

# Board of Zoning Appeals

## December 11, 2025

**Members present:** Phil Rooney, Chairperson; Blaine Wells; Alex Treece and Shaun Mason.

Phil Rooney called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and the general rules were reviewed.

The following was introduced by Mr. Erik Adkins:

**Case Number: BZA-41-2025-66646**

**Address: 1165 Trenton Avenue**

**Zone: C-2 General Commercial**

Filed by HAT #1, LLC, regarding a variance from Section 1161.12.11 of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance for a new interstate high-rise sign cabinet at 1165 Trenton Avenue. The requested variance seeks to allow a fifth cabinet of 75 square feet on an existing non-conforming interstate high-rise sign. This new cabinet will be supported by its own separate pole. This section currently allows a maximum of four cabinets of 75 square feet and requires sign setbacks to measure at least one-half (1/2) the height of the sign.

This case was previously heard in June, and a variance was granted on the condition that a wind load document be submitted to the Zoning Department. We are re-hearing the case because a modification was made to the proposed non-conforming sign.

Whereas the prior submittal showed the sign was held up by two exterior poles, the new proposal is to have a center pole supporting the new cabinet. Zoning has recommended that the new cabinet be attached to the two exterior poles as well, or it will appear to be a separate interstate high-rise sign.

The city supports the Board's decision on this case.

Mr. Wells asked for clarification that the change is just the center pole.

Mr. Adkins stated it is also lowered. We were waiting on the Wind Load Capacity Report from the previous variance that was granted, but we never got it.

Mr. Pete Hatcher, representative of the sign company, was sworn in. He stated with the calculations, it is too hard to determine if it can support it so that is why they decided to go with the middle pole. Being attached to the other two poles, it will increase the stability instead of taking the possible chance of decreasing it. It is 73 square feet, and it is 55-feet high.

Mr. Rooney asked if the new cabinet will be attached to the center pole and both side poles.

Mr. Hatcher stated that is correct.

Mr. Mason asked if the original concern was the wind load.

Mr. Adkins stated the amount of weight with the new cabinet, with the amount of wind off the interstate was the main concern.

Mr. Wells asked if the middle pole, footer, etc. will carry the wind load and will it be considered one sign instead of two independent signs?

Mr. Adkins stated that it was correct.

Mr. Rooney asked Mr. Adkins if there were any communications on this case.

Mr. Adkins stated there was no communication on this case.

Mr. Wells made a motion to approve the requested variance on the conditions that the new cabinet be attached to the existing poles and all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days.

Mr. Treece seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the requested variance on the conditions that the new cabinet be attached to the existing poles and all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days., 3-1 (Mr. Mason opposed).

The following was introduced by Mr. Erik Adkins:

**Case Number: BZA-42-2025-66647**

**Address: 2020 Elyria Street (parcels: #600001001460 (lot 16) & #600001001461 (lot 15))**

**Zone: C-2 General Commercial**

Filed by George Phebus, regarding a variance from Sections 1161.03(B)(1) and 1161.03(C)(2)(b) of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance for a new six (6) foot high chain-link fence at 2020 Elyria Street. The requested variance seeks to allow the replacement of a prior existing six (6) foot high chain-link fence with a new one in the same location. These sections state that a fence may be a maximum of four (4) feet in height, must be 50 percent open, and may not be chain-link.

The owner removed an existing, dilapidated chain-link fence with the intention of replacing it with the same height and style of fence in the same location, which stretches across two parcels.

Because the fence will be located inside the property line and a fence of the same height and style previously existed where the fence is being proposed, the City supports approval. However, the city would have liked to have seen the proposal and variance sought prior to the removal of the old fence.

If granted, a permit for each parcel will need to be obtained.

Mr. Phebus, 209 East Pearl Street, Findlay, Ohio, owner of above listed parcels, was sworn in. He stated they are replacing the old fence.

Mr. Wells asked if the existing fence is 6-foot and they want to replace it with a 6-foot fence.

Mr. Phebus stated that is right.

Mr. Wells asked if a 4-foot fence would solve the intended use of the property?

Mr. Phebus stated No.

Mr. Wells asked why can't a 4-foot high fence accomplish what you are trying to accomplish here?

Mr. Phebus stated he wants to store equipment inside the fence for security purposes, and 4 feet won't do it. He stated he is just asking to replace what was there for 30 some years, in the exact location. He stated he owns all the property around there so there is no neighborhood conflict.

Mr. Wells asked if he knew he needed a variance prior to starting the fence.

Mr. Phebus stated he did not. He was just trying to clean up the property and wanted to replace the existing fence with a nicer one, in the same place, at the same height.

Mr. Rooney asked Mr. Adkins if there were any communications on this case.

