

Board of Zoning Appeals

Munson Township

Minutes of May 21, 2025

Chair Dennis Pilawa called the meeting to order at 6:30pm with Danielle Konrad, Don Ondrejka, Jim O'Neill, Alternates Roger Simpson (serving) and Carol Maver, and Secretary Paula Friebertshauser present. Joe Tomaric was absent. Court Reporter Laura Ware was present. The Pledge of Allegiance was said.

Chair Pilawa explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals is a quasi-judicial Board which acts in the role of judges. He explained the difference between use and area variances. A court reporter is present so that anyone wishing to speak for or against the case must be sworn in for the record. The record is made up of testimony and evidence presented. Anyone not in agreement with the decision of the Board could file with the Court of Common Pleas within 30 days after the minutes of the meeting are approved.

Don Ondrejka moved and Jim O'Neill seconded to approve the minutes of April 16, 2025, as written. Motion carried, 4-0.

CASE 25-07: Krystal Crisman, H&M Landscaping, 12212 Mayfield Rd., Chardon OH – requests to operate a landscaping business and to construct a 30' x 40' concrete pad (for materials storage) without a principal structure on the property. Violates SEC. 407.2 Operating a landscaping business (and storage of materials) is not a permitted use in the Commercial District; SEC. 509.2 (in part) No accessory structure shall be erected within the front yard of any district.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violations. Zoning Inspector James Herringshaw was sworn in. He explained the variance request is a use and area variance. The owner was previously before the Board. He explained there is no principal structure so the pad is considered as being in the front yard. He referred to the site plan and pointed out the proposed location of the pad. He showed photos taken from Mayfield Road; a view from the east towards Petersen Excavating and Dale Jurgens businesses; and to the north of the woods and south..It is a deep I-shaped property that cannot be seen from Joy's Place. Mr. Pilawa asked if it made sense to act on the use and area variance together. It was agreed upon and the use variance was addressed first.

Both Krystal Crisman of 10389 Kinsman Rd., Newbury and representative Todd Petersen of 10689 Mayfield Road were sworn in. Mr. Petersen explained that H&M's main facility is on Route 87. The property on Mayfield is a byproduct of action by Newbury zoning. They had denied a salt bin which caused reconfiguration of the yard. With 200-plus employees the lot off of Mayfield Road is currently used for parking and limited material storage. It is 45' wide in the front where the material is stored. He pointed out that in looking at the permitted commercial uses it appears they were originally planned for retail. It has become a service district with Namco, Earthworx and Joy's Place there – it would be compatible with area uses. It would not be seen much with the hill there. Chair Pilawa

pointed out the hill in a photo. Mr. Petersen added that it makes sense in that area, and of the 57 permitted uses listed in the Resolution, they would never be there with the current lot configuration.

Chair Pilawa asked Mr. Petersen the following questions: Did he feel the hardship is unique to the property? Mr. Petersen responded that how the zoning is written makes it hard and an economic liability because it is a flag lot. How does the proposed use compare to adjacent uses? He felt it compares favorably. Is the hardship self-induced? No. Will adjoining properties be harmed? No, Joy's Place would be the most impacted and there is screening between the two. How does the zoning regulation protect the public health, safety and morals? He did not think it did.

Chair Pilawa noted that the Board is required to take evidence but does not have to give equal weight to the factors. In both the area and use variances requested whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction they do not give much weight to as anyone can find out the restrictions.

Mr. Petersen commented he has always looked at if the use in any way negatively impacts neighbors. He could not think in any way how the use would impact health, safety and morals.

Chair Pilawa commented that people often ask why the Board does not just follow what the Zoning Resolution says. He explained that whenever it was written, no one could have anticipated everything. The Zoning Resolution itself provides for the variance process.

When asked, Ms. Krisman did not have anything to say.

Chair Pilawa stated for the record there were seven affected property owners notified in Case 25-07. Sean Petersen of 11580 Regent Park owns the adjacent property and had no problem with the request. He has known Mark (owner) since he was a kid and had bought the property before them. Bernard Vukovic of 9760 Mayfield Road and owner of Namco had no problem with the request either.

Regarding the area variance, Chair Pilawa asked Mr. Petersen the following: Is the variance substantial? No. Will the essential character of the neighborhood be altered? Not at all. Will adjoining properties suffer detriment? No. Will the variance adversely affect delivery of government services? No. Can the predicament be feasibly relieved through some method other than a variance? No, this is the best way to do it. Will the spirit and intent behind the zoning be observed and substantial justice be done by granting a variance? Yes. Did the property owner purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction? He doubted it.

