

Minutes of Perrysburg Board of Zoning Appeals

Meeting Held December 8, 2025

CALL TO ORDER - 5:30 PM

Chairman Michael McIntyre called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Board members present were Michael McIntyre, Erin O'Rear, Mark Schrock, and Bill Williams (4). Mark Easterling, Deputy Planning & Zoning Administrator, was also present.

APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 10, 2025 MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Williams moved to approve the November 10, 2025 meeting minutes as written. Seconded by Ms. O'Rear, and the minutes were unanimously approved (4-0).

ADMINISTER OATH

Mr. McIntyre 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 42-25

MICHAEL PIAZZA IS REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE (HARDSHIP PROVISION) THAT WOULD ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO INCREASE THE SIZE OF A NONCONFORMING ACCESSORY DWELLING STRUCTURE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 10760 AVENUE ROAD AND IS ZONED R-2 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1265.09 HARDSHIP CASES: NONCONFORMING BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES MAY BE STRUCTURALLY CHANGED, ALTERED OR ENLARGED WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS. THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS MUST FIND THAT THE REQUEST IS A CASE OF EXCEPTIONAL HARDSHIP IN WHICH FAILURE TO GRANT THE RELIEF REQUESTED WOULD UNREASONABLY RESTRICT CONTINUED USE (**RESIDENTIAL**) OF THE PROPERTY OR WOULD RESTRICT VALUABLE BENEFITS THAT THE PUBLIC CURRENTLY DERIVES FROM THE PROPERTY AS USED IN ITS NONCONFORMING STATUS. WITH THE EXCEPTION THAT ANY APPROVAL FOR STRUCTURAL CHANGES, ALTERATION OR ENLARGEMENT MAY BE GRANTED ONLY WITH A FINDING BY THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS THAT APPROVAL WILL NOT HAVE AN ADVERSE AFFECT ON SURROUNDING PROPERTY AND THAT IT WILL BE THE MINIMUM

NECESSARY TO RELIEVE THE HARDSHIP.

NOTE: CHAPTER 1275.02(D)(1) USE VARIANCE: TO HEAR AND DECIDE INSTANCES WHERE IT IS ALLEGED THAT THE APPLICANT'S PROPERTY CANNOT BE USED FOR THE PURPOSES PERMITTED IN THE ZONING DISTRICTS BECAUSE THE RESTRICTIONS AS TO USE CREATE AN UNDUE HARDSHIP. THIS IS BECAUSE:

- A. APPLICANT'S PROPERTY CANNOT BE USED FOR THE PURPOSES PERMITTED IN THE ZONING DISTRICT.
- B. APPLICANT'S PLIGHT IS DUE TO UNIQUE CIRCUMSTANCES PECULIAR TO HIS PROPERTY AND NOT A GENERAL CONDITION IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
- C. APPLICANT'S SUGGESTED USE WOULD NOT ALTER THE ESSENTIAL CHARACTER OF THE AREA.
- D. APPLICANT'S PROBLEM HAS NOT BEEN SELF-CREATED.
- E. THE UNAVAILABILITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE RELIEF WHICH MIGHT AFFORD REASONABLE USE OF APPLICANT'S PROPERTY.
- F. IN ADDITION TO THE INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR OTHER VARIANCE REQUESTS, AN APPLICATION FOR A USE VARIANCE UNDER THIS CHAPTER SHALL INCLUDE A PLAN DRAWN TO SCALE DETAILING THE SPECIFIC USE AND IMPROVEMENTS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT AND A SUMMARY OF THE FACTS WHICH SUPPORT THE ALLEGED HARDSHIP.

THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO ALLOW FOR A 200 SF ADDITION ON A NONCONFORMING ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT. AS THIS BUILDING AND USE ARE LEGAL NONCONFORMING, ANY CHANGE THAT WOULD POTENTIALLY INCREASE THE INTENSITY OF THE USE MUST BE APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends denial of the request to enlarge the existing accessory dwelling unit. The structure is a nonconforming use because a second dwelling unit is not permitted on a single-family residential lot under the City's zoning code. Under Section 1265.09, the Board of Zoning Appeals may approve an enlargement of a nonconforming structure only in cases of exceptional hardship, where denial would unreasonably restrict the continued use of the property, and only when the expansion is the minimum necessary to relieve that hardship and will not adversely affect surrounding properties.

The applicant has not demonstrated an exceptional, property-based hardship. The stated hardship relates to interior accessibility for a single tenant. However, the applicant has not provided architectural plans, ADA feasibility studies, or any analysis showing why interior redesign or accessibility modifications (e.g., stair reconfiguration, chairlift installation, or other adjustments) cannot reasonably address the concern. The

proposed addition would not remove the existing stairs altogether and, therefore, does not directly resolve the claimed hardship. The evidence presented does not show that all reasonable alternatives have been exhausted.

