BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
MEETING MINUTES
Mayfield Village
October 20, 2026

The Board of Zoning Appeals met in regular meeting session on Tues, October 20, 2026 at 6:00 p.m. at the Mayfield Village Civic Center, Main Conference Room. Chairman Pro Tem Michalko presided.

ROLL CALL
Present:

Mr. John Michalko	Chairman Pro Tem	Ms. Kathryn Weber	Assistant Law Director
Mr. Bob Haycox		Mr. Daniel Russell	Building Commissioner
Mr. Bob Andrzejczyk	Alternate	Ms. Lisa Levine	Secretary
Ms. Alexandra Jeanblanc		Mr. John Marquart	Economic Dev. Manager

Absent:
Mr. Stivo DiFranco Chairman
Ms. Diane Calta Law Director

Also Present:
Councilman Michael Girbino

CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES: August 18, 2026
Discussion was had to postpone approval of the meeting minutes due to not having a quorum present from the August 18, 2026 meeting. Approval of meeting minutes tabled until next meeting.

CONSIDERATION OF CASE NUMBER 2026-10-01
Applicant: Paul & Rachel Baucco PPN #831-38-014
903 SOM Center Rd.
Detached Garage
Homeowner

1. The applicant is requesting to demo the existing detached garage and build a 1232 sq. ft. detached garage with a 7-foot side yard setback.

Abutting Property Owners:
SOM Ctr: 881,891,899,915,929
Glenview: 6695,6689,6688,6679,6680

CONSIDERATION OF CASE NUMBER 2026-10-02

Applicant: Progressive Insurance PPN #831-06-002
300 North Commons
Signage
MGR Real Estate

1. The applicant is requesting multiple zoning variances to replace existing directional signs with new. They will also be installing signs on existing light poles thru-out the parking lots.

Abutting Property Owners:

Altercare Rehabilitation Ctr.: 290 NC Blvd
Governors Village Assisted Living: 280 NC Blvd

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko called the meeting to order. Welcome, this is a meeting of the Mayfield Village Board of Zoning Appeals, Tues, October 20, 2026. It is 6:00 p.m.

OPEN PORTION

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko stated, we have two cases to consider today, consideration of Case #2026-10-01, Rachel & Paul Baucco PPN #831-38-014, 903 SOM Ctr. The applicant is requesting to demo the existing detached garage and build a 1232 sq. ft. detached garage with a 7-foot side yard setback. The abutting property owners on Glenview and SOM Ctr. have been notified.

OATH

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko stated, because we are a Quasi-Judicial Body, anyone wishing to speak must be sworn in. Whoever is to make a presentation please state your name for the record and I'll swear you in. Chairman Pro Tem Michalko swore in the applicant and invited Paul Baucco to speak.

Paul Baucco
903 SOM Ctr. Rd.

Presentation by Paul Baucco, Homeowner

Paul Baucco said, I mean, you guys have everything in front of you, obviously, but the garage is pretty much dilapidated. Whoever did it last took the post out of the middle, so I'm not even going to go park in there. So last house I don't put that car in either. But yeah, I mean, I proposed to put a four car, yeah, four car garage up, two doors. You know, so I could park all my cars and have somewhere. It's not like the house is very big, so it'll give us somewhere to, you know, maybe have family over in the summer. We put tables in there in one of the bays, but I know it says on there that it's a lift bay, but and that's because he knew at my last house I had a lift for my Corvette, so that I could put a car under it. But I'm probably not going to put one in because I don't need that anymore. You know, my kids live there.

I mean, we have three cars. Sure, I'll buy another one. So four cars pretty much suits us. It's not going to be super tall. I'm not going to live above it or anything like that, you know. So, yeah, I

think that's what he had called it the lift bay, but that's just where I had my lift on the last one. And we're not going to do this section. So, the phase one. That's why I had Terry put that as a phase one because I'm going to do the garage now. That way, I have somewhere to store my cars in the winter, and this may or may not happen in the future because I'm not sure I like how it would connect to the house. So, I may just do a nice outside area.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko said, and one of the variances you're asking for is instead of the 10 foot variance, you want seven. You want seven foot. Yes?

Paul Baucco replied, so seven foot actually would meet with the house. It would go on the same plane. The current garage right now is actually closer.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko said, Yeah, it's two feet off the-

Paul Baucco replied, yeah, and I talked to my neighbor last night. They really don't care. He parks his truck behind my garage, so it would actually give him more room, anyways. Even coming off, so seven foot, you know, I don't care. I think if we ended up connecting the house and the garage, it would just look nicer, you know. So that's the reason why he did that. Quite honestly, in the beginning, I didn't know where it sat on the property line. You know, I mean-

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, is that street facing?

Paul Baucco replied, no, it's the side yard.

Ms. Jeanblanc responded, okay.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko replied, okay, that faces Glenview.

Ms. Jeanblanc replied, just checking.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko replied, yeah.

Paul Baucco replied, no, well the back of the property, the side property line faces the next door neighbor.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko, right, but the garages are facing.

Paul Baucco replied, yes, the garage faces, and I think that must have been something they did later on because I know I have an apron in my front yard. So I'm pretty sure the driveway used to be coming up the side yard, but they changed that, which is all the better anyways. But yeah, I just you know it'll be a very nice garage. It will not be an eyesore. And really, the only difference between a 10 foot and a seven foot setback is the fact that it will match up with the house if I do put an addition or you know. I mean seven foot is going to give him more room to put his cars over there, anyways.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko said, well, actually, you're going to be more in compliance by moving it because you're only two foot off of it right now.

Paul Baucco replied, right. And I mean it's just you know, depends on how much concrete I'm going to have in the future going up to the garage. Quite honestly, you know, whether it comes out 10 feet or seven feet-

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko said, and you're also asking for a 432 sq ft. variance for the size of the garage.

Paul Baucco replied, yeah, that I never knew. You know, they told me that.

Mr. Russell said, yeah. He's allowed up 800 square feet because of his rear lot.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko said, right.

Mr. Russell replied, so he's going for 1232 sq ft. So a 432 sq ft. variance.

Paul Baucco replied, but essentially, it's my backyard goes so much further back. It's nowhere near. It's still nowhere near the neighbors. You know the bush line. I mean, since it'll just be a longer garage. But I'm not going to have like four doors. I'm just going to have two nice doors and a man door on the side.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko asked, do you have to widen the garage concrete or anything?

Paul Baucco replied, oh, it's all got to get ripped out. Yeah.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko asked, does he need a separate variance for a wider driveway?

Mr. Russell said, well, he's going to have to have a driveway to attach the garage itself.

Paul Baucco replied, yeah. What I am probably, obviously, going to have to do is take all the concrete out because that stuff is just done. You know, it's all pitted and cracked, so that'll all go. And then I'll cut the concrete across where the garage is going to come to, where the new floor is going to come to. Then we'll just, you know, make the driveway go wider.

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, do we have to do these two together?

Ms. Weber said, so right now he's asking for two variances. The first variance is the setback variance of three feet, and then the other variance is 432 square foot area variance. You can take those two separately. They do not need to be together.

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, I'm saying that if he's also going to need a variance for the driveway, should we do that?

Ms. Weber replied, well, that's not in front of us because he would have to file a permit application in order to install the driveway, and we don't know when he's proposing it.

Paul Baucco replied, so I think right now the biggest thing is just getting the garage up. You know, so we can actually store cars in the winter.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko asked, are we doing that together?

Ms. Weber replied, I would vote on both of these variances separate.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko asked, does anybody have any questions,

Mr. Andrzejczyk asked, is that stone on there?

Paul Baucco replied, well, yes, but when I went to the architectural review board meeting, because there's no stone on the house, so they didn't really like that idea. So I said I'll do brick, you know. So considering the fact that I'm not going to do stone because I'm probably not going to do the addition part of it. If I do, then I guess I'll you know go to the zoning again. If I had to do the entire brick around my house in stone to match it, then I guess I would you know if that's what I wanted to do, but they said it didn't match. So, I said well then we'll do brick, so that is fine.

DECISION

Mr. Haycox, seconded by Ms. Jeanblanc made a motion to approve the side yard setback variance as requested:

1) The applicant is requesting a setback of three ft.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: Chairman Pro Tem Michalko, Ms. Jeanblanc, Mr. Haycox, Mr. Andrzejczyk
Nays:

Vote Taken
Variance Approved

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko said, are there any other questions? We have a motion for the second variance.

