



**AGENDA**  
**BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS**  
**TUESDAY, May 27, 2025**  
**6:30 P.M.**

**Oxford Courthouse**  
**118 E High Street**

**MEMBERS**

Philip Russo, Chair

Baljinnyam Dashdorj  
Matt Wyatt

Steve Chaffin, Secretary

**STAFF**

Sam Perry, Director, Community Development  
Zachary Moore, City Planner/GIS Coordinator  
Christopher Conard, Law Director

**MEETING PROCEDURE:** The Board of Zoning Appeals is a quasi-judicial board. Our primary function is to hear testimony and issue decisions. Unlike other City boards and commissions, we only hear relevant, sworn testimony from the Applicant, his/her duly appointed agent or attorney, and any other person with standing to testify in a particular matter. The Applicant has the right to cross-examine any testimony given. Our hearings are open to public attendance, but public comment, opinion and discussion are not considered testimony and will not be heard.

Please wait until you are recognized by the Chair, state your name and address so that your comments may be properly recorded. Applicants are to limit their testimony to fifteen (15) minutes, including any information presented by his/her duly appointed agent or attorney. This time limit may be extended if the Board requests or approves further testimony. Other persons with standing are encouraged to testify and ask questions about the nature of the appeal, but must be acknowledged by the Chair prior to speaking.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of January 28, 2025 Minutes of the Regular Meeting 1
- III. New Business
  - BZA-2025-01, 124 Pin Oak Drive, VARIANCES** to Section 1143.01(c)(2)(B) minimum rear yard depth and Section 1143.01(c)(2)(C) minimum side yard width, **Scott Webb Architect, Applicant/Agent** 5
- IV. Adjournment



## OXFORD BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

### Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, January 28, 2025

[Link for website video here](#)

*Meeting procedure: The Board of Zoning Appeals is a quasi-judicial Board. Our primary function is to hear testimony and issue decisions. Unlike other City boards and commissions, we only hear relevant, sworn testimony from the Applicant, his/her duly appointed agent or attorney, and any other person with standing to testify in a particular matter. The Applicant has the right to cross-examine any testimony given. Our hearings are open to public attendance, but public comment, opinion and discussion are not considered testimony and will not be heard.*

*Please wait until you are recognized by the Chair, state your name and address so that your comments may be properly recorded. Applicants are to limit their testimony to fifteen (15) minutes, including any information presented by his/her duly appointed agent or attorney. This time limit may be extended if the Board requests or approves further testimony. Other persons with standing are encouraged to testify and ask questions about the nature of the appeal, but must be acknowledged by the Chair prior to speaking.*

### Roll Call

Philip Russo, Chair

D. Chadwick Smith, Vice Chair

Matt Wyatt

Steve Chaffin, Secretary

Baljinnyam Dashdorj

Time: 6:54

A regular meeting of the Oxford Board of Zoning Appeals was called to order by Chair Philip Russo on Tuesday, January 28, 2025 at 6:30 p.m.

Members in attendance were Steve Chaffin, Baljinnyam Dashdorj, and D. Chadwick Smith

Members excused: Matt Wyatt

**Staff Members in Attendance**

Mr. Sam Perry, Director, Community Development, Mr. Zachary Moore, City Planner/GIS Coordinator, Mr. Christopher Conard, Law Director, Ms. Eunike Miller, Administrative Assistant

**Staff Members Excused**

None

**Election of Officers and Swearing in BZA Members**

Time: 7:05

**Election of Officers**

**Motion 1 – To nominate Philip Russo for BZA Chair**

(Voice Vote) 1<sup>st</sup> Mr. Chaffin 2<sup>nd</sup> Mr. Dashdorj

AYE: (4)

NAY: (0)

ABS: (0)

**Motion 2 – To nominate D. Chadwick Smith for Vice-Chair of BZA**

(Voice Vote) 1<sup>st</sup> Mr. Chaffin 2<sup>nd</sup> Mr. Dashdorj

AYE: (4)

NAY: (0)

ABS: (0)

**Approval of October 22, 2024 Minutes of the Regular Meeting**

**Time: 9:35**

**Motion – To approve the minutes as written**

(Voice Vote) 1<sup>st</sup> Mr. Chaffin 2<sup>nd</sup> Mr. Dashdorj

AYE: (4)

NAY: (0)

ABS: (0)

**New Business**

**BZA-2024-06**

**Time: 10:12**

**Page 5 of the Agenda Packet**

1. BZA-2024-04, 417 E Withrow Street, VARIANCE, to Section 1143.07(c) maximum lot coverage, Scott Webb, Architect, Applicant/Agent

Those presenting during the BZA were sworn in by Law Director, Mr. Conard.