Don Ondrejka moved and Roger Simpson seconded to approve the variance requested in Case 25-07 as requested. There was no further discussion to what was already asked of the applicant's representative, Mr. Petersen. Upon the roll call members voted unanimously to grant the variance 5 -0. Motion carried.

CASE 25-08: Bernard Vukovic/Namco, 12200 Mayfield Rd., Chardon OH – requests to permanently keep a storage/shipping container located behind the principal structure. Violates SEC. 410 Uses Not Specifically Mentioned (in part) Any use of land or structures, unless otherwise noted herein as a

permitted principal, permitted accessory, or conditional use within any district shall not be permitted by the Zoning Inspector unless a variance has been granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violation. He noted it is a use variance and must show practical difficulty. Inspector Herringshaw explained the shipping container sits far back and cannot be seen. When he was over at H&M he saw it behind the building. He referred to the site map which showed how far back from the road it is and the shape of the property. Inspector Herringshaw advised if the Board considers approving the request, the storage container would have to stay behind the structure and cannot be seen from Mayfield Road. It would not really be horse-trading, but the Board can put conditions on it.

Chair Pilawa asked Mr. Vukovic for his consent to say the shipping container would remain where it is; would not be seen from Mayfield Road; and stay behind the building. Mr. Vukovic agreed. Mr. Pilawa stressed that if the variance were granted, it is a property right and remains with the property.

Mr. Vukovic explained his main manufacturing business is in Canada. They have manufacturing gear components that are deemed clean and need to be stored. The new components are in the building. He employs four local Munson residents. The property is clean, the lawn manicured. For him, it would be a cost disadvantage not to be able to store good used parts worth \$50-60K. Sean Petersen, affected property owner, said he can see the container from the rear of their property but has no problem with it. Chair Pilawa noted that Namco already got a use variance for the business. Mr. Ondrejka confirmed the intention was to use it for reuseable storage and nothing flammable. Mr. Vukovic said "yes". Mr. Simpson asked why he decided on using a storage container instead of adding to the building. Mr. Vukovic responded "money". Mr. Ondrejka asked if he had any thoughts about expanding the building and if so, would the conditions hold true if the storage container remained. Mr. Vukovic said "yes".

Chair Pilawa stated for the record there were seven affected property owners notified in Case 25-08. AJ Petersen of 11580 Regent Park was sworn in. He stated they are affected property owners and cleared the land for Mr. Vukovic. He thought it makes sense and agreed he has the cleanest property.

Chair Pilawa asked if the parts in the container were chemically treated. Mr. Vukovic said no. Chair Pilawa commented that the container would protect against any leeching if the parts were to be left outside.

Don Ondrejka moved and Danielle Konrad seconded to approve the variance requested in Case 25-08 as requested with the amendment and consent of applicant. Discussion following the motion included: Is the hardship unique to the property? The Board heard evidence about the specific hardship. Does the zoning regulation deprive the owner of a substantial property right? Yes, the request does not seem unreasonable and it could be argued that there are other ways to resolve the issue but the resolution does not account for everything. Zoning Inspector Herringshaw added that they are only allowed as temporary structures for 30 days. May the property be reasonably used in an economically viable manner without a variance? It is more economically viable than adding onto the building. There is good evidence that adjoining properties would not be harmed and evidence that it is not self-induced. There was no evidence regarding how the zoning regulation protects the public health, safety, and morals. Upon the roll call, members voted 5 -0. Motion carried.

CASE 25-09: John Wilson, Aqua Doc/WR Real Estate, 10779 Mayfield Rd., Chardon OH – requests to permanently keep a storage/shipping container located behind the principal structure. Violates SEC. 410 Uses Not Specifically Mentioned (in part) Any use of land or structures, unless otherwise noted herein as a permitted principal, permitted accessory, or conditional use within any district shall not be permitted by the Zoning Inspector unless a variance has been granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Prior to this case being heard, Chair Pilawa stated that he and Mr. Wilson are hockey teammates and he could recuse himself if anyone wanted him to do so. No one was opposed to him hearing the case.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violation. Zoning Inspector Herringshaw commented that it is similar to the last one and it cannot be seen from the road. He noticed it because the road he lives on is next door and he could see it in the Spring but not at all once the trees filled in. He happened to see the most affected property owner out on his street and she had no problem with it. He added that the same conditions could be utilized in this case.

