



CITY of MEDINA

Board of Zoning Appeals

Regular Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2025

Meeting Date: September 11, 2025

Meeting Time: 7:00 PM

Present: Steve Cooper, Kyle Funk, Bert Humpal, Logan Johnson, Paul Roszak, Andrew Dutton (Community Development Director), and Sarah Tome (Administrative Assistant)

Election of Vice-Chair of the Board

Mr. Funk made a motion to appoint Mr. Roszak as Vice-Chair of the Board of Zoning Appeals.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Cooper.

Vote:

Cooper	<u>Y</u>	Funk	<u>Y</u>
Humpal	<u>Y</u>	Johnson	<u>Y</u>
Roszak	<u>Y</u>		
Approved	<u>5-0</u>		

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Funk made a motion to approve the minutes from August 14, 2025, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Roszak.

Vote:

Funk	<u>Y</u>	Humpal	<u>Y</u>
Johnson	<u>Abstained</u>	Roszak	<u>Y</u>
Cooper	<u>Abstained</u>		
Approved	<u>3-0</u> with Mr. Johnson and Mr. Cooper asbstaining		

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

Applications

1. Z25-24 Justin Hadricky 245 Lafayette Road VAR

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant proposed to remove the existing nonconforming pole sign, remove two Valero signs, and install signs on the southwest and northeast sides of the canopy.

He noted that the proposed signs were 32.3 sq. ft. and contained a solid Amoco panel and digital pricing.

Mr. Dutton stated that, per Section 1147.07(j) of the Zoning Code, electronic message center signs were prohibited in the TC-OV District and were only permitted on ground signs. He noted that, by definition, electronic changeable pricing was considered an electronic message center sign. He added that the proposed wall signs required a variance as they were located in the TC-OV and were not ground signs.

Mr. Dutton continued that the second variance requested was for the size of the signs. He noted that the canopy was 47 ft. in width, allowing a 47 sq. ft. wall sign on the primary building frontage and an 11.75 sq. ft. wall sign on the secondary frontage. Mr. Dutton stated that two 32.3 sq. ft. wall signs were proposed on the canopy, therefore, whichever was considered the secondary frontage exceeded the maximum size by 20.55 sq. ft. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had indicated the following regarding the Standards for Variances and Appeals:

- Construction of the signs would not obstruct motorists' vision or affect safety.
- Exceeding the maximum area standard was aesthetically appropriate, would ease visibility, and would not impact traffic flow.
- The proposal would not adversely impact the character or appearance of the building, as the appearance would improve due to the removal of the existing pole sign.

Present for the case was Justin Hadricky of TRM Contracting, 535 Freeport Road, Creighton, PA. Mr. Hadricky stated that he was trying to conform with Amoco's branding standards. He noted that the proposed price signs did not contain letters or scrolling messages and would only display the gas prices.

Mr. Humpal opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public. Mr. Roszak inquired as to how the business currently changed the price on their pole sign. Mr. Hadricky stated that they were currently changing it by hand. He noted that the proposed signs would let them change the price by remote.

Mr. Roszak asked what the size of the proposed EMC signs would be. It was established that the electronic message center portions on the proposed signage were 3 ft. x 3 ft. 8 in.

Mr. Humpal stated that he had no issues with the proposal.

Mr. Funk made a motion to allow the electronic message center signs and a sign larger than permitted, stating that the signs would not greatly impact traffic flow, would allow for ease of visibility, and would not obstruct visibility for traffic.

Mr. Cooper seconded the motion.

Vote:

Humpal	<u>Y</u>	Johnson	<u>Y</u>
Roszak	<u>Y</u>	Cooper	<u>Y</u>
Funk	<u>Y</u>		
Approved	<u>5-0</u>		

2. Z25-17 Ross Romine 823 North Broadway Street VAR (Revised)

Mr. Dutton stated that the Board had previously reviewed this site in July for a three-season room and a deck located 25 ft. from the rear property line. He added that the application had required a variance to Section 1121.05, which required a 30 ft. setback. Mr. Dutton continued that the applicant had revised the application to include a full addition to the rear of the home, a garage under the addition, and the expansion of the driveway. He noted that the 25 ft. rear setback would be maintained from the original proposal.

Present for the case was Ross Romine, 823 North Broadway Street. Mr. Romine stated that when he believed he could maximize his house by adding a full addition and creating a garage for storage underneath. He noted that the proposed driveway expansion would allow him to park his work truck further back on the property.

Mr. Humpal opened the public hearing. There were no members of the public present to address the Board.

Mr. Humpal asked if Mr. Dutton had received any comments from neighbors. Mr. Dutton stated that he had not.

Mr. Funk noted that they were not reviewing the driveway in the variance application. Mr. Dutton confirmed that driveways did not have a required setback.

Mr. Roszak made a motion to approve the variance with the revised plan for the two-story addition, stating that the essential character of the neighborhood would not be substantially altered, adjoining properties would not suffer substantial detriment as a result of the variance, and the variance would not affect the delivery of government services.

Mr. Funk seconded the motion.

Vote:

Johnson	<u>Y</u>	Roszak	<u>Y</u>
Cooper	<u>Y</u>	Funk	<u>Y</u>
Humpal	<u>Y</u>		
Approved	<u>5-0</u>		

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Bert Humpal, Chairman