Mr. Adkins stated there was one communication on this case. He received an email from the neighbor (Charles) to the South. He stated Charles was mistaken about where the fence was proposed to go. Mr. Adkins emailed Charles back with the correct location of the proposed fence and did not hear back from him.

Mr. Mason made a motion to approve the requested variance on the condition that all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days. (For both parcels: #600001001460 (lot 16) & #600001001461 (lot 15)).

Mr. Wells seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the requested variance on the condition that all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days. (For both parcels: #600001001460 (lot 16) & #600001001461 (lot 15)), 4-0.

The following was introduced by Mr. Erik Adkins:

**Case Number: BZA-43-2025-66650 (Northern) and BZA-44-2025-66655 (Southern)**  
**Address: 14701 CR 212**  
**Zone: I-1 Light Industrial**

Filed by Kreate, regarding a variance from Section 1161.12.17 of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance for a new off-premises sign at 14701 CR 212. The requested variance seeks to allow for an off-premises monument sign on the northern and southern parts of the parcel, neither of which is a billboard. This section currently allows only billboards to be utilized as an off-premises sign.

The owner is proposing to place two off-premises signs on an adjacent parcel that they own to direct traffic to the new facility they just developed on Industrial Drive. If this parcel were developed, due to its frontage along Industrial Drive, the site would be allotted two monument signs.

The owner has chosen to file two separate cases in the hope that at least one off-premises sign will be approved.

If the Board rules in favor of granting one or both requests, the Board should place conditions on the size allowed for the signs, such as a maximum of eight (8) feet in height and 32 square feet or less in area.

The city will be supportive of the Board's decision.

Mr. Wells asked if these are directional signs for the facility directly to the East.

Mr. Adkins stated yes.

Ms. Josette Brinkman, 303 East Sandusky Street, owner of Fast Signs, was sworn in. She stated the signs will be 15 square feet each. They are directional signs and will be 4-foot tall.

Mr. Adkins stated the reason for the recommendation is the maximum size of the Industrial Way Finding signs.

Mr. Rooney asked Mr. Adkins if there were any communications on this case.

Mr. Adkins stated there was no communication on this case.

Mr. Wells stated he agrees with Mr. Treece that over the years, that area will continue to get developed so there is a need for the signs.

**Case BZA-43-2025-66650 (Northern):**

Mr. Wells made a motion to approve the requested variance on the conditions that the sign be maximum 4 feet tall and no more than 15 square feet and all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days.

Mr. Mason seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the requested variance on the conditions that the sign be maximum of 4 feet tall and no more than 15 square feet and all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days, 3-0 (Mr. Rooney abstained).

**Case BZA-44-2025-66655 (Southern):**

Mr. Wells made a motion to approve the requested variance on the conditions that the sign be maximum of 4 feet tall and no more than 15 square feet and all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days.

Mr. Mason seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the requested variance on the conditions that the sign be maximum of 4 feet tall and no more than 15 square feet and all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days, 3-0 (Mr. Rooney abstained).

The following was introduced by Mr. Erik Adkins:

**Case Number: BZA-45-2025-66656**

**Address: 941 Interstate Drive**

**Zone: C-2 General Commercial**

Filed by Whitson Investors, LLC, regarding a variance from Section 1161.12.11 of the City of Findlay Zoning Ordinance to replace a cabinet on a non-conforming interstate high-rise sign at 941 Interstate Drive. The requested variance seeks to allow for the replacement of the non-conforming signs' cabinet with one of different dimensions. The sign's non-conformity is its setback distance. This section requires a setback from all property lines equal to one-half (1/2) the sign's height.

The owner is currently rebranding the hotel, and the existing cabinet on the interstate high-rise sign will not work for the new sign face replacement. The proposed cabinet is wider than the one that is currently on the pole and will lower the total sign height if replaced. The non-conformity is due to the setback requirement from the leading edge of the sign not being met.

The city is supportive of this request due to the reduction in overall height and the minor nature of the change, which reduces the existing non-conformity rather than increasing it.

Mr. Kyle Hite, 224 Sherman Drive, Findlay, representing the owner, was sworn in. He stated they did everything they could to not have to go through this process. They wanted to just change the face of the cabinet, but Marriott would not allow that.

Mr. Rooney asked Mr. Adkins if there were any communications on this case.

Mr. Adkins stated there was no communication on this case.

Mr. Wells stated the non-conformity is being reduced and there are no other alternatives.

Mr. Wells made a motion to approve the requested variance for the Eastern setback of 10.76 feet and on the condition that all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days.


Mr. Treece seconded the motion.

Motion to approve the requested variance for the Eastern setback of 10.76 feet and on the condition that all necessary permits be obtained within 60 days, 4-0.

The November 13, 2025, meeting minutes were approved.

The meeting was adjourned.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary