



BZA Summary Document

Printed Date: July 23, 2025

Permit Number:	SV25-000022	Permit Type:	Board of Zoning Appeals Standard Variance
Property Address:	3079 EUCLID HEIGHTS BLVD CLEVELAND HEIGHTS, OH 44118		
Application Date:	07/01/2025		
Applicant Name	Lyndsay Brock	Applicant Email	
Applicant Address	3079 Euclid Heights Blvd. Cleveland Hts OH 44118	Applicant Company Name	
Applicant Company Address	Cleveland Hts OH 44118	Applicant Home Phone	
Applicant Cell Phone		Applicant Work Phone	
Applicant Relationship to Property	Owner		
Name	Lyndsay Brock		
Home Address	3079 Euclid Heights Blvd Cleveland Heights, OH 44118		
Home Address City/State/Zip	3079 Euclid Heights Blvd Cleveland Heights, OH 44118		
Phone Number			
Email Address			
Property Type	Single Family Residential		
Brief Summary of Variance Request	To permit the placement of a 10' x 14' garden shed (140 sq ft) in the corner side yard of a corner lot property located at the intersection of Superior and Euclid Heights Boulevard.		
Number of Variances Requested	1		
A. Explain special conditions or circumstances that exist which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable generally to other lands or structures in the same Zoning District. (examples of this are: exceptional irregularity, narrowness, shallowness or steepness of the lot, or adjacency to nonconforming and	This property presents several unique conditions not generally applicable to other properties in the same zoning district: 1. Corner Lot Configuration: The property is situated on a 0.57-acre corner lot at the intersection of Superior and Euclid Heights Boulevard. Due to the corner lot designation, a significant portion of what would typically be considered "side yard" is classified as "corner side yard" under Cleveland Heights zoning regulations. 2. Irregular Terrain in Rear Yard: The designated rear yard slopes downward beginning 9 feet from the patio, making the terrain unsuitable for shed placement. The area transitions into marsh-like terrain where drainage naturally collects, with uneven ground, dense mature trees, and root systems. The width of the shed (10 ft) exceeds the stable portion of land available before the slope begins, making it physically unfeasible to relocate the shed to this rear yard area. 3. Limited True Side Yard: What the zoning code designates as the true "side yard" consists primarily of the driveway area, making shed placement physically impossible in this location. 4. Natural Screening: The property is surrounded by tall hedges		

inharmonious uses, structures or conditions.)

and trees. Along Euclid Heights Boulevard, hedges measure 8 feet 6 inches tall, completely obstructing visibility of the shed from that street. While the Superior Road side has shorter hedges, large trees still provide substantial screening, and the shed is not visible in plain view from that side either.

B. Explain how the property in question would not yield a reasonable return or there could not be any beneficial use of the property without the variance.

Without this variance, the property owner cannot reasonably utilize their large 0.57-acre lot for appropriate garden storage needs. • The rear yard is too sloped and marshy; the applicant would need to excavate, level, and install costly drainage, which is not feasible for accessory storage. • The driveway side yard is completely consumed by paved access to the detached garage. • The shed's current placement allows for safe, functional use without obstructing any use of open yard space or affecting neighbors.

C. Explain whether the variance is insubstantial.

Yes, this variance is insubstantial. The shed: • Is only 140 square feet (well below the 200 sq ft threshold requiring building permits) • Is placed 33 feet from Superior Road and 63 feet from Euclid Heights Boulevard, significantly exceeding the 15-foot minimum setback. • The distance to the back property line exceeds 100 feet. • The structure is largely invisible from public view due to dense trees and 8'6" hedges and will be painted white to match the home.

D. Explain whether the variance is the minimum necessary to make possible the reasonable use of the land.

Yes, this is the minimum variance necessary. The applicant has already: • Explored all zoning-compliant locations and found them physically unusable. • Positioned the shed in the location that provides maximum screening and minimum visual impact. • Maintained proper setbacks from property lines. • Avoided disrupting the property's natural terrain, vegetation, and drainage systems. • Chosen the least visible location possible given the property constraints. No other location on the property would comply with current zoning while being physically suitable for placement.

E. Explain whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance.

No substantial alteration or detriment would occur: • The shed is well-shielded by existing vegetation. • It maintains appropriate setbacks from all property lines. • The shed will be painted to match the house and designed to blend in aesthetically, ensuring it is not unsightly. • No adjacent neighbors would be negatively impacted due to the shielding and setback distances. • The shed is not visible from most public vantage points due to natural vegetation.

F. Explain whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental service (e.g., water, sewer, garbage.)

No adverse effects on governmental services would result: • The shed has proper drainage provisions. • It does not interfere with water, sewer, or garbage collection access. • The placement does not impede any public right-of-way or city-maintained areas.

G. Did the applicant purchase the property without knowledge of the zoning restriction.

The applicant was not aware of the specific corner lot zoning restrictions. While familiar with general setback requirements (which were properly observed with the 15-foot setback), the specific distinction between "side yard" and "corner side yard" designations and their different regulatory treatments was not understood. The applicant previously lived in Cleveland Heights but was not aware of these particular corner lot provisions due to not living in a home with a corner side lot.

H. Explain whether the special conditions or circumstances (listed in response to question A above) were a result of actions of the owner.

No, the special conditions are inherent to the property itself: • The corner lot configuration existed prior to ownership. • The irregular, marshy terrain in the rear yard is a natural condition. • The driveway placement and true side yard limitations are existing site conditions. • The mature screening vegetation was already established.

I. Demonstrate whether the applicant's predicament feasibly can be resolved

No feasible alternative exists: • Rear yard placement is not feasible due to irregular, marshy terrain and drainage issues. • True side yard placement is impossible due to the

through a method other than a variance (e.g., a zone-conforming but unworkable example.)

J. Explain whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and/or substantial justice done by granting the variance.

K. Explain whether the granting of the variance requested will or will not confer on the applicant any special privilege that is denied by this regulation to other lands, structures, or buildings in the same district.

Once you submit your application you will be taken to the payment page. Enter your payment information and submit. I understand review won't start until payment is made.

driveway location. • Any other suitable location on the property would also be classified as "corner side yard" and require a variance. • The physical constraints of the property make variance the only viable solution.

Yes, granting this variance would observe the spirit and intent of zoning regulations: • The purpose of building placement restrictions is to maintain neighborhood character and prevent adverse impacts on adjacent properties. • This placement achieves these goals through natural screening and appropriate setbacks. • Public health, safety, and welfare are protected. • Does not obstruct traffic views or alter the neighborhood's visual harmony. • The shed serves a legitimate accessory use function for property maintenance.

No special privilege would be conferred. This variance request addresses legitimate practical difficulties created by the unique combination of corner lot zoning designations and natural site conditions. The requested relief is minimal, well-screened, and maintains the intent of zoning regulations while allowing reasonable use of the property.

Yes