John Wilson was sworn in. He was okay with the conditions. He explained they have been in Munson for 20 years and in business for 42 years. They employ Munson residents and with growth, bought the former schoolhouse. His office is in the 1910 house. Around COVID times he built the building over the rental unit and another warehouse/training center. He rented the container, and then bought it for tool storage, etc. It makes the property more functional and beautiful. Mr. Ondrejka asked him if he had any intention of storing gas containers. He said no, they have an approved location for those.

Chair Pilawa stated for the record there were eight affected property owners notified in Case 25-09. There was no public comment.

Chair Pilawa asked Mr. Wilson the following: Does this variance seek to take care of the hardship not unique to property – No. Does the zoning regulation protect public health, safety, and morals? No. Will adjoining properties be harmed? Not at all. How does the proposed use compare to adjacent and nearby uses? It is basically in the Commercial area and would not change anything.

Don Ondrejka moved and Jim O'Neill seconded to grant the variance requested in Case 25-09 with the amendment as noted by the Zoning Inspector that it would remain behind the principal structure and cannot be seen from Mayfield Road. Upon the roll call, all members voted unanimously to grant the variance, 5-0; motion carried.

CASE 25-10: Anthony Cosiano, 12380 Bean Rd., Chardon OH - requests to put a 12' x 16' accessory structure approximately 7' from the south side property line (road right-of-way). Violates SEC. 411 Minimum Dimensional Requirements (in part) Minimum side yard requirement for a corner lot is 60'.

Chair Pilawa read the variance and violation. Inspector Herringshaw referred to the site plan and pointed out that Mr. Cosiano's house is nonconforming and 14 feet from the north side property line. In looking at the photos he had taken, Mr. Herringshaw pointed out there is a bank of trees where the proposed building would be located. Chair Pilawa asked how long the house was there. Inspector Herringshaw did not know, but as a nonconforming structure, probably before zoning.

Anthony Cosiano was sworn in. He explained that to be within the setbacks it would be an eyesore in the center of the backyard and more visible to the neighbors. The previous owner had planted arborvitae, and even though the shed would be visible from Ravenna, there is a tree there. Mr. Cosiano said the neighbor came over and let him know that he would not be able to see it and mentioned that his house was the first home there.

Chair Pilawa commented that historically someone would show up if they did not like it. He stated for the record that six affected property owners were notified in Case 25-10. There was no public comment. He reviewed the following factors with Mr. Cosiano. Did he feel the variance was substantial? No. Will the essential character of the neighborhood be altered? No. Does he think adjoining properties would suffer a detriment? He did not. Will the variance adversely affect the delivery of government services? No. Can the predicament be feasibly relieved through some method other than a variance? No.

Don Ondrejka moved and Danielle Konrad seconded to grant the variance requested in Case 25-10 as written. The Board felt all the Duncan factors had been met. Upon the roll call, members voted unanimously to grant the variance, 5-0. Motion carried.

CASE 25-11: Clyde & Susan Quiggle, 10616 Sherman Rd., Chardon OH – requests to keep a driveway extension approx. 10' and an RV parked approx. 12' from the west side property line. Violates SEC. 511 Driveways (in part) Driveways shall be a minimum of 15' from any lot line; SEC. 516.2(a) (in part) Outdoor parking or storage of a recreational vehicle shall not be located closer than 20' from any side or rear lot line.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violations. Inspector Herringshaw explained that he found out about this variance because the Quiggles' had come in before because the neighbor was splitting his lot. He noticed the driveway extension then. It has been there since 2015. The neighbor, Mike Hollowell, could not be in attendance and even though it cannot be used as evidence, they wanted an email dated May 10 read (letter attached as part of the minutes).

Clyde Quiggle was sworn in. He explained that on the west side of the garage there is a 12 foot slide out. A Class RV parked on limestone. It was positioned there so the slide out would not hit the garage. They considered other places but it would be difficult to maneuver to the other side of the garage or they would have to go across the septic area. He commented that as they get older it is harder to maneuver.

Mr. Simpson asked Mr. Herringshaw if there were any concerns from the neighbor. He said there could be a future fence 12 feet away, but there should be no problem.

Chair Pilawa stated for the record there were six affected property owners notified in Case 25-11. There was no public comment. He asked Mr. Quiggle the following questions: Did he feel the variance was substantial? Not really. Would the essential character of the neighborhood be altered? No; Would adjoining properties suffer a detriment? No, as he understood the letter that was read, the neighbor did not have a problem; Would the variance adversely affect the delivery of government services?

