



City of Hudson, Ohio

Meeting Minutes - Draft Board of Zoning & Building Appeals

Jane Davis, Chair
Lou Wagner, Vice Chair
Lydia Bronstein
Robert Kahrl
Cory Scott

Nick Sugar, City Planner
Lauren Coffman, Associate Planner

Thursday, April 17, 2025

7:30 PM

Town Hall
27 East Main Street

I. Call to Order

Acting Chair Wagner called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals at 7:30 p.m., in accordance with the Sunshine Laws of the State of Ohio, O.R.C. Section 121.22.

II. Roll Call

Present: 4 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein and Mr. Scott

Absent: 1 - Ms. Davis

III. Identification, by Chairman, of City Staff

Chair Wagner introduced: Lauren Coffman, Associate Planner, and Seth Markin, Acting City Solicitor.

IV. Swearing in of Staff and Audience Addressing the Board.

Chair Wagner swore-in staff and all the persons wishing to speak under oath.

V. Approval of Minutes

[BZBA 2.20.2025](#) Minutes of Previous Board of Zoning & Building Appeals Meeting: February 20, 2025.

Attachments: [February 20, 2025 - BZBA Meeting Minutes - Draft](#)

A motion was made by Mr. Kahrl, seconded by Ms. Bronstein, that the February 20, 2025, Minutes be approved as amended. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein and Mr. Scott

VI. Public Hearings - New Business

BZBA 25-128 The subject of this hearing is a variance request of five (5) feet from the required side yard accessory structure setback of fifteen (15) feet, resulting in a side yard setback of ten (10) feet pursuant to section 1205.06(d)(5)(D)(4), “Property Development/Design Standards - Setbacks” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to build a detached garage.

The applicant is Brennan Szczepanski, 7030 Saint Ives Blvd, Hudson, Ohio 44236. The property owners are Brennan and Renee Szczepanski, 7030 Saint Ives Blvd, Hudson, Ohio 44236 for the property at 7030 Saint Ives Blvd in District 3 [Outer Village Residential Neighborhood] within the City of Hudson.

Attachments: [BZBA Staff Report - 7030 St Ives Blvd](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by displaying the property, describing the project, and reviewing the staff comments and considerations.

Mr. Brennan Szczepanski, applicant, described and displayed photos of the location of the house and proposed garage on the parcel and stated the hill and easement on the back of the property make the proposed location the only location on the property for the garage as designed. Mr. Szczepanski also described the need for this garage and his discussion with the neighbors who signed a letter in agreement with the variance.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: The drain installed from the back of the house to the front, that the detached garage will have doors that face the street, that the structure will be 20-feet tall, that the previously approved garage was 16 x 28 feet, that the storage needs of the family are dictating the large size of the proposed building, the topography of the properties around the applicants houses, how the applicant will build if the variance is not granted, that the applicant wants the proposed garage to be aligned with the house, and that the garage roof, as proposed, will align with the street view of the house.

The Board discussed: (Mr. Kahrl’s extensive comments could not be heard), that the LDC code allows for unusual or exceptional conditions to receive a variance - however - all the houses in the development have odd shaped lots, that because this is a common lot size and type - the Duncan Factors will not give reason for approving the variance, that the lot is not typical of Hudson houses as a whole, and that the shed may be designed in other ways which will meet most of the homeowner’s needs,

Mr. Szczepanski noted that the variance request is only 31 square feet, and that the neighbor’s view will not be as pleasant if built without receiving the variance.

After reviewing the application, the hearing of evidence under oath, reviewing all documentary submissions of interested parties and by taking into consideration the personal knowledge of the property in question, Mr. Kahrl made a motion, seconded by Mr. Scott, that the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals hereby deny the following:

A variance request of five (5) feet from the required side yard accessory structure setback of fifteen (15) feet, resulting in a side yard setback of ten (10) feet pursuant to section 1205.06(d)(5)(D)(4), “Property Development/Design Standards – Setbacks” of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to build a detached garage.

The Board finds and concludes;

1. **The Board acknowledges that there would be beneficial use of the property without the variance, as the property in question currently has a functioning 2-car garage.**
2. **The requested 33% variance is deemed substantial.**
3. **The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered, and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.**
4. **The variances would not affect the delivery of governmental services.**
5. **The existing regulations were in effect when the applicant purchased the property in 2022.**
6. **The Board finds that the applicant's predicament can be resolved feasibly through some method other than granting the variance. The Board notes that by adjusting the angle of the proposed structure, the applicant could construct the garage to meet all Land Development Code requirements.**
7. **The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would not be observed and substantial justice would not be done by granting the variance.**

Aye: 3 - Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein and Mr. Scott

Nay: 1 - Mr. Wagner

[BZBA 25-247](#) The subject of this hearing is a variance request of five (5) feet from the required side yard principle structure setback of eight (8) feet, resulting in a side yard setback of three (3) feet pursuant to section 1205.07(d)(6) (B)(1), "Property Development/Design Standards - Setbacks" of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to build an addition.