Denying the request would not unreasonably restrict the continued use of the property. The property remains fully capable of its permitted single-family residential use, and the existing accessory dwelling unit can continue to function in its current configuration. The proposed enlargement would increase the scale and potential occupancy of the ADU, thereby intensifying a use that is already nonconforming. This represents an expansion in density consistent with a two-family use, which is not permitted in the R-2 zoning district and is contrary to the intent of the code.

For these reasons, the application does not meet the standards of Chapters 1265.09 or 1275.02(d)(1)(A–F). The Deputy Administrator, therefore, recommends denial of the request.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 42-25. Michael Piazza was present and said that his mother-in-law lives in the guesthouse, which was built in 1854, and added that it is reasonable to accommodate a first-floor bedroom as the second-story loft is not ADA compliant at twenty-two (22) feet wide. He added that his mother-in-law has had a hip replacement and has already fallen twice. Mr. Piazza referenced Chapter 1265.02, noting that there is an understanding that allows for a dwelling expansion as a variance request. He added that he attempted a lot split to break up the properties, but was unable to do so due to the nonconforming status of the property. Mr. Piazza said that the minimum width for an ADA chairlift is twenty-nine (29) feet; overall, he added that he intends to get ahead of future risk, therefore ridding the use of the second-story bedroom altogether. He added that the loft would be used as storage if the variance is approved.

Mr. Easterling said that he is sympathetic to the request, while noting that it intensifies the use of the property. Ms. O'Rear asked if there were stairs to the kitchen, and Mr. Piazza said that they are working towards a solution. Mr. Piazza stated that the variance request includes a new master bedroom with a closet. Mr. Easterling added that a neighboring property called Planning & Zoning to better understand the request. There was a brief discussion about accessory dwelling units, and Mr. Easterling clarified that those are currently not permitted. He said that it's possible with the zoning code rewrite that this portion of the code could change, but there are still four to five months left in that review and approval process. Mr. Easterling stated that increasing the intensity by two-hundred (200) square feet allows the property owners to rent out the guesthouse as a two-bedroom apartment instead of a one-bedroom as it currently exists.

Mr. Schrock said that he understands the concern regarding the future use of the guesthouse and that he understands the applicant's point of view. He asked Mr. Easterling if there was a way to restrict the future use of the guesthouse, and Mr. Easterling said no, as it's a legal, non-conforming use. Mr. Piazza said that they bought

the property in 2023 with the intention of his mother-in-law living in the guesthouse. Mr. Easterling clarified that the Planning & Zoning Division is in favor of accessory dwelling units for the code rewrite and added that the Land Use Plan reflects the need.

Mr. Schrock moved to grant conditional approval of Application 42-25 as submitted, with the condition that the guesthouse be utilized as a one-bedroom residence. Seconded by Mr. Williams, and the application was unanimously approved (4-0).

APPLICATION 43-25

MARY PLOUFFE AND DOUG ADLER ARE REQUESTING A ZONING VARIANCE TO ALLOW FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A CARPORT ON THE SIDE OF THE FREESTANDING GARAGE. THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED AT 136 WEST FIFTH STREET AND IS ZONED R-3 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL).

NOTE: CHAPTER 1250.61(F) - 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, PROVIDING THAT THE REQUESTED SIZE DOES NOT EXCEED 8% OF THE LOT SIZE.

THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A VARIANCE TO CONSTRUCT A CARPORT ADDITION ONTO AN EXISTING FREESTANDING GARAGE, WHICH WOULD INCREASE THE ALLOWABLE PERCENTAGE TO 7.8%.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Deputy Administrator recommends approval of the variance, as the application satisfies criteria B, C, D, and F outlined in Chapter 1275.02(c)(3). The proposed carport addition allows the existing tree canopy to remain undisturbed while providing protection for the vehicles from weather conditions. Although the structure extends from the existing garage, its open-sided design will maintain a sense of openness on the property and prevent the area from feeling overcrowded, while still achieving the applicant's intended purpose.

Mr. Easterling reviewed Application 43-25. Mary Plouffe was present, adding that they purchased the home in 2019 with only a one-car garage and a small driveway off the alley. She said that they installed a temporary canvas structure due to the parked cars being subject to falling branches. Ms. Plouffe said that a secure 17-foot by 20-foot metal carport was built on site to accommodate their needs, and Mr. Easterling added that it also required a building permit from Wood County Building Inspection.

Dean & Ellen Kosanovich, of 138 W. Fifth Street, were present and said that they are not in favor of the request due to the neighbors' history within the last few years. Ms. Plouffe added that the Zoning Inspector, William Shuff, had previously visited with her to give property line guidance. She said that she was not aware of these concerns prior

to tonight from the Kosanovichs.

Mr. McIntyre asked Mr. Easterling for clarification on the variance request, and Mr. Easterling confirmed that it is the size of the carport under review today. Mr. Easterling added that the carport meets the five (5) foot setback requirement.

Ms. O'Rear moved to approve Application 43-25 as submitted, and found criteria B, 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).

OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Heather Alfaro
Recording Secretary

The next meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2026, at 6:00 p.m. in the Municipal Building at 201 W. Indiana Avenue.