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, do we know what are the justifications for the size exception?

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko then read the criteria in 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.

Ms. Weber replied, and so to determine whether or not there is a practical difficulty there are a number of factors that are outlined in the applicants application they submitted.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko asked, are there any more questions?

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, well, do we know what size the house itself is? Because I know that like new builds, there's a minimum size, and that a lot of the older homes are smaller than that.

Paul Baucco replied, it's approximately 1450 square feet, I believe.

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, and isn't the new standard 1800? So, could the practical difficulty be met by the fact that this is smaller than we want houses to be if they're a new build?

Ms. Weber replied, I can go through the factors with you if that would be helpful for you to find the practical difficulty. But one of the factors is the uniqueness of the property. Other factors that you're to consider are will the property in question yield a reasonable return, or can there be an economically beneficial use of the property without the variance?

Ms. Jeanblanc replied, because we do have the applicant stating that you know they're planning on using it to compensate for size of the house for family gatherings. So perhaps that's how we move that requirement.

Ms. Weber replied, it would be up to the board.

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko asked if anyone had any more questions and there were none.

DECISION
Mr. Haycox, seconded by Mr. Andrzejcyk made a motion to approve the area variance as requested:

2) The applicant is requesting a variance of 432 sq ft.

ROLL CALL
Ayes: Chairman Pro Tem Michalko, Ms. Jeanblanc, Mr. Haycox, Mr. Andrzejczyk
Nays:

Vote Taken
Variance Approved

Right to Appeal

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko stated, you or any interested party has the right to appeal the decision within ten (10) days to Council. You will receive a notice in the mail regarding the approval.

Paul Baucco replied, okay, so then after 10 days, I'll talk to you about permits and stuff.

Mr. Russell replied, yeah, you can talk to me during that period of time, but I can't issue anything. Just give me a good plan of exactly what you're doing and what they already be approved on that plan too. So you have one success plan, two sets of drawings.

Paul Baucco replied, okay I'll call you.

OPEN PORTION

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko stated, our second case to consider today, consideration of Case #2026-10-02, Progressive Insurance PPN #831-06-002, 300 North Commons. The applicant is requesting multiple zoning variances to replace existing directional signs with new. They will also be installing signs on existing light posts throughout the parking lot. The abutting property owners on North Commons have been notified.

OATH

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko stated, because we are a Quasi-Judicial Body, anyone wishing to speak must be sworn in. Whoever is to make a presentation please state your name for the record and I'll swear you in. Chairman Pro Tem Michalko swore in the applicants and invited Kevin McGrath and Lyndsey Wolfram to speak.

Kevin McGrath
Lyndsey Wolfram
Progressive Insurance

Presentation by Kevin McGrath & Lyndsey Wolfram, Progressive

Kevin McGrath said, okay, Mr. Chairman, I'm Kevin McGrath with Progressive Insurance. I'm joined by Lyndsey Wolfram, who leads our design team and is presenting all information about what we're calling a wayfinding sign program. As we have more people returning to the office to the campus. We have multiple buildings. It's kind of hard to know which building to go to. So we're going to try and help our arriving employees.

Lyndsey Wolfram said, thank you all. Again, Lyndsey Wolfram. We can start with this, or we also have a map of like the locations that we're proposing. If we want to flip to that, we can. But essentially, as Kevin said, our wayfinding exists today. It's in signs that are about like 22 by 22 around the campus. The problem is that people kind of miss them as they're driving by. It's hard to see or read all the information on there. So, what we are proposing if you scroll down just a hair, you can see this is our campus, right? And to Kevin's point, there are a lot of places that people can make a decision whether they need to go straight, right, left, all the way around the

campus. And so, for the most part, we are requesting that we replace the signs that exist, we are just making them larger. And then we do have some supplementary signage that we are requesting. So these ones right here that are shown in the parking lot would be like a banner on a light post that would help guide people to know which building they're parking closest to because we have fairways, cranes, trees, and woods, and you can enter in all of these multiple locations. Just to help people get to the right place, we are proposing adding those two. So, in short, variances we are requesting are the number of directional signs are technically exceeded, even though we are replacing essentially one for one for these ground signs, I believe the code states we are allowed to have. And Dan, I'm going to look to you for your help. I believe it's like one.

