

## Minutes of Perrysburg Board of Zoning Appeals

Meeting Held October 13, 2025

### CALL TO ORDER - 5:30 PM

Vice Chair Erin O'Rear called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

### ROLL CALL

Board members present were Erin O'Rear, Mark Schrock, and Bill Williams (3). Michael McIntyre and Eric Nicely were absent (2). Mark Easterling, Deputy Planning & Zoning Administrator, was also present.

### APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Williams moved to approve the September 8, 2025, meeting minutes as written. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the minutes were unanimously approved (3-0).

### ADMINISTER OATH

Ms. O'Rear 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 35-25**

KYLE ARMSTRONG IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A FENCE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 308 SOUTHWOOD DRIVE AND IS ZONED R-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

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

R1-R5 ZONING:

4' MAXIMUM IN FRONT YARD

4' MAXIMUM IN SIDE YARD

4' 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 HOME IN ONE SIDE YARD.

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

The Deputy Administrator recommends denial of the variance request, as the

application does not satisfy the number of factors required for approval under Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). A six (6) foot privacy fence would not meaningfully improve privacy, as there are no doors or windows on this side of the home, nor would it provide greater protection from basketball activity than a four (4) foot fence. While there is a central air conditioning unit located along this side of the home, a four (4) foot fence would offer the same level of protection for the unit.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 35-25. Kyle Armstrong was present and added that the proposed fence is necessary to help deter the neighbors' stray basketballs from hitting the house, gas meter, and to protect the infrastructure. He noted that the fence is five (5) feet and eight (8) inches tall and is composed of black aluminum with horizontal slatwoods.

Andrew Hollinger, of 312 Southwood Drive, was present and said that he has a unique housing arrangement compared to his neighbor at 308 Southwood Drive. He added that he installed the basketball hoop in the center of the driveway to try to offset the impact on his neighbor's house. Mr. Hollinger said that they are working together as neighbors and splitting the cost of the fence, and added that the taller fence height provides safety to functionally play basketball at this house. He said that he has a large driveway and that he doesn't want the neighbor inconvenienced.

Mr. Easterling noted that the old basketball hoop was marked on the packets that the Commission members received, and one of the members added that they saw the new location. Mr. Schrock asked if other options had been considered for protection. Mr. Armstrong added that the stray balls are also hitting the siding of the living room and dining room of his home. He noted that a few homes in the historic district have fences taller than four (4) feet in the side yard and added that he has a unique parcel compared to the neighbors. Mr. Easterling confirmed that neighboring comments had not been received.

Mr. Williams moved to approve Application 35-25 as submitted, and found criteria B, C, D, and F of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Ms. O'Rear, and the application was unanimously approved (3-0).

### **APPLICATION 36-25**

ROB HALL OF TOLEDO SIGN COMPANY, ON BEHALF OF COLUMBUS EQUIPMENT, IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO REPLACE A SIGN. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 12500 WILLIAMS ROAD, IS ZONED I-1 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL).

**NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.32(A) PERMANENT FREESTANDING SIGNAGE (10' OR LESS)**

ZONING DISTRICT: I-2 (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL)  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT: 10'  
MAXIMUM SIZE: 72 SQUARE FEET  
MINIMUM SETBACK: 25' 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, SHALLOWSNESS 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 MORE 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 SETBACK VARIANCE TO REPLACE AN EXISTING FREESTANDING SIGN APPROXIMATELY FOUR (4) FEET FROM THE FRONT PROPERTY LINE.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Deputy Administrator recommends denial of the variance request, as it does not meet all the necessary criteria for approval. A compliant sign can be installed that fulfills the same purpose. In industrial districts and for similar types of uses, this approach is both common and effective.

The property is sufficiently large to accommodate a conforming sign that meets visibility and functional needs. Comparable businesses within these districts have opted for this solution, often utilizing directional signage at the entrance. This not only promotes a clean, standardized appearance and prevents visual clutter at property entrances, but also ensures that patrons and employees can easily locate the site.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 36-25. Rob Hall, of Toledo Sign, was present on behalf of Columbus Equipment and said that this is an existing sign with a proposed face replacement. He added that the sign has a foundation and noted that if the variance is not granted, then the sign will remain installed as-is. Mr. Easterling further explained that the goal of the zoning code is to bring non-conforming structures (such as this sign) into compliance. Mr. Williams said that he understands the goal of the zoning code, and added that the new sign looks great. Mr. Schrock asked about the reasoning if the variance is denied, and Mr. Hall referenced cost-effectiveness. Mr. Easterling noted that the code also requires landscaping around monument signage. He referenced Chapter 1250.39(a)(6), where the code states that the cost of a non-conforming sign cannot be used as a factor. Mr. Easterling stated that he is in support of the variance for directional signage and added that Columbus Equipment has other options to install signage that would meet the code. Mr. Hall confirmed that this request is based on aesthetics.

Mr. Williams moved to deny Application 36-25 as submitted, and added that it does not meet the criteria of Chapter 1250.39. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the application was unanimously denied (3-0).

