

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS**  
WALNUT TOWNSHIP, FAIRFIELD COUNTY, OH - BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS (BZA)  
11420 Millersport Rd., Millersport, OH 43067  
**HEARING #25-69 MEETING MINUTES**  
JUNE 12, 2025 7:00 PM

**Board of Zoning Appeals members present/absent**

Members present - Alex Fant, Martha Snavely, Ken Rienscheld, Mark Helms, Ron Sharpe

Members absent: Rick Singer, Alternate

**Zoning Inspector:** Mike Berry – present

**List of members of the public present, from sign-in sheet:**

1. Charles Pillon, 13699 Laurel Rd.

**Advertised Purpose of Hearing:** Requesting variance from Section 10.2A front yard setback (R2 25').

**Chair administered the oath to all members addressing the Board of Zoning Appeals. Chair administered the oath to all members addressing the Board of Zoning Appeals. Swearing in of ALL members of the public that intend to speak by the Chair:** Chair stated. Any member of the public intending to speak or think they may want to speak during these proceedings shall rise to be sworn in. Please raise your right hand and repeat *"I state your name, agree to tell the truth the whole truth and nothing but the truth during these proceedings, so help me God"*.

**Discussion:** Chair Fant asked the applicant to state the reason for application. Charles Pillon, neighbor and builder, representing Jerry and Linda Van Meter, 5461 Lakeshore Dr. NE. He is requesting a 15' road setback. Encroachment in to the front yard setback on Lakeshore Dr. This would still allow the house approximately 45' setback and in no way would affect a clear view vision at the intersection of Laurel Rd. and Lake Shore Dr. The front of the house will be facing North on Lakeshore.

He is trying to request the front setback be closer to the road but maintains at 35' is more than its standard setback from the road. It will not impede the view from both directions. Also, the front porch is 10' of the setback. He said he staked the lot to show where the current setbacks are.

Currently looking at 35' off the road to the property line itself. Mike Berry said that the current road right of way is 40' but Charles stated that the road right of way is actually 60'. The road is only one side of the right of way, on the north side. Chair Fant asked if he was building up to the property line with the porch, and Charles Pillon replied no. Chair Fant asked if there was any impediment of water, sewer, garbage etc., and Charles replied no.

**Information provided to the Board of Zoning Appeals prior to the proceedings:**

**Exhibit #25-69 - A (4 pgs.):** Zoning Application #25-69

**Exhibit #25-69 – B (1 pgs.)** Setback Drawing

**Exhibit #2569 – C (1 pgs.):** Auditor's Site Survey

**Exhibit #25-69 – D – (2 pgs.):** Property Photos

**Exhibit #25-55– E - (2 pgs.):** Notice to Property Owners (contiguous)

**Exhibit #25-69 – F (1 pgs.):** List of Property Owners (contiguous)

Is the applicant asking for a variance dealing with?

- I. **Area Variance:** If the applicant is asking for a variance in the area requirements of the Code (size, setbacks, etc.), a variance should be granted if strict adherence results in practical difficulties with the use of the property. To determine if there is a practical difficulty, using the variance application and testimony from the applicant at hearing, review the following:

- a. In granting an Area Variance, the Board shall determine that one or both of the following factors are met by the request:
  - i. The conditions upon which an application for a Variance is based are particular to the subject property with respect to the physical size, shape or other characteristics of the premises or adjoining premises, differentiating it from other premises in the same district; or “we have that in that the layout of the roadway, no fault through the previous or current owners have responsibility of how it was laid out,”
  - ii. The Variance would result in an improvement of the property that is more appropriate and more beneficial to the community than would be the case without granting of the Variance. “currently, there is an empty lot, so a single-family home would be more beneficial.”
- b. In granting an Area Variance, the Board shall also determine that all of the following factors are met by the request:
  - i. 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; “obviously a single- family home that sits 25’ back from road right-of-way fits”
  - ii. The spirit and intent behind the subject zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the Variance; “still within the road setback”
  - iii. The Variance is not substantial and is the minimum necessary to afford relief to the applicant and achieve an appropriate and beneficial improvement of the property; and “
  - iv. The Variance would not adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (e.g., water, sewer, garbage). “not impacting government services”
- c. In granting an Area Variance, the Board shall also consider the following factors:
  - i. Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the restriction; “Chair thinks they did since it was just purchased in 2024 and restrictions have been in place since 2004.”
  - ii. Whether the property in question will yield a reasonable return or whether there be any beneficial use of the property without the Variance; and “Chair thinks we balance with that”
  - iii. Whether the property owner’s predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a Variance.

Chair Fant asked for a Motion to Approve Variance Application #25-69, Martha Snavelly made a motion to approve, Ron Sharp seconded the motion.

**Roll call: Fant, Yes, for the reasons stated in red above, - Helms, Yes for the reasons stated -, - Snavelly - Yes for the reasons stated, Reinschild - Yes for the reasons stated.**  
**Applicant’s proposed variance Application #25-69 5 with 5 yes votes.**

**Adjournment:** Martha Snavelly made a motion to adjourn, Ron Sharpe seconded the motion. The motion passed with 5 yes votes.

Minutes Recorded By: Patricia McLoughlin



Alex Fant – Chair  
Chair



Martha Snavelly - Vice