIMUM IN SIDE YARD
- 6' MAXIMUM IN REAR YARD

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A SIX (6) FOOT FENCE IN THE SIDE YARD BEYOND THE HALFWAY POINT TO THE FRONT

CORNER OF THE BUILDING INTO THE FRONT YARD.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and G of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The property is a large corner lot, and the proposed fence extension into the front yard is minor in scope, extending only far enough to screen the adjacent residential property. The fence will provide privacy and security for children using the play area while serving as a sound barrier for neighboring residents. The proposed fence presents no safety or visibility concerns and is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 07-26. Jacob Barns was present on behalf of the application for West Side Montessori and added that the proposed area is south of the building where the playground is located. He noted that the six (6) foot privacy fence is one hundred eighty-eight (188) linear feet that will provide better security for the children and the campus.

Ms. Castellano moved to approve Application 07-26 as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Williams, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 08-26

JOSHUA BALL IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A SHED IN THE FRONT YARD. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 400 S. RIDGE DRIVE AND IS ZONED R-2 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: 1250.61(A) ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND USES: NO ACCESSORY BUILDING OR USES SHALL BE LOCATED IN ANY FRONT OR SIDE YARD SETBACK EXCEPT UNDER UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE SUCH ACTIVITY WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH THE INTENT AND PURPOSES OF THIS ZONING CODE OR WHERE ENFORCEMENT WOULD RESULT IN EXTREME HARDSHIP. EITHER EXCEPTION SHALL REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS.

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO INSTALL A SHED THAT WILL BE LOCATED IN THE FRONT YARD.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions A, C, D, and F of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The property is a corner lot subject to a large gas easement that encumbers the rear yard, eliminating compliant placement of an accessory structure within the permissible area. These are conditions specific to the property and are the result of a self-created issue. The proposed shed represents the minimum variance necessary to allow for

reasonable accessory use of the property.

The proposed location, while technically classified as a front yard due to the corner lot configuration, functions as a secondary side yard in practice. The structure will be screened by an existing tree line, finished in a color consistent with the home, and will not be prominently visible from either W. Indiana Avenue or S. Ridge Dr. The placement presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns and will not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services or alter the essential character of the neighborhood. Granting the variance upholds the spirit and intent of the zoning code, and substantial justice would be done by its approval.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 08-26. Josh Ball was present on behalf of the application and said that the proposed shed will allow for more storage and better utilization of the garage for parking their cars. The Board thanked Mr. Ball for his thorough application and exhibits.

Mr. Williams moved to approve Application 08-26 as submitted, and found criteria A, C, D, and F of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 09-26

CHRIS MIKONOWICZ IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 514 STREAMVIEW DRIVE AND IS ZONED R-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.42 FENCES, WALLS, STRUCTURAL SCREENS, HEDGES, AND SCREEN PLANTINGS

R1-R3 ZONING:

4' MAXIMUM IN FRONT YARD

4' MAXIMUM IN SIDE YARD

6' MAXIMUM IN REAR YARD

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FIVE (5) FOOT FENCE IN THE SIDE YARD BEYOND THE HALFWAY POINT OF THE PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and G of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The applicant proposes to replace an existing four-foot split rail fence with a four-and-a-half-foot ornamental iron rod fence installed in the same location. The requested height increase is minimal and is attributable to the standard sizing available for this fence style. The open character of the ornamental iron design provides comparable visibility to the existing split rail fence and will not adversely affect sight distance or traffic safety. The placement presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns and is consistent with

the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 09-26. Chris Mikonowicz was present and said that he has lived here for twelve years and has made multiple updates to the property. He added that the proposed fence would provide safety for his grandkids and for keeping people out of his pool.

Ms. Castellano moved to approve Application 09-26 as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Williams, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 10-26

JAMES CHANDLER IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A SHED IN THE FRONT YARD. THE PROPERTY IS A CORNER LOT LOCATED AT 2013 KENTON TRAIL AND IS ZONED R-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: 1250.61(A) ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND USES: NO ACCESSORY BUILDING OR USES SHALL BE LOCATED IN ANY FRONT OR SIDE YARD SETBACK EXCEPT UNDER UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE SUCH ACTIVITY WILL NOT CONFLICT WITH THE INTENT AND PURPOSES OF THIS ZONING CODE OR WHERE ENFORCEMENT WOULD RESULT IN EXTREME HARDSHIP. EITHER EXCEPTION SHALL REQUIRE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS.

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO INSTALL A SHED THAT WILL BE LOCATED IN THE FRONT YARD.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and F of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The property is subject to 30-foot easements that abut the existing pool enclosure, leaving insufficient space for compliant placement of an accessory structure with reasonable access. These constraints are inherent to the property and not of the applicant's making. The proposed shed will abut the pool's fence screen and project eight feet into the front yard, representing the minimum encroachment necessary to accommodate the structure. The placement presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns and is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 10-26. James Chandler was present and said that he has lived here since 2014. He brought additional pictures to show the Board his request, and added that the shed will match the home.

Alan McCain, of 1941 Kenton Trail and HOA President, was present and said that he has spoken with Mr. Chandler to understand the scope of the shed and that the HOA is in support of this request.