Chair Pilawa thought not. Can the predicament be feasibly relieved through some other method? Other options were considered but this was the best one.

Danielle Konrad moved and Roger Simpson seconded that the variance requested in Case 25-11 be approved as written. The Duncan factors were believed to have been met. Upon the roll call, members voted unanimously to approve the variance, 5-0. Motion carried.

CASE 25-12: Robert Brownlee, 11185 Elk Run, Chardon OH – requests to keep an existing driveway/turnaround approx. 0' from the west side lot line. Violates SEC. 511 Driveways (in part) Driveways shall be a minimum of 15' from any lot line.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violation. Inspector Herringshaw referred to the site plan and explained that when the neighbors purchased the property they discussed putting up an accessory building. When he pulled up the map it appeared the Brownlee's driveway might be over the line. In 2008, the owners had extended the driveway turnaround in gravel, since that time it was asphalted. It has been there for 18 years. Mr. Ondrejka asked if it was the same owner the whole time. Inspector Herringshaw responded yes, they have been there since 1978.

Robert Brownlee was sworn in. He explained that in 2007 he and his son put the gravel in; and in 2011 they asphalted it. He said it was more than a turnaround. It is a convenient place for them to park. They had no idea of any encroachment; a survey was never done. They have generally gone by the electrical box – one half theirs, one-half the neighbor's (who passed away two years ago). He mentioned there is a pin way in the back. Mr. Brownlee said they looked into removing the turnaround and it would be over \$2,000.

Kurt Hoffmann was sworn in. He said he did his homework and there was a pin in front. He had several posters of the properties and said the straight line on his property is accurate. When asked, Mr. Hoffmann said a survey had not been done. He pointed out that the driveway was over the line in 2010. In 2007, he said it was very plausible it was within 10 feet. Three samples showed it over the line. His request is that the driveway goes back to its original place or they would have to take civil litigation. He felt there was no potential hardship but encroachment and was concerned if they were to sell their property. Mr. Hoffmann said the BZA could provide conditions that the Brownlees are to get a survey boundary if approved. Chair Pilawa responded that another alternative is that the neighbors could work it out with who is to bear the cost of the survey. It seems the least contentious approach. Mr. Brownlee commented they are not the people that are making it an issue. The previous owner was a bachelor; they shared water when it stormed; called 911 for him and cut each other's grass – it's the way neighbors are. He was shocked that this was an issue. They have talked to Mr. Hoffmann and were very surprised he went to the trouble he has. There has been no harm done and he is sure there are other more detrimental instances but he cannot see it in this instance with the flat ground. It serves as a convenience when their friends in their 70's come over. They have a 150' drive.

Mr. Ondrejka asked if the contentious point is because it is over the line a couple of feet or keeping it at zero feet. Mr. Hoffmann responded ultimately no, he would like it to be as it was in 2007 and requested a survey. Even though Mr. Hoffmann knew where the front pin is and Mr. Brownlee the one in the back there is no direct line of sight. Chair Pilawa asked Mr. Hoffmann if he bought the property

in this condition. Mr. Hoffmann said yes. Chair Pilawa commented that until Mr. Hoffmann found out about the issue, he did not suffer a detriment. Mr. Hoffman responded no, but if he were to sell, it would be an encroachment on his property. Chair Pilawa mentioned the Duncan factor that asks if adjoining properties would suffer a detriment and he understood there is a legal wrong right now but he has not suffered a practical detriment. Resident Sean Petersen asked if they do a survey at point of sale. Mr. Hoffmann responded they conduct a location survey at best, not a boundary survey. Mr. Simpson confirmed there were trees, etc. in the line of sight. Mr. Hoffmann said yes. Chair Pilawa explained that when the Board sees a possibility, they will often continue a case to give parties a chance to work things out. The opportunity exists and they would ask the Trustees to waive the fee.

Mr. Brownlee said they talked with their son about cutting the turnaround halfway back but they would be losing something very important to friends and family. Chair Pilawa commented that if it is encroaching Mr. Hoffmann would be gaining back some of his property. Mr. Brownlee commented that he thought they were going to be able to work it out. Chair Pilawa responded all he could do is make the offer for the case to be continued to encourage that. Mr. Simpson added that personally he thought he should continue. Mr. Brownlee felt he has the most beautiful home on the cul-de-sac and would make sure they would be compliant. He wasn't sure he could communicate with Mr. Hoffmann. Ms. Konrad commented that it would be less expensive to have someone they know take a chunk off the drive – be it three feet or five feet it doesn't look like a lot. Mr. Simpson asked for clarification on how much it is over the line. Inspector Herringshaw suggested exploring the pins more and seeing if there were a way to more closely figure the measurement out.

