

## **Minutes of Perrysburg Board of Zoning Appeals**

**Meeting Held June 8, 2026**

### **CALL TO ORDER - 6:00 PM**

Chair Aaron Harder called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL**

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

### **APPROVAL OF MAY 11, 2026 MEETING MINUTES**

Mr. Harder moved to approve the May 11, 2026 meeting minutes as written. Seconded by Ms. Castellano. Ayes: Castellano, Geib, and Schrock (3). Nays: (0). Abstain: Harder (1).

### **ADMINISTER OATH**

Mr. Harder 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 14-26**

LORI UDOWSKI IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 1561 WATERMILL LANE AND IS ZONED R-2 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL). THE PROPERTY HAS TWO FRONT YARDS (ALONG WATERMILL LANE AND FORT MEIGS ROAD).

**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 ACROSS THE FRONT YARD ALONG FORT MEIGS ROAD.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends denial of the variance

request, having found that the application does not satisfy the minimum four conditions required under Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). The subject property is one of 31 residential properties sharing frontage along a city-maintained drainage ditch, representing in excess of a half mile of continuous rear yard frontage classified as a second front yard under the zoning code. The recent clearing of overgrown vegetation from the ditch, while necessary, is a city maintenance action that applies equally across all 31 properties and does not constitute a unique condition specific to this parcel. Granting a variance for a six (6) foot privacy fence along this frontage would establish a basis for relief that is neither unique nor limited to this property, and approval could reasonably be expected to prompt similar requests along the entire shared corridor, fundamentally altering the character of the neighborhood streetscape. This finding is supported by conditions B, C, and F, each of which is not satisfied.

The requested height of six (6) feet represents a fifty percent increase over the four (4) foot maximum permitted by right in a front yard, making the variance substantial under Condition B. The potential cumulative impact of approval on the essential character of the neighborhood along this corridor does not satisfy Condition C. The applicant also has conforming alternatives available. A green screen planting of arborvitae or comparable vegetation carries no height limitation on properties with multiple front yards and would address the applicant's stated privacy concern without variance relief. Additionally, the applicant currently maintains a permitted six-foot fence along another property boundary, further demonstrating that privacy needs can be addressed through means other than the requested variance. Because feasible alternatives exist, Condition F is not satisfied. The applicant further retains the ability to maintain the existing permitted four-foot split rail fence. For these reasons, the Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends denial.

The Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator encourages the applicant to reapply following the completion of the drainage ditch clearing project. The clearing began directly behind the subject property, and the full extent of rear yard exposure across all 31 affected properties will not be determinable until construction is complete. Should the clearing result in conditions uniquely impacting this property relative to the broader corridor, that distinction would materially strengthen the basis for variance relief and better support the findings required under Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). The current request is premature in that regard, and a future application supported by those conditions would receive full consideration.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 14-26. Lori Udowski and Aaron Valentine (of NexFence) were present on behalf of the application. Ms. Udowski noted that currently all the construction is in front of her home along Fort Meigs Road, as her property features the widest part of the ravine at twenty-four (24) feet. She presented the Board with further documents to support her variance request and noted that the traffic and car headlights from the stop sign at Sutton Place go straight into her bedroom and kitchen. Ms. Udowski added that her property is the only one along Fort Meigs Road that has a concrete drain installed, and said that she has concerns with noise, traffic, car headlights, and privacy. Mr. Valentine added that resale value could be affected by



this construction, and Mr. Harder noted that the change in privacy is significant. Mr. Schrock asked about the definition of the two front yards for this property, and Mr. Easterling noted that this property has two arterial streets (Watermill Lane and Fort Meigs Road). There was further discussion about the plans and plantings along Fort Meigs Road, and Mr. Easterling confirmed that there is an access easement where the city tried to minimize as much as they could with the infrastructure project. Ms. Castellano asked about Criteria D of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) and if government services could be impacted; Mr. Easterling noted that, after speaking with Ms. Udowski today, the installation of the concrete structure has created a difference between the other thirty properties along Fort Meigs Road. Ms. Udowski noted that she had previously planted twelve arborvitaes and that eight of them died; she added that she gained a quote of \$7,200.00 for nine new arborvitaes.