The applicant is Rebecca Pantuso, Pantuso Architecture, 30 S. Franklin Street, Chagrin Falls, Ohio 44022. The property owners are David and Lisa Lemmons, 78 Aurora Street, Hudson, Ohio 44236 for the property at 78 Aurora St in District 4 [Historic Residential Neighborhood] within the City of Hudson.

Attachments: [BZBA Staff Report - 78 Aurora St](#)

Ms. Coffman introduced the application by describing: The property, the 1880 build date of the house, the proposed project, and the staff comments and considerations.

Ms. Rebecca Pantuso, Pantuso Architecture, described the 380 square foot addition, the nonconforming preexisting conditions, the steep lot leading to the garage, the garage being too close to the setback, the house being closer to the garage than currently allowed, the existing stairs from the second floor to the first floor being very steep, and that a fence does not follow the true property line.

The Board, applicant, and staff discussed: The correct property lines, the location of the three-story elevator, other ways to design the project and what variances would be needed, that the house at present is a nonconforming structure, that the definition of an attached and non-detached garage is the issue, that nothing is

being added to make the nonconforming structures more nonconforming, and previous cases with similar variance requests.

After reviewing the application, the hearing of evidence under oath, reviewing all documentary submissions of interested parties and by taking into consideration the personal knowledge of the property in question, Mr. Kahrl made a motion, seconded by Ms. Bronstein, that the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals hereby grant the following:

A variance request of five (5) feet from the required side yard principal structure setback of eight (8) feet, resulting in a side yard setback of three (3) feet pursuant to section 1205.07(d)(6)(B)(1), "Property Development/Design Standards – Setbacks" of the City of Hudson Land Development Code in order to build an addition.

The Board finds and concludes;

- 1. The Board acknowledges that there would be beneficial use of the property without the variance, as the property in question currently has a functioning 2-car garage.**
- 2. The requested 63% variance is deemed substantial; however, the Board notes that the existing garage is currently a non-confirming structure that was constructed prior to the adoption of the Land Development Code in 1999.**
- 3. The essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered, and adjoining properties would not suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.**
- 4. The variances would not affect the delivery of governmental services.**
- 5. The existing regulations were not effect when the applicant purchased the property in 1988.**
- 6. The Board finds that the applicant's predicament can be resolved feasibly through some method other than granting the variance; however, the Board finds that the proposed attachment of the existing garage to the main mass would be the most efficient and practical use of the property in question.**
- 7. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice would be done by granting the variance.**

Aye: 4 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein and Mr. Scott

VII. Other Business

Ms. Coffman discussed the upcoming applications for the May meeting, and noted the database of previous cases is progressing with a possible demonstration at the May meeting.

This matter was discussed

[BZBA - Submittal Requirements](#) **Discussion of Planning Commission Subcommittee - Review of Appendix A - Submittal Requirements**

Attachments: [Staff Memo to BZBA Submittal Requirements](#)

The Board discussed the review of Appendix A - Submittal Requirements, and staff's recommendations for changes of: 1) Application submittal requirements. 2) How Planning Commission should make decisions that might be referred to BZBA for appeal.

The Board and acting solicitor discussed the bifurcation of appeals with BZBA and City Council both having authority, the acting solicitor's advise against the Board members having group communication outside of a noticed meeting, and how a subcommittee is formed.

VIII. Adjournment

A motion was made by Mr. Kahrl, seconded by Mr. Scott, that this be adjourned. The motion carried by the following vote:

Aye: 4 - Mr. Wagner, Mr. Kahrl, Ms. Bronstein and Mr. Scott

Lou Wagner, Acting Chair

Lydia Bronstein, Board Member

Joe Campbell, Executive Assistant

Upon approval by the Board of Zoning & Building Appeals, this official written summary of the meeting minutes shall become a permanent record, and the official minutes shall also consist of a permanent audio and video recording, excluding executive sessions, in accordance with Codified Ordinances, Section 252.04, Minutes of Architectural and Historic Board of Review, Board of Zoning and Building Appeals, and Planning Commission.

* * *