

**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES
Mayfield Village
Dec 16, 2025**

The Board of Zoning Appeals met in regular meeting session on Tues, Dec 16, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. at the Mayfield Village Civic Center, Main Conference Room. Chairman DiFranco presided.

ROLL CALL

Present:

Mr. Stivo DiFranco	Chairman	Ms. Kathryn Weber	Assistant Director of Law
Mr. John Michalko	Chairman Pro Tem	Mr. Daniel Russell	Building Commissioner
Mr. Jim Kless	P & Z Rep to BZA	Ms. Deborah Garbo	Secretary
Ms. Alexandra Jeanblanc			
Mr. Bob Haycox			

Absent:

Mr. Bob Andrzejczyk Alternate

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: Oct 21, 2025

Mr. Haycox, seconded by Mr. Kless made a motion to approve the minutes of Oct 21, 2025 as written.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: Mr. DiFranco, Mr. Kless, Ms. Jeanblanc, Mr. Haycox

Abstain: Mr. Michalko

Nays: None **Motion Carried**
 Minutes Approved

CONSIDERATION OF CASE NUMBER 2025-06

Applicant: Charles Schulman
6933 Wilson Mills Rd 44040
PPN # 831-25-006

- 1) A request for a front yard setback variance 5' 8 inch variance (for the garage) and 3' 6 inch variance (for the front porch) from Section 1181.07 (e) to allow for construction of a front yard addition.

Abutting Property Owners:

Wilson Mills Rd: 6941, 6947, 6917, 6928, 6918
Hanover Rd: 780

OPEN PORTION

Chairman DiFranco called the meeting to order. Good Evening everyone, this is a meeting of the Mayfield Village Board of Zoning Appeals, Tues, Dec 16, 2025 at 6:00 p.m. We have one case before us today, consideration of Case #2025-06, the applicant is Charles Schulman at 6933 Wilson Mills Rd, 44040, PPN #831-25-006. The request is for a front yard setback variance of 5' 8" for the garage and 3' 6" variance for the front porch from Section 1181.07 (e) to allow for construction of a front yard addition.

Mr. Russell stated, we have a change, it's only going to be a 3' 6" variance. The paperwork initially had showed the 3' 6" and the 5' 8" but the main plan only shows 3' 6". It's a front porch kitchen area.

Chairman DiFranco said, the abutting property owners on Wilson Mills Rd and one on Hanover Rd have been notified.

OATH

Chairman DiFranco stated, because we are a Quasi-Judicial Body, anyone wishing to speak must be sworn in. Chairman DiFranco administered the Oath to Bob Cancasci with the Architects office and Charles Schulman, homeowner.

Chairman DiFranco invited Bob Cancasci to proceed with his presentation.

Presentation *by* Bob Cancasci, Architects Office

Bob Cancasci stated, what we're presenting is a 3' 6" setback from the 90' from the center of Wilson Mills Rd. to the setback. I don't know if it's on this drawing, or on the second, but there is another variance plan that we submitted that shows this garage was moved over so it's equal to the 3' 6". If you don't have it, I brought one. There you go, that's the one. So that's the variance that we're proposing, the 3' 6" difference from the 90' from the front of Wilson Mills Rd.

Chairman DiFranco asked, Dan can you describe this variance for us please.

Mr. Russell stated, they're required to have a 90' setback from the middle of Wilson Mills. A lot of the houses on that street are even closer than theirs.

Charles Schulman stated, 14 of the houses between SOM Ctr Rd and Robley are closer than 90', some of them as close as 71'.

Ms. Jeanblanc stated, you'd get a very strange looking house if you kept sliding the addition over.

Mr. Russell agreed. They're not encroaching anything more on the sideyard and setbacks at all.

Ms. Weber said Stivo, to answer your question, this is an area variance, so you would need to demonstrate that there's a practical difficulty, so you'll need to determine whether or not the literal enforcement of the zoning code would result in a practical difficulty here.

Charles Schulman stated very simply, it's an existing home, I purchased the home in 1983, I added a second floor 35 years ago. We had a galley kitchen in the home, 5 bedroom, 3 ½ bath home with a galley kitchen and a very small garage. So we wanted to expand the garage, move it out and have a 2 ½ car garage in front of the existing garage and we wanted to have a larger kitchen. We're only asking for a variance actually to the corner of each of those rooms. The majority of the new additions are well within the 90'. It's just for literally the corner of both the garage and the kitchen.