Mr. Williams moved to approve Application 10-26 as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Ms. Castellano, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 11-26

COLLEEN WARD IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE. THE PROPERTY IS A CORNER LOT LOCATED AT 244 W. SIXTH STREET AND IS ZONED R-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.42 FENCES, WALLS, STRUCTURAL SCREENS, HEDGES, AND SCREEN PLANTINGS

R1-R3 ZONING:

4' MAXIMUM IN FRONT YARD

4' MAXIMUM IN SIDE YARD

6' MAXIMUM IN REAR YARD

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A SIX (6) FOOT FENCE IN THE SIDE YARD BEYOND THE HALFWAY POINT OF THE PRINCIPAL STRUCTURE.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and G of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The property is a corner lot, and the applicant proposes to install a fence along the side yard between the residence and the adjacent property to the east. The requested fence height is necessary to prevent the homeowner's dogs from escaping and to address safety concerns given the property's proximity to the street. The fence will extend only to approximately the midpoint of the original structure, will not encompass the entire property, and will be largely screened from view relative to the neighboring property to the east. The placement presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns and is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 11-26. Colleen Ward was present and said that she would like the front part of her fence to be six (6) feet tall to match the neighbor's fence and to enclose the dogs that could jump a shorter fence.

Mr. Geib moved to approve Application 11-26 as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Ms. Castellano, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 12-26

AARON SCHOEN, ON BEHALF OF FIFTH AND LOCUST LLC, IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO REDUCE THE FRONT YARD SETBACK FROM SANDUSKY

STREET AND A ZONING EXCEPTION TO REDUCE THE FRONT YARD SETBACK FROM EAST FIFTH STREET TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TWO-FAMILY RESIDENCE. THE PROPERTY IS A CORNER LOT, IDENTIFIED AS PARCEL Q61-000-902109002501 (FORMERLY ADDRESSED AS 500 SANDUSKY STREET) AND IS ZONED R-5 (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1230.01 INTENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

R-5 ZONING:

FRONT YARD = 35'

REAR YARD = 30'

SIDE YARD MIN = 6'

SIDE YARD TOTAL = 16'

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A FRONT-YARD SETBACK VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A NEW HOME. THE VARIANCE WOULD PLACE THE STRUCTURE FIFTEEN (15) FEET FROM THE FRONT YARD PROPERTY LINE ALONG SANDUSKY STREET.

2. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A ZONING EXCEPTION TO REDUCE THE FRONT YARD SETBACK ALONG EAST FIFTH STREET TO TWENTY-ONE (21) FEET FROM THE PROPERTY LINE.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance and exception request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and F of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The subject property is uniquely shaped, creating practical difficulty in meeting minimum setback requirements for any residential use without variance relief. The proposed structure will be consistent with the established setbacks of neighboring properties along both Sandusky Street and East Fifth Street, which are set back fifteen and eighteen feet, respectively. The placement presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns and is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 12-26 for northern Parcel Q61-000-902109002501 (0 Sandusky Street). Aaron Schoen and Scott Anderson were both present on behalf of the application. Mr. Anderson noted that the setbacks will be linear due to the R-5 zoning district.

Ms. Castellano moved to approve variance #1 of Application 12-26 for northern Parcel Q61-000-902109002501 (0 Sandusky Street) as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and F of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Williams, and the variance was unanimously approved (4-0).

Mr. Geib moved to approve zoning exception #2 of Application 12-26 for northern Parcel Q61-000-902109002501 (0 Sandusky Street) as submitted. Seconded by Ms. Castellano, and the exception was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 13-26

AARON SCHOEN, ON BEHALF OF FIFTH AND LOCUST LLC, IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO REDUCE THE FRONT YARD SETBACK FROM SANDUSKY STREET AND A ZONING EXCEPTION TO REDUCE THE REAR YARD SETBACK, TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW TWO-FAMILY RESIDENCE. THE PROPERTY IS IDENTIFIED AS PARCEL Q61-000-902109002500 (FORMERLY ADDRESSED AS 500 SANDUSKY STREET) AND IS ZONED R-5 (TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1230.01 INTENSITY AND DIMENSIONAL STANDARDS

R-5 ZONING:

FRONT YARD = 35'

REAR YARD = 30'

SIDE YARD MIN = 6'

SIDE YARD TOTAL = 16'

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A FRONT-YARD SETBACK VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A NEW HOME. THE VARIANCE WOULD PLACE THE STRUCTURE FIFTEEN (15) FEET FROM THE FRONT YARD PROPERTY LINE ALONG SANDUSKY STREET.

2. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A ZONING EXCEPTION TO REDUCE THE REAR YARD SETBACK TO SIXTEEN (16) FEET FROM THE PROPERTY LINE ALONG THE ALLEY.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance and exception request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and F of Section 1275.02(c)(3). The subject property is uniquely shaped, creating practical difficulty in meeting minimum setback requirements for any residential use without variance relief. The proposed structure will be consistent with the established setbacks of neighboring properties along Sandusky Street, which are set back fifteen feet. The placement presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns and is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 13-26 for southern Parcel Q61-000-902109002500 (Sandusky Street). Aaron Schoen and Scott Anderson were both present on behalf of the application. Mr. Anderson noted that the setbacks will be linear due to the R-5 zoning district.

Mr. Williams moved to approve variance #1 of Application 13-26 for southern Parcel Q61-000-902109002500 (Sandusky Street) as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and F of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Ms. Castellano, and the variance was unanimously approved (4-0).

Ms. Castellano moved to approve zoning exception #2 of Application 13-26 for southern Parcel Q61-000-902109002500 (Sandusky Street) as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the exception was unanimously approved (4-0).

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro
Recording Secretary

The next meeting is scheduled for June 8, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building at 201 W. Indiana Avenue.