



**Village of South Russell
5205 Chillicothe Road
South Russell, Ohio 44022
440-338-6700
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES**

June 18, 2025 - 7:00 p.m.

Members Present: Andy Hitchcock, Chairman, Mike Mulloy, Cindy Matejcik

Member Absent: John Buda, Martin O'Toole

Other Officials: Todd Hicks, Solicitor; Dave Hocevar, Building Official;
Mayor Bill Koons; Ruth Griswold, Board Secretary

Visitors: Jaclynn Bosley, 100 Fox Trail; Angelo Alesci, 115 Leaview Lane; Tom
Fowler, 128 Countryside Drive; Quinn Fowler, 128 Countryside Drive

Mr. Hitchcock called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm. Ms. Griswold conducted roll call.

Mr. Hitchcock asked if the board had any questions or comments after reviewing the minutes of the meeting held on May 21, 2025. Hearing none, he made a motion to approve the minutes from May 21, 2025, as is. Ms. Matejcik seconded. On roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hitchcock asked Todd Hicks to swear in anyone who would be giving testimony. Mr. Hicks said the Board of Zoning Appeals is only supposed to listen to sworn testimony. He said anyone who will be speaking tonight, whether an applicant or a member of the public, please raise their right hand. Mr. Hicks swore in the applicants, guests and Mr. Hocevar.

Mr. Hitchcock addressed the applicants and said that typically, the board has five members present. Tonight's meeting was anticipated to have four, but unfortunately one person was unable to make it due to some travel issues. With three members, there is a quorum, but the applicants would need all three votes to be in the affirmative for their applications to be passed. Both applicants understood.

Agenda Item 1: BZA Case #25-09: Angelo Alesci, applicant and owner of the property located at **115 Leaview Lane**, is seeking approval to locate a shed 7' from the side lot line at the rear of the shed and 15' from the side lot line at the front of the shed. Section 4.02 of the South Russell Zoning

Code requires accessory structures to be located at a minimum of 20' from all property lines, requiring an area variance of 13' at the side lot line at the rear and 5' at the side lot line at the front.

Mr. Hitchcock asked Angelo Alesci to give the board a little background as to what brought him before the board today. Mr. Alesci said that on January 2, he received a call from Ruth Griswold saying that it was brought to their attention that he was putting a shed up, and that it seemed too close to the lot line. It was determined that there was no permit. He went on to say that he had discussed the location with his neighbor because the shed would be closer to the lot line than usual. His neighbor agreed and had no issues with the location. His neighbor also wrote a letter, which is submitted as part of the application before the board. Mr. Alesci said he is requesting two variances for the side yard setback, because the shed is situated at an angle.

Mr. Hitchcock asked Mr. Alesci when he began the construction process of the shed. Mr. Alesci said he began the project in the spring and summer of last year. Mr. Hitchcock confirmed that the project was started before Mr. Alesci was made aware that he needed a permit or a variance, or both. Mr. Alesci said that is correct.

Mr. Hitchcock said that Mr. Alesci's application noted mature trees on the property as one of the reasons that would prohibit locating the shed differently and asked him to explain further. Mr. Alesci said their property is one of the most tree-filled on the street, and he loves having them there. He did not want to cut down any trees to put up a shed. The chosen location was the best spot for placement of the shed in order to save the trees. He also wanted it near the driveway.

Mr. Hitchcock said as he drove past the property, he didn't look at the neighbor's house. He asked approximately how close their house and any other buildings are to the lot line. Mr. Alesci said there's nothing back there, and the shed is really far away from the rear lot line. His neighbor also has a lot of trees on the side lot line, but there are no structures near it.

Ms. Matejcik said she had visited and walked the property with Mr. Alesci. Her only concern was with the water flow. Mr. Alesci explained how he had cut out a little bit of the property, but she felt with the creek there, everything was still flowing properly. Ms. Matejcik said she does like that the trees were all left there. They had gone to the neighbor's property to look at the view from there, and all that can be seen are the trees.

Mr. Hitchcock asked Ms. Matejcik and Mr. Mulloy if they had any other questions. They did not. Mr. Hitchcock asked Mr. Alesci if he had any other comments or anything the board should consider. Mr. Alesci said the shed will look beautiful if the board approves it.

Mr. Hitchcock said for BZA Case #25-09 for the property located at 115 Leaview Lane, he makes a motion to approve a 13' variance to the side lot line to permit the rear of a shed to be no closer than 7' from the side property line, which is the north property line. He asked if there were any questions on the motion. There were none. Ms. Matejcik seconded. On roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hitchcock said for BZA Case #25-09 for the property located at 115 Leaview Lane, he makes a motion to approve a 5' variance to the side lot line to permit the front of a shed to be no closer than 15' to the lot line, which is the north property line. Mr. Mulloy seconded. Mr.

Hitchcock asked for any discussions or questions on the motion. There were none. On roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hitchcock told Mr. Alesci he is approved, and said he appreciated him coming out tonight. Mr. Alesci thanked the board.

Agenda Item 2: BZA Case #25-10: Randy and Jaclynn Bosley, applicants and owners of the property located at **100 Fox Trail**, are seeking an area variance of 1,225 square feet, to allow a deck and pool structure in their rear yard. Applicants show their proposed deck and pool to be 1,760 sq ft. and Section 4.01 of the South Russell Zoning Code limits accessory structures to 500 sq ft per acre. At 1.07 acres, this property would allow 535 sq ft. of accessory structures. Proposed structures total 1,760 sq ft, requiring an area variance of 1,225 sq ft for the proposed deck and swimming pool.