Mr. Russell replied, yeah, you're only allowed to have one.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, okay. Obviously, right we're a huge campus, so we're hoping for that variance. And then on the setback, two is 30 feet, and we are asking for relief for that because number one is proximity closer to the road will help people visibly see the sign. Then in some of these areas we just don't have that much you know ground coverage. So we are asking for I believe it's a 10, 10 foot setback, you know, all the way around. And then the last one is number of identification signs exceed and setback, and those are really for these light post signs. Dan, if I'm not mistaken, it's not; these aren't not necessarily common, right, in the village, and so may not be applicable to the code that exists today.

Mr. Russell said, our code does not detail anything for a large campus, so this is all new.

Mr. Michalko replied, this is all new to all of us.

Ms. Jeanblanc replied, well, yeah, which lends to the uniqueness of the property.

Mr. Russell replied, it’s definitely unique. So I think they do need all those signs, honestly, because it's very confusing. I've been there a million times. I still get confused.

Mr. Michalko replied, I worked on a large campus, and I know about signage and people getting lost.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, they sure do. Yes, and I mean I think to our campus is confusing. There's multiple doors that really visitors shouldn't be going to. So we're trying to help visitors get to the right place, and then our employees get to the right place. And it's not even just about entering. It's like where to park. I mean you can see we have parking lots all around.

Ms. Jeanblanc said, better signage is also important for pedestrian safety.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, yes. The one thing I will call out is if you could scroll down a little bit more. All the signs except for one are on our property. So this sign right here is technically on village property. We do have an existing sign there today. However, we could not find any variances that exist of how it got approved in the first place. But it's been there since we built the campus. And so, the one thing to note about this sign is we worked with our vendor to create a smaller sign, so it's not as wide as our kind of like typical signs throughout the campus. I also believe it's a little bit shorter and it's thinner. And the reason that we're proposing that is because we know this is a major intersection, right, where there's a path right here for pedestrians, and so

to be able for people who are parked here at the light, you know, waiting for the light to turn for visibility, right? For pedestrians and cars. So this one is the exception to the rule. It's smaller.

Ms. Weber stated, and so this body knows that is not going to require a variance because it is on a Village property, and we are working with Progressive in order to make sure that we have what we need in place.

Mr. Michalko replied, also talked about signage on the poles, the height of the signs on the poles, from six foot to 10 foot.

Mr. Russell replied, right. Yeah, the code really allows six feet in height. They're going 10 feet.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, yes.

Mr. Michalko asked, is that 10 feet from the ground or 10 feet total in height?

Mr. Russell replied, 10 feet from the ground to the bottom of the sign.

Mr. Michalko replied, so it's six feet now, and they want to go 10. And most of them-

Mr. Russell replied, they don't have any up right now.

Ms. Weber replied, The sign code requires it can only be six feet. They would like to place it at 10 feet.

Mr. Michalko replied, understand. Four foot variance-

Ms. Weber replied, I know the applicant did not have that variance listed in their materials, but after Dan reviewed the plans, we determined there was a need.

Mr. Michalko replied, that one is needed. Yeah, and is there a reason why you wanted it at 10-foot

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, for visibility, right? As people are walking, driving.

Mr. Michalko asked, a lot of those poles are not in islands; they're just in the parking lot, correct?

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, yes. And I know you flipped away from that page, but in most of the lots, we're asking to do them along the perimeters of the lot and not necessarily on the inside of the lot. So, like around.

Mr. Michalko replied, because if you were doing on the inside a lot, I can understand the 10-foot.

Ms. Jeanblanc said, well, I mean, she mentioned delivery vehicles. So you know, if it's a taller vehicle, if it's a taller sign, then it won't be likely to be blocked.

Mr. Michalko replied, that's why I said with the if it was in the parking lot and there's no island there. Equipment I've seen cleaning your parking lot. Those signs won't be there after the first time they go by because they're 10-foot tall or taller.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, oh, for the trucks?

Mr. Michalko replied, for the trucks, yeah.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, okay. Fair point. So, question about that. If we were to come back and say, hey, we want to put them at 15 feet, 20 feet, do we need to come back? Okay.

Mr. Michalko replied, yes.

Ms. Weber said, well it looks like you had a picture of them on the pole.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, yeah, we do have a rendering. Now, again, that was schematic, right. So we can certainly change that if we need to.