Mr. Easterling read an email into the record from Bob & Jackie Venzel (of 1583 Watermill Lane) stating that they support the denial of the variance request (a copy of the email is attached hereto).

There was further discussion regarding the 2017 ditch clearing and plans for the future, and Ms. Udowski said that these were not disclosed to her when she bought the home.

Ms. Castellano moved to approve Application 14-26 as submitted, and found criteria A, D, F, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Harder, and the variance was unanimously approved (4-0).

Mr. Easterling noted that, in terms of precedence, it is important that each applicant provides detailed information to support their unique circumstance based on their variance request.

#### **APPLICATION 15-26**

DESI VARSEL WITH SIGNS UNLIMITED, ON BEHALF OF ACE HARDWARE, IS REQUESTING TWO ZONING VARIANCES TO REPLACE THE NAME PLATE ON A SIGN AND TO REPLACE, REDUCE AND ENLARGE SIGNAGE ON A SECOND FREESTANDING SIGN. THE BUSINESS IS LOCATED IN A MULTI-TENANT COMMERCIAL CENTER LOCATED AT 1175 LOUISIANA AVENUE AND IS ZONED C-3 (COMMUNITY SHOPPING).

**NOTE:** CHAPTER 1250.32(A) PERMANENT FREESTANDING SIGNAGE (20' OR LESS)

ZONING DISTRICT: C-3  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT: ≤10'  
MAXIMUM SIZE: 72 SQUARE FEET  
MINIMUM SETBACK: 10' SETBACK  
QUANTITY: 1 PER FRONTAGE (2 FRONTAGE MAXIMUM)

ZONING DISTRICT: C-3  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT: 10'<20'

MAXIMUM SIZE: 48 SQUARE FEET  
MINIMUM SETBACK: 40' SETBACK  
QUANTITY: 1 PER FRONTAGE (2 FRONTAGE MAXIMUM)

**NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.39 VARIANCES**

THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MAY GRANT A VARIANCE ONLY IF IT FINDS THAT ALL OF THE FOLLOWING APPLY:

(A) THAT THE LITERAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS CHAPTER WOULD INVOLVE PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES BASED ON THE PRESENCE OF SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH ARE PECULIAR TO THE LAND OR STRUCTURE INVOLVED AND WHICH ARE NOT APPLICABLE TO OTHER LANDS OR STRUCTURES IN THE SAME ZONING DISTRICT. A FINDING OF SUCH SPECIAL CONDITIONS OR CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL BE BASED ON A REVIEW OF FACTORS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:

- (1) EXCEPTIONAL NARROWNESS, SHALLOWNESS OR SHAPE OF A SPECIFIC PROPERTY ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS CHAPTER OR AMENDMENT; OR
- (2) EXCEPTIONAL TOPOGRAPHIC OR ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS OR OTHER EXTRAORDINARY SITUATION ON THE LAND, BUILDING OR STRUCTURE; OR
- (3) THE IMPACT ON THE PROPERTY OF USES OR DEVELOPMENT OF IMMEDIATELY ADJOINING PROPERTY OR PROPERTIES.
- (4) WHETHER THE APPLICANT WAS AWARE OF THE RELEVANT CODE LIMITATION WHEN THE PROPERTY WAS SOLD OR LEASED TO IT.
- (5) WHETHER THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION WILL YIELD A REASONABLE RATE OF RETURN IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PROPOSED VARIANCE, OR WHETHER THERE CAN BE ANY BENEFICIAL USE OF THE PROPERTY WITHOUT THE PROPOSED VARIANCE.
- (6) WHETHER THE ISSUE COULD BE RESOLVED BY SOME OTHER METHOD, EVEN IF THIS ALTERNATE METHOD IS LESS CONVENIENT OR MOST COSTLY TO ACHIEVE.