Mr. Hitchcock said the board has all the documents Ms. Bosley submitted and asked her to give them a little background to her proposal. Ms. Bosley said they would like to add a semi-in-ground swimming pool to their backyard, adjacent to the back side of their home. They want it to be fully enclosed within a new deck structure. Their current smaller deck would be removed. The new deck would be expanded to accommodate the pool and have an eating or sitting area.

Mr. Hitchcock asked how many square feet the existing deck is. He said he wants to look at the net difference between what they will be removing and what they will be adding. Ms. Bosley said she doesn't have that exact figure, but she would say it's probably about half of what will be there. Ms. Bosley referred to the site plan submitted, noting they are only extending about 5' to the left of the back door, and then the entire length of the 13' pool, and approximately 20' to the right side and very close to the end of the house, which includes a recent addition.

Mr. Hitchcock asked approximately how large the pool is relative to the overall square footage. Ms. Bosley said the pool is 16' x 32', or 512 square feet, and the deck is 1,248 square feet, which totals 1,760 square feet.

Mr. Hitchcock said one of the things that the board is tasked with considering is alternatives and whether the need for a variance could be eliminated or reduced. He asked if the pool was a standard size. Ms. Bosley said yes, the rectangle is a standard size. They also offered round, oval or lagoon shaped. The round ones are larger; the lagoon was 16' x 28', but they did not want the odd shape since it wouldn't be used as a leisure pool, but rather a family pool and mainly used for swimming, which is why they want as much circumference as possible.

Mr. Hitchcock said when he visited the property and walked the yard with Mr. Bosley, he saw that there were many mature trees in the backyard. He asked if the plan included the removal of any trees. Ms. Bosley said there is one smaller interior tree that must be removed in order to get the equipment in without cutting it too close. The other trees were removed on the recommendation of the tree company, since they were diseased and posed a hazard. She said the other trees in the bed also have the same disease, and they will be removed as well. The removal of these trees was not related to the project; the only one to be removed because of the project will be the small one on the interior of the yard.

Ms. Matejcik said she also walked the yard, but there was no one home at the time. She asked what would be on the lower edge of the pool decking. Ms. Bosley said there will be a two-foot perimeter border for landscaping such as ornamental grass and other plantings yet to be decided. Ms. Matejcik said she wanted to be sure it was closed off enough for safety reasons. Ms. Bosley said there will only be one entrance from the exterior, which is where the locked gate will be, and the railings have been approved by Village Council to serve as the required fencing. Ms. Matejcik asked if they had looked at other options for the size of the pool as Mr. Hitchcock had mentioned, such as how to make it more compact so as to lessen the area variance needed. Ms. Bosley said because of the way their yard is sloped, they wanted to do the semi-in-ground pool vs a fully in-ground pool. There are more options if you go with a standardized in-ground pool. They would still need the same variance for the deck side, and the next size down for this pool would be 14' x 28' and that's just not a lot of swimming area. The awkward shaped options would have been smaller, and they really wanted a rectangle or an oval. She said for their need and what they are looking to do, the medium size pool was the best choice. She went on to say that two of their neighbors both have in-ground pools of similar size, but they also have a pool house and a deck, and they have less acreage than their property. She feels that their choice of the medium size is not grandiose or extravagant, and there will be no slides or extra additions to the pool project.

Mr. Mulloy asked if there were any neighbors present to speak. There were none, and he confirmed that they had all been notified.

Mr. Hitchcock said, as he mentioned before, they have a handful of criteria to consider when making decisions, and most of them do not apply to this situation. The one that is reasonably relevant is the significance of the area variance request, which is roughly two and a half times what the code allows. He said he would be hung up on that if this sizable variance was for a detached accessory structure. Mr. Hitchcock said if their proposal was for an attached addition or expansion to their home, they wouldn't even be here, since they would be well within their ability to do that. They do view pools and decks differently than kitchens and dining rooms. The fact that the existing deck would be removed, and that this is attached to the house, and that really only one neighbor is affected makes him a lot more comfortable with it. Ms. Bosley said that neighbor will be putting in a pool next year.


Mr. Hitchcock asked board members if they had any further questions. There were none.

Mr. Hitchcock said for BZA Case #25-10, for the property located at 100 Fox Trail, he makes a motion to approve an area variance of 1,225 square feet, to permit a deck and pool structure no greater than 1,760 square feet. Mr. Mulloy seconded. Mr. Hitchcock asked for any discussion or questions on the motion. Hearing none, he asked for roll call. On roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Hitchcock told Ms. Bosley she is approved, and he hopes they enjoy the pool. Ms. Bosley thanked the board.

Mr. Hitchcock said they already have one applicant for the Board of Zoning Appeals meeting on July 16. Ms. Griswold confirmed that, and said the applicants are aware that only four board members are able to attend.

Mr. Hitchcock asked if there was any **Old Business**. There was none. He asked for any **New Business**. Hearing none, he adjourned the meeting at 7:27 pm.



Andy Hitchcock, Chairman

July 16, 2025

Date



Ruth Griswold, Board Secretary

7-16-2025

Date