Mr. Moore presented the staff report and responded to the questions the BZA members had. During Mr. Moore’s presentation a letter of the performed Zoning inspection dated 5/18/2024 was introduced as Staff Exhibit A.

Mr. Scott Webb, Architect presented his report in behalf of the property owner.

Mr. Jack Grove, Attorney of the Property Owner, presented photos of various properties around town as supporting documents of the case.

**Motion – To Enter into Deliberation**

(Voice Vote) 1<sup>st</sup> Mr. Dashdorj 2<sup>nd</sup> Mr. Chaffin

AYE: (4)

NAY: (0)

ABS: (0)

**Comments from the Public**

There were no comments from the public.



# STAFF REPORT

Community Development | Board of Zoning Appeals

## APPLICATION DETAILS

<b>Applicant</b>	Scott Webb, Architect
<b>Location</b>	124 Pin Oak Drive
<b>Owner</b>	Alan & Marti Kyger
<b>Action Request</b>	Variances to <i>Section 1143.01(c)(2)</i> , minimum side & rear setbacks
<b>Lot Size</b>	13,102 square feet / 0.30 acres
<b>Lot Width</b>	100 feet
<b>Current Use</b>	Single-Family Dwelling
<b>Current Zoning</b>	R-1A Single-Family Low-Density Residential District
<b>Surrounding Land Uses</b>	Golf course (Oxford Country Club) to west; single-family residential in all other directions

## BACKGROUND

On behalf of the property owners, Architect Scott Webb has submitted a request for variances specific to a proposed improvement project at 124 Pin Oak Drive. Planned improvements include a new backyard deck and pergola facing the Oxford Country Club's golf course, as well as the conversion of an existing carport into an enclosed two-car garage.

In this case, with the lot zoned R-1A Single-Family Low Density Residential District, the minimum rear and side yard setbacks are 40 feet and 10 feet respectively. While the existing house presently complies with all required setbacks, the proposed deck would encroach into the rear setback by 8 feet 8 inches, and the garage addition would expand the present footprint of the carport further south thus encroaching into the side yard setback by 4 feet 6 inches.

In summary, if the Board were to approve these requests, the new deck would be located 31 feet 4 inches from the rear lot line adjoining the Oxford Country Club property, and the new garage would be located 5 feet 6 inches from the side lot line abutting 122 Pin Oak Drive.

**DESCRIPTION**

The applicant’s requested variances can be summarized as follows:

Requirement	Code Section	Standard	Proposal
<b>Minimum Rear Yard Setback</b>	1143.01(c)(2)(B)	40 feet min.	31 feet 4 inches
Per <b>Section 1141.01(a)(3)</b> , decks are normally required to comply with the same district setback standards applicable to structures. The applicant proposes a new deck approx. 26 feet wide by 14 feet deep, resulting in a total size of 364 square feet. While the existing house presently complies with the required 40-foot rear setback, the new deck as proposed would encroach into this setback by 8 feet 8 inches. Apart from the new deck accompanied by an accessory pergola, an extension of an existing covered porch is also planned, though this particular portion would comply with the rear setback.			
<b>Minimum Side Yard Setback</b>	1143.01(c)(2)(C)	10 feet min.	5 feet 6 inches
The applicant originally applied for Building Permit approval on February 7. In this first submittal, the 10 foot side yard setback was noted on the plot plan, along with a note calling out a “10’ 8” approx. distance to property line” from the edge of the proposed garage expansion. Therefore, staff found the side yard setback compliant during the first round of review on this permit. A property survey was later obtained and provided a more accurate picture of the current setback, which could then be compared to the proposed garage addition. The survey revealed that the existing carport and covered patio were 21.8 feet from the side lot line abutting 122 Pin Oak Drive. The proposed garage addition brings the structure 16.3 feet closer to this lot line, thereby reducing the setback distance to 5.5 feet.			

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Notification was mailed to property owners within 200 feet and a sign was placed on the property. No official public comments have been received as of this writing.

**DEPARTMENT COMMENTS**

Below are comments from City departments:

Department	Respondent	Response
<b>Economic Development</b>	Seth Copenbaker, Economic Development Specialist	Reviewed without Comments
<b>Engineering</b>	Scott Otto, City Engineer	Reviewed without Comments
<b>Fire</b>	John Detherage, Fire Chief	Reviewed without Comments
<b>Police</b>	John Jones, Police Chief	Reviewed without Comments

**BZA SITE HISTORY**

There is no prior BZA case history available in City records for this property.