(B) THAT GRANTING THE VARIANCE WILL NOT CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT TO PROPERTY OR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VICINITY OR WILL NOT MATERIALLY IMPAIR THE INTENT AND PURPOSES OF THE REQUIREMENT BEING VARIED OR OF THIS CHAPTER AND IS THE MINIMUM VARIANCE NECESSARY TO PROVIDE RELIEF.

(C) THAT THE VARIANCE WOULD NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE DELIVERY OF GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES (E.G., WATER, SEWER, GARBAGE).

(D) THAT THE VARIANCE AS GRANTED WOULD NOT CONFER ON THE APPLICANT ANY SPECIAL PRIVILEGE, OR DEPRIVE THE APPLICANT OF RIGHTS, WHEN COMPARED WITH THOSE RIGHTS COMMONLY ENJOYED IMMEDIATELY ADJOINING PROPERTIES;

(E) THAT THE VARIANCE REQUEST IS NOT ONE WHERE THE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS PERTAINING TO THE PROPERTY ARE SO GENERAL OR RECURRENT IN NATURE AS TO MAKE THE FORMULATION OF A GENERAL



REGULATION FOR THOSE CONDITIONS REASONABLY PRACTICABLE.

SIGN 1 (LOUISIANA AVENUE)

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO REPLACE A NAMEPLATE ON AN EXISTING SIGN THAT HAS A SETBACK OF SIXTEEN (16) FEET FROM THE PROPERTY LINE.
2. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A HEIGHT VARIANCE TO ALLOW FOR A SIGN HEIGHT OF SEVENTEEN (17) FEET.
3. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A SIZE VARIANCE OF 430 SF.

SIGN 2 (E. SOUTH BOUNDARY STREET)

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO ENLARGE A NAMEPLATE ON AN EXISTING SIGN THAT HAS A SETBACK OF EIGHT (8) FEET FROM THE PROPERTY LINE.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends approval of both variance requests. The existing monument sign along Louisiana Avenue is a legal nonconforming structure that predates the current sign standards established in the 2006 code rewrite. The applicant is not proposing any structural modifications, height increase, or expansion of the sign area. The request is limited to the replacement of a nameplate to reflect the current business occupant within the existing sign face. Approval does not expand or intensify the existing nonconformity and is consistent with the reasonable continued use of a legally established sign structure. The existing multi-tenant monument sign along E. South Boundary Street is legal nonconforming with respect to the setback, sitting eight (8) feet from the property line where ten (10) feet is required. The sign is otherwise compliant in height and total area at ten (10) feet and seventy (70) square feet respectively, both within the applicable C-3 standards. The applicant is not proposing any structural changes or increases to the overall sign area. The request is limited to an adjustment of the proportional sizing of two existing nameplate panels within the current sign face. No expansion of the nonconforming setback condition is proposed. Requiring full setback compliance would necessitate complete removal and relocation of an otherwise compliant structure, which is not proportional to the minimal nature of the proposed change and would not serve the intent of the sign regulations.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 15-26. Desi Varsel (of Signs Unlimited) was present virtually via Teams on behalf of the application and noted that the client was unaware that the signs were legal non-conforming.

Mr. Harder moved to approve Sign #1 (Louisiana Avenue) and Sign #2 (E. South Boundary Street) as submitted. Seconded by Mr. Geib, and the variances were unanimously approved (4-0).