Mr. Hoffmann commented that if the Brownlees leave it the way it is at the time of transfer they would have to do an actual survey (boundary).

Roger Simpson moved and Don Ondrejka seconded to continue Case 25-12 for 30 days and to request that the Trustees waive the continuance fee. Upon the roll call members voted 5-0, motion carried.

CASE 25-13: Gabriella Taylor/Taylor Plumbing, 12287 Mayfield Rd., Chardon OH – requests to keep 9 existing parking spaces, 9' wide, 8' deep and 25' from the road right-of-way. Violates SEC. 521.2 Size of Parking Spaces – The width of a parking space shall be a minimum of 10' and the length shall be a minimum of 20'. The total area of a parking space shall be a minimum of 200 sq. ft.; SEC. 521k (in part) Parking may be permitted no closer than 50' from the road right-of-way.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violations. Inspector Herringshaw referred to the site plan and pointed out that the orange area indicates the requested parking. The parking area was supposed to be against the front of the building only, which would have been 50 feet back and in compliance. They had delivery issues so they moved them. He showed photos of other commercial uses in the district that are less than 25 feet, all grandfathered in. The Zoning Commission changed the requirement from 60 feet to 50 feet; most in the Commercial District are less. Chair Pilawa commented that the essential character of the neighborhood would not be changed. Mr. Herringshaw agreed and mentioned he had taken those pictures as general information for the Land Use Plan Committee. He then referred to photos taken with the view from the west, looking west and from the business driveway.

Ethan Taylor was sworn in. He explained that having the parking solely by the building presented delivery issues. They get two to four delivery trucks per day that must back in from Mayfield; it is a safety issue. Mr. Ondrejka asked if there were more parking spaces on the east side. Mr. Taylor said yes and thought this would help the trucks turnaround easier. Mr. O'Neill asked if there was still parking against the building. Mr. Taylor said they do have seven front-facing parking spots against the building and a handicap parking spot.

Chair Pilawa stated for the record there were seven affected property owners notified in Case 25-13. Sean Petersen commented that they are neighbors and felt they have done a wonderful job. He had no issue with the request. Chair Pilawa asked Mr. Petersen if he felt the essential character of the neighborhood would not be affected but made better. Mr. Petersen responded, "100 percent". AJ Petersen vouched for the safety issue because he has backed into their property and it can be scary. It made sense to him. When asked if the variance was substantial, Mr. Petersen said not at all. Would adjoining properties suffer a detriment? No. Would the delivery of government services be adversely affected? No. AJ agreed.

Don Ondrejka moved and Jim O'Neill seconded that the variance requested in Case 25-13 by approved as written. The Board felt the Duncan factors were covered. Upon the roll call, all members voted unanimously to approve the variance request, 5-0. Motion carried.

CASE 25-14: Cynthia Ahern, 9984 Mayfield Rd., Chesterland OH – requests to permanently keep 3 storage/shipping containers behind an accessory building. Violates SEC. 410 Uses Not Specifically Mentioned (in part) Any use of land or structures, unless otherwise noted herein as a permitted principal, permitted accessory, or conditional use within any district shall not be permitted by the Zoning Inspector unless a variance has been granted by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violation. Inspector Herringshaw referenced photos he had taken in April when he happened to see a corner of one of the shipping containers. When he spoke with the resident, she told him there were three, but they cannot be seen from Mayfield Road. The property is located in an R-4 district (wetlands) so the containers can only be put in front. Photos showed a high bank of land with trees and to the east the property goes all the way to the corner of Rockhaven with natural screening. Chair Pilawa commented that the Board is going to see more and more of them. Inspector Herringshaw mentioned that going down Auburn Road there are two used as a main structure with siding and a roof. The Geauga County Building Department had no problem with it. He added that the previous zoning inspector had mistakenly allowed shipping containers in two instances. Chair Pilawa commented that the Board cannot zone for aesthetics.

Cynthia Ahern was sworn in. She said she had no idea they were in violation and asked that her son speak to the matter. Michael Ahern of 12920 Wellswood was sworn in. He said his father used a 1986 semi-trailer for storage of tools and equipment. In the winter of 2022 or 2023 they got rid of the dilapidated trailer and bought storage containers. There are two side by side behind the building and one behind them they use for small equipment. Mr. Ahern explained that because they had the semi-trailer they did not know they were not allowed to have shipping containers; they were just trying to clean up and have a place to store equipment. When asked if they would consent to conditions such as locating them behind the main structure and have screening, Mr. Ahern said yes. He commented there

is current screening of arborvitae on the north side and Norway spruce to the west. When asked what they were used for he said they stored a Bobcat skidster, small tools, lawn equipment and straw bales. It is an economic storage space and cannot be seen. His parents have owned the property since 1982.

