

Minutes for Public Hearing held on:
August 8, 2026 at 9:45 pm
Town Hall on Division

Amending Residential Zoning Districts R-1 & R-2

1. Mayor Ehrbar calls Council to Order.
2. Council Members Present:

RC: M. Gaither__Y_, J. Wolfe_Y_, G. Finger__Y_, J. Divoll____Y____, S. Stevenson__Y____, C. Kipfer__Y____

3. All rise and recite the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

4. ORDINANCE NO. 2026 – O - _____: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING & 152.031 (D) (1) ENTITLED R-1 LOW DENSITY SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT; AREA REGULATIONS

(INTRODUCED BY: COUNCILMAN JOE WOLFE)

5. ORDINANCE NO. 2026 – O - _____: AN ORDINANCE AMENDING & 152.032 (D) (1) ENTITLED R-2 MEDIUM DENSITY SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONING DISTRICT; AREA REGULATIONS

(INTRODUCED BY: COUNCILMAN JOE WOLFE)

Mayor Ehrbar welcomes Public Comment.

D. Lambros: Floor is open for Public Comment.

Chris Beakley, Beach Development: Thanks for letting me take time to talk to you about the proposed doubling of the minimum lot size.

I saw this in the paper, so that's why I came to my attention and I went through and did some research and looked at some things.

And I was curious if before this proposal came up, if the village had gone through and had conducted any planning studies, what developmental problems is the amendment intended to solve?

Is there any evidence that exists of lot sizes are causing like septic drainage, traffic, water infrastructure problems?

Why is it to come and double the current requirements rather than a smaller adjustment?

How many existing parcels will become non-conforming?

How many currently developable lots would be eliminated as a village?

Done analysis on the economic impact of the existing property owners as the village considered the effects on any property values and or the property tax revenues?

Was the village proposal change consistent with the villages, Is there a comprehensive plan to this?

Also, what is the specific problem that the village is trying to solve by doubling the required lot sizes?

I'm asking that before the village council doubles the minimum lot size;

I ask that we take this proposal and be tabled until the village can provide the public with the planning justifications, the economic analysis, infrastructure analysis, property rights analysis, supporting the 'cause. I think the property owners deserve to understand exactly what they're asking to be given up before this change is adopted.

Tommy Tollett: I'm a landowner on Memory Lane Sweet Briar subdivision. I would say about 90% of what I was going to ask. He kind of covered one of the things I'd like to ask.

I understand if you change the status; and these subdivisions, it's already built lots and proposed new lots or vacant land, right? Is that accurate?

D. Lambros: Say that again.

T. Tollett: Does the status of an already built lot change from legal conforming to legal non-conforming as well as bare land status of all the lots that are presently subdivided on the village remain the same?

D. Lambros: They're buildable, yes. They stay the same. The status is that everything stays the same. They're legal non-conforming uses.

T. Tollett: There's the status of the ones that are already built, then changed to legal non-conforming as well.

D. Lambros: No, they are already built.

T. Tollett: If your home is already built, let's say you had a fire, your home's already built.

D. Lambros: Yeah, you can rebuild on it.

That's the law. In fact, there was a lawsuit in Kelleys Island about 30 years ago on that.

T. Tollett: So in the subdivisions, if your home's already built, the status of those lots will not be changed to legal non-conforming.

D. Lambros: Correct.

T. Tollett: If your home is or if your lot is there and already purchased, that will be a legal non-conforming lot, you can still build.

D. Lambros: Correct.

Marcie Mielke at 131 E Lakeshore Drive. I just want to come up and comment on the 1st gentleman who spoke. I guess he's not aware of the multi \$1,000,000 sewer project that all of us or a number of us have to pay for. Obviously, he's not on the list and the brand new water tower we're putting in for multi millions of dollars.

Dennis Deemer: Our family owns a property at 104 Laylan Lane. It's actually owned by my wife and her two siblings. There's three that have an undivided interest in the property, which is 2.88 acres. If you pass this legislation, arguably one of the three will not be able to build on a lot because it's going to fall outside the 1.0 acre limit.

It seems as if this might be an overreach of my part, but it's kind of like a taking of our property rights without any compensation for it. I wasn't here for the beginning of the meeting and I apologize. Has anybody asked where 1.0 came from as opposed to .75 point 50?

Was it just a number that seemed a good number to use for the zoning? I don't need an answer right now, but I'd like that to be addressed sometimes.

It's just that this particular legislation, if passed, could have a negative impact on our property rights and I don't think that's fair.

Dan Hazard: 123 Beach. I just wondered if it came up beforehand, because it did come up for the transient rental program that one of the things they were worried about was increased taxes for people and the rising price of houses on the island and also the lack of affordable housing for people that worked on the island. And I just wondered if that was brought under consideration. As you know, increasing the lot size would seem to both 'cause, you know, prices will definitely go up because it'll be bigger, lots of bigger houses. And I would guess that it would also 'cause even bigger issues for people trying to build affordable housing for employees.

Leslie Korenko: 330 Beach Road. In reading the ordinance, it looks like you're replacing a section and then referencing the section you replaced. Unclear.

Wouldn't it be easier to just say any new lots developed after this ordinance will be this size? That way, a new zoning inspector coming in 510 years from now, we'll look at it and say, I know you have two lots that meet the old requirements, but that's not in the code anymore.

Drew Algase: Melody Lane. I know you've answered it already. Currently, the line that was added to the legislation about non-conforming lots; all lot current deeded lots are still buildable under the old minimum lot size correct?

D. Lambros: Correct. Written in the legislation.

6. Motion to Adjourn:

M. Gaither__2__, J. Wolfe_1__, G.Finger__Y__, J. Divoll____Y____, S. Stevenson__Y____, C. Kipfer____Y____

Public Hearing Adjourned at: 9:58

Lisa M. Klonaris

Paul E. Enck