**APPLICATION 16-26**

JAMES CHANDLER IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE IN THE FRONT YARD. THE PROPERTY IS A CORNER LOT LOCATED AT 2013 KENTON TRAIL 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 ONE OF THE TWO FRONT YARDS.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). The subject property has two front yards, one along Kenton Trail where the primary entrance is located and one along Bishopswood Lane. The Board previously approved a variance last month to permit an accessory structure in the secondary front yard along Bishopswood Lane. The applicant is now requesting a height variance to install a six (6) foot fence in that same yard to screen the approved shed from view and allow functional access to the structure toward either the rear of the property or the pool area. The four (4) foot maximum fence permitted in a front yard is insufficient to screen the shed, making the height variance a practical extension of the relief already granted. The proposed fence will enhance the appearance of the secondary front yard, further maintain the character of the neighborhood, and presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 16-26. James Chandler was present on behalf of the application and said that he would like to move the white vinyl fence along the pavilion to box in the shed. He presented the Board with additional pictures to support his request.

Mr. Harder moved to approve Application 16-26 as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the variance was unanimously approved (4-0).

**APPLICATION 17-26**

SETH & ELLEN MCLAUGHLIN ARE REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 326 W. SEVENTH 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, THIRTY-FIVE (35) FEET INTO THE FRONT YARD.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies conditions B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). The applicant is requesting a six (6) foot fence along one side of the property, extending thirty-one (31) feet into a forty-eight (48) foot deep front yard, to screen the bedroom windows of the residence from the adjacent property. The applicant has documented a legitimate safety concern regarding the neighboring property that warrants additional privacy measures beyond what a compliant four (4) foot fence would provide. The four (4) foot maximum permitted in a front yard is insufficient to achieve the necessary screening given that the applicant's home sits thirty-one (31) feet behind the neighboring residence, creating a direct line of sight into the bedroom windows. The requested height is the minimum necessary to address that condition. The proposed fence presents no safety, visibility, or utility concerns and is consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 17-26. Seth McLaughlin was present on behalf of the application and said that he would like to bring the fence forward by thirty-nine (39) to forty (40) feet for privacy.

Mr. Easterling read an email into the record from Mr. and Mrs. Matt Brouillard (of 316 W. Seventh Street) stating that a fence up to the front entryway is acceptable, but extending past the front entry door would be appealable (a copy of the email is attached hereto).

Ms. Castellano asked how far the fence would extend past the neighbor's front entryway, and Mr. McLaughlin said that it would be one (1) to two (2) feet past the front door. Mr. Easterling clarified that this fence is a continuation of an existing privacy fence. Mr. McLaughlin noted that the contractors from 316 W. Seventh Street are consistently trespassing onto his property.

Ms. Castellano moved to approve Application 17-26 as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

**APPLICATION 18-26**

LAUREN BORER WITH FASTSIGNS, ON BEHALF OF SALON HAZELTON, IS

REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO REPLACE A FREESTANDING SIGN. THE BUSINESS IS LOCATED AT 131 W. INDIANA AVENUE AND IS ZONED C-2 (CENTRAL BUSINESS).

**NOTE:** CHAPTER 1250.32(A) PERMANENT FREESTANDING SIGNAGE  
ZONING DISTRICT: C-2  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT: 6'  
MAXIMUM SIZE: 24 SQUARE FEET  
MINIMUM SETBACK: 30' SETBACK  
QUANTITY: 1

**NOTE:** CHAPTER 1250.39 VARIANCES  
THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MAY GRANT A VARIANCE ONLY IF IT FINDS THAT ALL OF THE FOLLOWING APPLY:

(A) THAT THE LITERAL ENFORCEMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS CHAPTER WOULD INVOLVE PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES BASED ON THE PRESENCE OF SPECIAL CONDITIONS AND CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH ARE PECULIAR TO THE LAND OR STRUCTURE INVOLVED AND WHICH ARE NOT APPLICABLE TO OTHER LANDS OR STRUCTURES IN THE SAME ZONING DISTRICT. A FINDING OF SUCH SPECIAL CONDITIONS OR CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL BE BASED ON A REVIEW OF FACTORS INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE FOLLOWING:

(1) EXCEPTIONAL NARROWNESS, SHALLOWNESS OR SHAPE OF A SPECIFIC PROPERTY ON THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THIS CHAPTER OR AMENDMENT; OR  
(2) EXCEPTIONAL TOPOGRAPHIC OR ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS OR OTHER EXTRAORDINARY SITUATION ON THE LAND, BUILDING OR STRUCTURE;  
OR

(3) THE IMPACT ON THE PROPERTY OF USES OR DEVELOPMENT OF IMMEDIATELY ADJOINING PROPERTY OR PROPERTIES.