**APPLICATION 37-25**

KEITH COBB OF LITECH LIGHTING MANAGEMENT SERVICES, ON BEHALF OF SHELL, IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO REPLACE A SIGN. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 933 WEST BOUNDARY STREET, IS ZONED C-4 (HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL), AND IS IN THE CORRIDOR OVERLAY DISTRICT.

**NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.32(A) PERMANENT FREESTANDING SIGNAGE**

ZONING DISTRICT: SPECIAL DISTRICT – CORRIDOR OVERLAY (CO)  
MAXIMUM HEIGHT: 6'  
MAXIMUM SIZE: 48 SQUARE FEET  
MINIMUM SETBACK: 10' 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 MORE 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 SETBACK VARIANCE TO REPLACE AN EXISTING FREESTANDING SIGN AT A HEIGHT OF APPROXIMATELY TWENTY (20) FEET TALL.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Under Chapter 1250.39, all criteria must be satisfied for a variance to be granted, and the applicant has not provided sufficient material or evidence to demonstrate compliance with these requirements.

Specifically, the application fails to establish the presence of a practical difficulty or unique site condition that would justify such a significant deviation from the code. The proposed 23-foot height is not warranted, as the sign is not intended to be viewed from the expressway and does not require that level of visibility.

Attached are examples, including comparable signs, that conform to the permitted height and size limits while aligning with the standards and vision of the City of Perrysburg Corridor Overlay District.

Approval of the requested height and area variances would contradict the purpose of the sign code and grant a special privilege not extended to similarly situated properties.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 37-25. Keith Cobb, of Litech Lighting, was present on behalf of the application for the Shell Gas Station, and he added that the proposal is a face change to the signage as True North has rolled out a new program. He said that the signage will remain the same square footage and height. Mr. Schrock asked about the reasoning for the height, and Mr. Cobb referenced visibility as a factor. Mr. Schrock further asked about the location of the gas station, if the current sign height is necessary, if there is a uniqueness to this location, and if a shorter sign would work in this location. Mr. Cobb confirmed that Shell is simply updating their signage across their sites.

Mr. Williams moved to deny Application 37-25 as submitted, and added that it does not meet the criteria of Chapter 1250.39. Seconded by Ms. O'Rear, and the application was unanimously denied (3-0).

**APPLICATION 38-25**

PETE SCHWIEGERAHT, ON BEHALF OF PIVOTAL DEVELOPMENT LLC, IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO REDUCE THE AMOUNT OF PARKING REQUIRED. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 0 W. SIXTH STREET (DIRECTLY NEXT TO THE FORMER AMERICAN STEEL TREATING FACILITY) AND IS ZONED

RM (MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL). THE PARCEL ASSOCIATED WITH THIS APPLICATION IS Q61-000-902305013000.

**NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.03(A)(B) REQUIRED OFF STREET PARKING — RESIDENTIAL**

TWO (2) FOR EACH DWELLING UNIT HAVING THREE (3) OR LESS BEDROOMS AND TWO-AND-ONE-HALF (2½) FOR EACH DWELLING UNIT HAVING MORE THAN THREE (3) BEDROOMS

1. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING TO REDUCE THE MINIMUM AMOUNT OF PARKING FROM THE REQUIRED 140 SPACES TO 89 SPACES.

**RECOMMENDATION:**

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance request, as the proposal meets criteria C, D, E, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). The applicant provided documentation from similar properties showing that the City's current parking requirement is higher than what is typically needed. On average, these properties use about 1.1 parking spaces per resident, including spaces for staff and visitors, meaning the lot at the proposed size would rarely be full. Reducing the parking area also creates room for more green space, resulting in a more attractive and environmentally friendly site design.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 38-25. Pete Schwiegeraht, of Pivotal Development LLC, was present on behalf of the application. Mr. Schrock added that he is impressed with the presented evidence. Mr. Schwiegeraht added that Mr. Easterling and Mr. Walters came out to the property at Harbor Town Senior Residence for a tour of the site, as it's a similar use to what is currently being proposed on this parcel. He added that Pivotal Development has three consistent properties within the area in which a third party conducted outside research with a focus on parking counts and ratios, and he added that they do not envision off-street parking being utilized.

Kyle Tucker, of Eastman & Smith Ltd., was present and noted that the code allows for this variance request if it is demonstrated to be in full compliance with Chapter 1250.02(c)(3).

Pat Smith, of 3120 Lighthouse Way #326, was present and said that he is in favor of the variance request. He added that Pivotal Development is a good landlord and that green space is important.

Mr. Schrock asked if the applicant had followed up with neighbors as noted at the last meeting. Mr. Schwiegeraht said that he knocked on doors in the neighborhood and left his card; he added that he was unable to speak with residents on-site at their properties.

Mr. Williams moved to approve Application 38-25, and found criteria C, D, E, and G of Chapter 1275.02(c)(3) to be true. Seconded by Mr. Schrock, and the application was unanimously approved (3-0).

**OTHER BUSINESS**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro  
Recording Secretary

The next meeting is scheduled for November 10, 2025, at 5:30 p.m. in the Municipal Building at 201 W. Indiana Avenue.