**DECISION CRITERIA**

In accordance with *Section 1139.02(c)(1)*, the burden of proof is upon the Applicant to present reliable and substantial evidence that supports the request for Variance. Furthermore, per *Section 1139.02(c)(2)* the BZA must find that **practical difficulties** exist that would render strict application of the Code unreasonable. In determining whether such difficulties exist which are sufficient to warrant the Variance, the Board shall use the attached eight decision criteria (A-H) in its deliberation. See the enclosed narrative addressing the review criteria from Mr. Webb.

If the BZA determines that difficulties exist which are sufficient to warrant the Variance, staff recommends that the BZA cite any new or different specific evidence not yet identified and approve the Variance request. If the BZA does approve the Variance it can make separate findings and attach any appropriate conditions it deems necessary as permitted by *Section 1139.02(d)(2)*.

Staff’s review of the criteria is outlined in the table below:

<b>Criterion A</b>	<b>Whether the property in question will yield reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance</b>
<b>Mixed evidence</b>	<p>The land use of the subject property is not in jeopardy with this request. The existing land use is a single-family dwelling, and the property is zoned for single-family use. The existence and occupancy of this dwelling constitutes sufficient evidence that there is already reasonable return for the property.</p> <p>However, staff does feel the applicant’s arguments regarding the conversion of an antiquated carport feature to a more modern garage amenity do warrant some merit with respect to increasing beneficial use, marketability, and value for the property. Therefore, staff is assigning a rating of “mixed evidence.”</p>
<b>Criterion B</b>	<b>Whether the variance is substantial</b>
<p><b>Supports</b> granting the Variance for the Rear Yard Setback</p> <p><b>Does not support</b> granting the Variance for the Side Yard Setback</p>	<p>The subject lot, given its smaller size and shape, is actually more reminiscent of a lot in the R-1B or R-2A District. Rear yard setbacks are typically less in those Districts, requiring 35 feet minimum and 30 feet minimum respectively. For these reasons, staff feels a rear setback distance of 31 feet 4 inches – which meets <b>78%</b> of the required R-1A distance of 40 feet – is not substantial.</p> <p>The side yard setback of 5 ½ feet on the other hand constitutes <b>55%</b> of the required distance and therefore could be construed as substantial ... at least from a numerical standpoint.</p>
<b>Criterion C</b>	<b>Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance</b>
<b>Supports</b> granting the Variance	<p>Staff agrees with the applicant’s findings pertaining to this criterion. The essential character of the neighborhood will not be substantially altered, nor will there be substantial detriment to surrounding properties. The more “estate-style” feel of this subdivision will not be negatively affected, especially given the incredible amount of distance already found between 124 Pin Oak and the neighbor to the south at 122 Pin Oak.</p>


<b>Criterion D</b>	<b>Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage)</b>
<b>Supports</b> granting the Variance	No comments or concerns were returned by the City Engineer, Fire Chief or Police Chief on this matter. The granting of this Variance is not expected to have any adverse impact on governmental services.
<b>Criterion E</b>	<b>Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction</b>
<b>Undetermined</b>	<p>This criterion tries to get at whether or not the variance is provoked by a “self-created hardship.” In other words, an owner purchasing property who knows full well that the zoning regulations restrict or prevent what they intend to do should not expect a guaranteed outcome in their favor.</p> <p>Staff does not believe enough information has been made available in the submitted application to offer a definitive stance, and is therefore rating this criterion as “undetermined” at this time.</p>
<b>Criterion F</b>	<b>Whether the property owners’ predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a variance</b>
<b>Mixed evidence</b>	The “predicament” at hand is that the owner wishes to construct new amenities on the property which are coming into conflict with the City’s imposed setback limitations. As the applicant states, the requested variances are truly necessary in order for the features as proposed to be constructed; there is no other alternate location, or method, for “getting around” the applicable standards with regard to the property’s present configuration. The only other option would be to diminish the size of the proposed deck and garage features; likely, this would entail downgrading the garage size to hold one car instead of two cars.
<b>Criterion G</b>	<b>Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance</b>
<b>Supports</b> granting the Variance	The subject lot is part of the “Fairway” subdivision, recorded in 1955. As the applicant notes, the house was constructed in 1957. Both the Fairway subdivision as well as the “Hill & Hollow” subdivision it connects to were initially developed outside of the City of Oxford corporate limits, and then later annexed into the City in the 1960s. Therefore, at the time the property was first conceived, it was not subject to any City-specific zoning restrictions. At roughly 13,000 sq ft in size, this lot as well as others in the Fairway subdivision are smaller than “typical” R-1A lots, which are now required to be a minimum of 15,000 sq ft in size. In terms of setbacks, the 1955 subdivision plat only makes it clear that structures are to be 40 feet away from the right-of-way along Pin Oak Drive, which is actually 10 feet greater than the typical 30-foot front setback now applied universally to all properties zoned R-1A (in cases where code setback standards and plat building lines are inconsistent with one another, the greatest distance of the two is enforced). All of this is to say, in this particular case staff feels the standards of the R-1A District need not be treated as the “end all be all” with respect to lots in the Fairway subdivision, inclusive of the subject lot at 124 Pin Oak. Substantial justice would be done by granting the variances.