(4) WHETHER THE APPLICANT WAS AWARE OF THE RELEVANT CODE LIMITATION WHEN THE PROPERTY WAS SOLD OR LEASED TO IT.

(5) WHETHER THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION WILL YIELD A REASONABLE RATE OF RETURN IN THE ABSENCE OF THE PROPOSED VARIANCE, OR WHETHER THERE CAN BE ANY BENEFICIAL USE OF THE PROPERTY WITHOUT THE PROPOSED VARIANCE.

(6) WHETHER THE ISSUE COULD BE RESOLVED BY SOME OTHER METHOD, EVEN IF THIS ALTERNATE METHOD IS LESS CONVENIENT OR MOST COSTLY TO ACHIEVE.

(B) THAT GRANTING THE VARIANCE WILL NOT CAUSE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT TO PROPERTY OR IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VICINITY OR WILL NOT MATERIALLY IMPAIR THE INTENT AND PURPOSES OF THE REQUIREMENT BEING VARIED OR OF THIS CHAPTER AND IS THE MINIMUM VARIANCE NECESSARY TO PROVIDE RELIEF.

(C) THAT THE VARIANCE WOULD NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE DELIVERY OF GOVERNMENTAL SERVICES (E.G., WATER, SEWER, GARBAGE).

(D) THAT THE VARIANCE AS GRANTED WOULD NOT CONFER ON THE



APPLICANT ANY SPECIAL PRIVILEGE, OR DEPRIVE THE APPLICANT OF RIGHTS, WHEN COMPARED WITH THOSE RIGHTS COMMONLY ENJOYED IMMEDIATELY ADJOINING PROPERTIES;

(E) THAT THE VARIANCE REQUEST IS NOT ONE WHERE THE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS PERTAINING TO THE PROPERTY ARE SO GENERAL OR RECURRENT IN NATURE AS TO MAKE THE FORMULATION OF A GENERAL REGULATION FOR THOSE CONDITIONS REASONABLY PRACTICABLE.

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO INSTALL A FREESTANDING SIGN ONE (1) FOOT FROM THE FRONT PROPERTY LINE.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Interim Planning & Zoning Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, having found that the application satisfies all applicable conditions under the sign variance provisions of the Codified Ordinances. The subject property presents a practical difficulty peculiar to this parcel. The primary structure is set back approximately thirty-one (31) feet from the front property line, and the applicable C-2 district sign setback requirement of thirty (30) feet would effectively force placement of any freestanding sign directly against the building's facade. At that depth, the sign would have no meaningful visibility from either direction of approach along the street, rendering it functionally useless and depriving the property of signage rights commonly enjoyed by immediately adjoining properties in the historic district whose freestanding signs are placed at comparable locations. The requested variance does not confer a special privilege but rather places this applicant on equal footing with neighboring properties.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 18-26. Lauren Borer (of Fast Signs) was present on behalf of the application and asked why this variance is needed. Mr. Easterling noted that there is a visible structural change, and Ms. Borer noted that they are adding skirting to the signage.

Mr. Harder moved to approve Application 18-26 as submitted. Seconded by Ms. Castellano, and the variance was unanimously approved (4-0).

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro

Recording Secretary

The next meeting is scheduled for July 13, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building at 201 W. Indiana Avenue.