Chair Pilawa thought the hardship was not self-induced due to the wetlands and contour of the property. When asked how the proposed use compares to nearby uses, Mr. Ahern responded that down the road is Aqua Doc. He did not see any impact on public health, safety and morals and did not believe adjoining properties would be harmed.

There were 12 affected property owners notified in Case 25-14. There was no public comment.

Danielle Konrad moved and Don Ondrejka seconded to grant the variance requested in Case 25-14 with preconditions consented to by the applicant (could not be seen from Mayfield Road; kept behind the accessory structure; with screening from residential neighbors). Upon the roll call, all members voted unanimously to grant the variance, 5-0. Motion carried.

CASE 25-15: Petersen Holdings LLC, 12236 Mayfield Rd., Chardon OH – requests to keep an extended parking area approx. 25' from the front road right-of-way. Violates SEC. 521k (in part) Parking may be permitted no closer than 50' from the road right-of-way.

Chair Pilawa read the variance request and violation. Inspector Herringshaw referred to the site map and explained the parking was conforming but then he noticed the tractor trailers were closer. He showed a photo taken from Mayfield Road. He explained they have a bed of trees lined with rocks in front. The parking lot slopes down and in and he referred once again to the photos he took originally for possible use for the Land Use Plan Committee.

Sean Petersen explained they were originally near the 50-foot mark but the property slopes down hard the length of a truck and there is a risk of hitting the truck next to it. When asked if he felt the variance was substantial, Mr. Petersen responded no. Will the essential character of the neighborhood be changed, he responded no. Would adjoining properties suffer a detriment, no. Would the delivery of government services be adversely affected, he felt they might be enhanced because there would be less likelihood of an accident. Chair Pilawa confirmed that Mr. Petersen suggested that there is no feasible way to make it safer. There were nine affected property owners notified in Case 25-15. There was no public comment.

Roger Simpson moved and Jim O'Neill seconded that the variance requested in Case 25-15 be approved as written. Mr. Simpson mentioned that it was obviously another property like those nearby. Mr. Ondrejka commented that in another year or two with the tree growth the trucks would not be seen. Upon the roll call, members voted unanimously to grant the variance, 5-0. Motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:20pm.


Dennis Pilawa, Chair


Date


Paula Friebertshauser, Secretary


Date

*The Hollowells requested I
read this letter to the
BZA*

James Herringshaw

Subject:

FW: Zoning Appeals Meeting 5/21/25--- variance request 25-11

From: michael hollowell <michaelhollowell@hotmail.com>

Sent: Saturday, May 10, 2025 9:41 PM

To: James Herringshaw <james@munsontwp.com>; michael hollowell <michaelhollowell@hotmail.com>

Subject: Re: Zoning Appeals Meeting 5/21/25--- variance request 25-11

We are sorry that we could not attend tonight's meeting that addresses variance 25-11 under consideration. We would wholeheartedly support that the zoning board grant Clyde and Sue Quiggle their request allowing them to park their RV on a driveway that is adjacent to the side property line that divides 10616 and 10606 Sherman Road. My only concern is that they may not be able to access or maneuver their RV in and out of the space that will be created between the fence and the garage once I install my fence along the side property line that divides 10606 Sherman from 10616 Sherman per the following Munson zoning regulation:

509.5 Fences, Gates, and Walls Shall be in conformity with the following provisions:

- a. Fences, gates, and walls shall be erected outside of the right-of-way of any public or private road.
- b. Fences, gates, and walls shall not block or impede clear sight distance of vehicle operators at the intersection of any public or private road.
- c. Fences and walls shall be a maximum of four (4) feet in height in any front yard and no more than six (6) feet in height in any side or rear yard, except as otherwise provided herein.

We know that both Clyde and Sue are very upset that we purchased the property that surrounds their home and that we plan on building a house behind them someday. Please pass along our apology to them for any pain and hardships that we may have caused them. We only hope that one day we can mend our relationship with them as their neighbors so that we can live in peace next to each other in the years to come.

Sincerely,

Michael and Darla Hollowell
10606 Sherman Road
Munson, Ohio 44024