Chairman DiFranco asked, is there any other way, if you made the garage smaller-

Charles Schulman replied, then it wouldn't be a 2 ½ car garage.

Mr. Michalko asked, your garage now faces Robley?

Charles Schulman replied no, it faces Wilson Mills.

Mr. Haycox asked, so you're retaining the existing garage and just adding onto the front of it?

Charles Schulman replied, correct. Preferentially we'd like to do the 5' 8" just because of the way it lays out. We're going to have to make the garage smaller than what we had intended because of the size of that small corner. This corner right here is what we're talking about on the kitchen and this corner right here is what we're talking about in the garage and that's it. Everything else is well within the 90' setback.

Mr. Haycox asked, are you planning on redoing your driveway closer to Robley?

Charles Schulman replied, if we need to, we don't need to according to the plan. And we widened the driveway 30 years ago so we'd have adequate parking in the drive.

Mr. Michalko said, so there's only two small portions that you're bringing out closer.

Charles Schulman replied, just two small corners, but it makes the house substantially more livable.

Chairman DiFranco asked, Katie do you have any concerns?

Ms. Weber replied, I do not.

Chairman DiFranco asked, Dan do you have any concerns?

Mr. Russell replied, I do not.

Chairman DiFranco asked Board Members, any other concerns?

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, so which variance are you requesting, the bigger one or the smaller one?

Charles Schulman replied, I'd prefer if you'd be willing to consider it, the 5' 8".

Mr. Russell stated, we don't have a plan showing that, we have a plan showing at 3' 6".

Charles Schulman said, I would prefer it be the first plan you looked at, 5' 8" if you'd be willing to consider that.

Ms. Jeanblanc asked Dan, is there a problem with that plan?

Mr. Russell replied, no.

Chairman DiFranco stated, we need to know what you're submitting for.

Charles Schulman replied, we prefer to do the 5' 8". We'll settle for the 3' 6" if you won't consider the 5' 8". It's kind of a stilted look if you do it with the 3' 6" rather than the 5' 8".

Ms. Weber asked Dan, were both sets of plans submitted to you to review?

Mr. Russell replied, I reviewed it and I came up with my initial variances they're required to have but I talked to the Architect and they wanted the 3' 6" initially specifically.

Ms. Weber stated, since both sets of plans were submitted to you then I'd say that the applicant can at this time decide what they would like this Board to consider.

Charles Schulman stated, 5' 8" if the Board is willing to consider it.

Chairman DiFranco stated, then let's make sure the record shows 5' 8" and then 3' 6" on the kitchen side.

Chairman DiFranco said, one thing that's been brought up was that there are other houses that are even closer.

Mr. Michalko said, I can agree with him that there's a lot of them that are a lot closer. I live on Wilson Mills, mine is farther back than my neighbors by the width of his house.

Chairman DiFranco stated, the precedent is there. I do think that look is going to be better for you.

Chairman DiFranco said, let me start back again with Katie, do you have any concerns with the change?

Ms. Weber replied, no. I would just note that in your motion.

Chairman DiFranco asked Dan, any concerns?

Mr. Russell replied, no concerns.

Chairman DiFranco asked Board Members, any concerns?

Mr. Michalko replied, no concerns, it gives him the space he actually needs.

Ms. Jeanblanc replied, to your point, so many of the neighbors are much closer. I think we've covered practical difficulty.

Chairman DiFranco stated, I'll read the criteria for granting a variance;

In granting an Area Variance, the Board shall determine that one or both of the following factors are met by the request:

- a. 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
- b. 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.

Chairman DiFranco said, it seems that they might meet both of those in my mind.

DECISION

Mr. Kless, seconded by Mr. Haycox made a motion to approve the request for a front yard setback variance of 5' 8" for the garage and 3' 6" for the front porch from Section 1181.07 (e) to allow for construction of a front yard addition.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: Mr. DiFranco, Mr. Michalko, Mr. Kless, Ms. Jeanblanc, Mr. Haycox

Nays: None

Motion Carried
Variance Approved

Right to Appeal

Chairman DiFranco stated, you or any interested party has the right to appeal the decision within ten (10) days to Council.

ANY OTHER MATTERS

Chairman DiFranco asked, are there any other matters to come before the BZA tonight that anybody would like to discuss?

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DiFranco, seconded by Ms. Jeanblanc, made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

Chairman

Secretary