---

**Re: Follow Up on Neighbor's Fence Variance**

---

**From** Jackie Venzel <jackie.venzel@gmail.com>  
**Date** Sun 6/7/2026 8:22 PM  
**To** Venzel Communications <bobvenzel@venzelcommunications.com>  
**Cc** Mark Easterling <measterling@perrysburgoh.gov>

Mark, I would like to reiterate my husband's comments. Our neighbor is being very reactive and this project needs to unfold before fences are built. Furthermore when she moved in I told her about the "ditch project" and how we were proactive in planting vegetation 30 years ago.

Vegetation is the answer to complement this project, not privacy fences.

Further more I noticed a corner house on W River Road (may be at S Ridge st) that has a 6' fence around their yard but a 4' fence along River Road.

Perrysburg is about welcoming not building walls. Thank you for considering our comments.

Let the wise listen and add to their learning, and let the discerning get guidance. Proverbs 1:5

On Sun, Jun 7, 2026 at 8:05 PM Venzel Communications <[bobvenzel@venzelcommunications.com](mailto:bobvenzel@venzelcommunications.com)> wrote:

Mark,

Over the weekend I read about our neighbor's fence variance request at 1561 Watermill Lane. I also saw your recommendation to deny the variance and the reasons for it.

I support your denial for the variance. You are correct, there are 31 properties that border Ft. Meigs Rd. as one of their front yards (ours included). Her variance would definitely set a precedence and affect the overall look of the street. We planted trees and bushes years ago for that very reason to enhance our privacy, and they work just fine. She can do the same along her split rail fence. Plus, it's way too premature. We need to see how things turn out with the city's fence you are installing along with the trees.

Please our objection along to the zoning committee. Thank you.

--

Bob Venzel  
Venzel Communications, Inc.

This message was sent from an external email address. Do not open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected emails.



---

**Re: BZA Response**

---

**From** matt brouillard <paintproplus2@gmail.com>

**Date** Sun 6/7/2026 7:15 PM

**To** Mark Easterling <measterling@perrysburgoh.gov>

It has been brought to our attention that the home owners of 326 W 7th street Perrysburg OH are asking for a variance to install a 6 ft privacy fence to run through to the front our house. We are unsure if this means to the front of the total structure or even with the front entry door.

A 6 ft fence installed past the rear of our home would diminish sunlight and views from our windows on that side. We respect Mr and Mrs Handley's request for privacy as we would also appreciate privacy. Our home at 316 W 7th Street has been in my wife's family for over 100 years. She inherited it after her parents death and we have worked very hard to improve it to carry on her family legacy. We have invested a considerable amount of time and money to improve this property.

We do expect that our right to use and enjoy our home be respected. We also wish the same for the Handleys.

We will not protest the fence up to the front entryway. This should give them the added privacy they are requesting without impeding our street view. With this we will be losing some view from the kitchen windows but will concede to that.

Any variances that extends the fence past our front entry door will leave us no choice but to appeal. We believe this is a compromise that can both be acceptable and benefit both parties.

We also understand that some of the work for the fence will require access to our property. We expect that the workers will be respectful and not disturb the air conditioning unit on that side or lean anything against the house.

Thank you for your consideration of our input to this variance request.

Sincerely,

Mr and Mrs Matt Brouillard

On Fri, Jun 5, 2026, 3:20 PM Mark Easterling <[measterling@perrysburgoh.gov](mailto:measterling@perrysburgoh.gov)> wrote:

Please let me know your thoughts to the application.

**Mark Easterling**

*Deputy Planning & Zoning Administrator*

**[City of Perrysburg](#)**

Planning & Zoning Division

**[201 W Indiana Avenue](#)**

**[Perrysburg, OH 43551](#)**

P: 419.872.7987



*NOTICE: This electronic message transmission and all attachments transmitted with it are intended for the use of the individual or entity that is the intended recipient and may contain legally privileged, protected, or confidential information. If you are not the designated recipient please be aware that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have*