Mr. Michalko asked, Mike, could you pull that one up?

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, so that would be in- I believe it's close to the last page, if I'm not mistaken. Yes, thank you. Oh, that says 12. Again, this was schematic. Melanie, do you recall? I know you kind of did the last write-ups.

Ms. Jeanblanc replied, that is 10 feet,

Mr. Michalko replied, yeah. There is a bunch of talking over each other.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, okay. Yeah. So that's yeah.

Mr. Russell replied, I mean, you're going to want to see those signs from a distance and driving around.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, driving in, you know, to the campus.

Ms. Jeanblanc said, especially for a parking lot.

Kevin McGrath replied, yeah. I mean, your average SUV at this point is approaching six feet tall.

Ms. Jeanblanc replied, so the sign does you no good if parked cars is obscure it.

Kevin McGrath replied, yeah. Truthfully, as you're approaching one of our buildings, four stories high, you're looking-

Mr. Michalko said, my observation: I drove to campus on Sunday to check out this, and what amazed me was the fact that signs we have there now are not accenting the building at all.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, correct.

Mr. Michalko said, that looks like it was an afterthought that just put the put a pole in the ground, put a little sign on.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, I wasn't here at the time, but I don't disagree with you.

Mr. Michalko replied, and they are fading right now.

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, they are. The people that we talked to when we did some focus groups around this, the people, our employees say I drove right in and I didn't even know that I drove past something. So we do feel pretty strongly that the new designs do complement the design of the building and the architecture of the building and more visible and definitely look more esthetically pleasing than what exists.

Mr. Michalko asked, I didn't notice anything in the notes about it, but are they illuminated? Any of the signs?

Lyndsey Wolfram replied, no, we're not planning on illuminating anything. We're planning on using like reflective material for the lettering. So as you're driving, and if it's at nighttime with your lights on,

Mr. Russell replied, and they still have to go to the architectural review board. Yeah. So we have no record of any of these signs ever being installed.

Mr. Michalko replied, Yeah, but the uniqueness of this property and the campus is totally nowhere near our ordinance. So if I'm correct, we're looking at four variances that we're looking for with the height change on one pole.

Ms. Weber replied, is it four or five? We have okay. So there's a variance for relief to allow 18 ground-mounted directional signs. The code allows one. Then you have the setback relief from the 30-foot setback in order to allow them at 10 feet, so that's a 20-foot setback variance. Then the third variance is for 21 light pole identification signs. The code allows one, and then there's a setback, a setback variance on those as well. They're requesting it be set 10 feet back from the curb. The code requires it to be 30, so that's four, and then the height variance for the signs on the light poles is five. So to allow them to be at 10 feet instead of six.

Mr. Michalko asked, anything else from the board or those present?

Ms. Jeanblanc asked, would you prefer that we take them separately or clustered?

Ms. Weber replied, I think that these all relate to each other. So I think if you would like to take these all together you can take them all as one.

DECISION

Ms. Jeanblanc, seconded by Mr. Haycox made a motion to approve the variance as requested:

1. The applicant is requesting multiple zoning variances to replace existing directional signs with new. They will also be installing signs on existing light poles thru-out the parking lots.

   (1) variance to allow 18 ground-mounted directional signs.
   (2) 20 ft. setback variance for relief from the 30-foot setback requirement in order to allow 18 ground mounted signs setback 10 feet.
   (3) variance to allow 21 light pole identification signs.
   (4) 20 ft. setback variance for relief from the 30-foot setback requirement to allow 21 light pole identification signs to be set 10 feet back from the curb.
   (5) 4 ft. height variance in order to allow 21 light pole identification signs to be at 10 feet.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: Chairman Pro Tem Michalko, Ms. Jeanblanc, Mr. Haycox, Mr. Andrzejczyk
Nays:

Vote Taken
(5) Variances Approved

Right to Appeal

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko stated, you or any interested party has the right to appeal the decision within ten (10) days to Council. You will receive a notice in the mail regarding the approval.

ANY OTHER MATTERS

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

There was none.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Pro Tem Michalko, seconded by Ms. Jeanblanc, made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Ayes: All — **Motion Carried**
Nays: None — **Meeting adjourned at 6:26 p.m.**

_____ _____

Chairman Pro Tem — Secretary