Criterion H	Any other relevant factor
N/A	Staff does not understand the applicant’s reasoning with respect to this criterion, as this is not a “walkable” area in close proximity to Uptown, Stewart Square, or transit stops. Seeing as how the nature of these setback requests is relatively granular, staff feels Comprehensive Plan goals have little to no direct relevance.

**CONCLUSION**

At the time of this report, staff believes **there is substantial evidence** to support both variance requests.

**SUBMITTED BY:**



-----  
**Zachary Moore, AICP**  
 City Planner / GIS Coordinator

**DATE:** May 21, 2025

BZA MOTION FOR VARIANCES

In the case of BZA-2025-01 ...

1) Regarding the variance requested to Section 1143.01(c)(2)(B) for minimum rear yard setback

Mr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ hereby moves that the Board adopt and make the following findings of fact:

- A. The property in question (will / will not) yield a reasonable return or (can / cannot) be used beneficially without the variances because:\_\_\_\_\_
B. The variance (is / is not) substantial because:\_\_\_\_\_
C. The essential character of the neighborhood (would / would not) be substantially altered by the variance and adjoining properties (would / would not) suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance because:\_\_\_\_\_
D. The variance (would / would not) adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage, etc.) because:\_\_\_\_\_
E. The property owner (did / did not) purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction because:\_\_\_\_\_
F. The property owner's predicament (can / cannot) feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance because:\_\_\_\_\_
G. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement (would / would not) be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because:\_\_\_\_\_
H. Other relevant factors, if any, considered include:\_\_\_\_\_

It is further moved that after considering and weighing these factors, the Board should find that practical difficulty (is/is not) shown sufficient to warrant granting the Variance requested, and that the Variance should be accordingly (APPROVED / DENIED / APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS). The conditions for approval, if any, include:

Motion Seconded by: Mr. / Ms. \_\_\_\_\_
Vote: Aye: \_\_\_\_\_ Nay: \_\_\_\_\_

2) Regarding the variance requested to *Section 1143.01(c)(2)(C)* for minimum side yard setback...

Mr./Ms. \_\_\_\_\_ hereby moves that the Board adopt and make the following findings of fact:

- I. The property in question (**will / will not**) yield a reasonable return or (**can / cannot**) be used beneficially without the variances because:\_\_\_\_\_
- J. The variance (**is / is not**) substantial because:\_\_\_\_\_
- K. The essential character of the neighborhood (**would / would not**) be substantially altered by the variance and adjoining properties (**would / would not**) suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance because:\_\_\_\_\_
- L. The variance (**would / would not**) adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage, etc.) because:\_\_\_\_\_
- M. The property owner (**did / did not**) purchase the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction because:\_\_\_\_\_
- N. The property owner’s predicament (**can / cannot**) feasibly be obviated through some method other than a variance because:\_\_\_\_\_
- O. The spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement (**would / would not**) be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance because:\_\_\_\_\_
- P. Other relevant factors, if any, considered include:\_\_\_\_\_


It is further moved that after considering and weighing these factors, the Board should find that practical difficulty (**is/is not**) shown sufficient to warrant granting the Variance requested, and that the Variance should be accordingly (**APPROVED / DENIED / APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS**). The conditions for approval, if any, include:

Motion Seconded by: Mr. / Ms. \_\_\_\_\_  
Vote: Aye: \_\_\_\_\_ Nay: \_\_\_\_\_

# Aerial Map

 Site


0 50 100 200 Feet



# Current Zoning

 Site


0 50 100 200 Feet



## BZA-2025-01

### Surrounding Property Owners Map

-  Oxford Corporate Boundary
-  Parcels
-  Case Boundary
-  200 Foot Buffer



100  
Feet

Date: 4/30/2025  
10:12 AM



The City of Oxford does not guarantee the dimensional accuracy of this map. Precise dimensional accuracy should be based upon recorded deeds, plats, or a professional survey.



# VARIANCE APPLICATION

Please print legibly. To apply, email completed form and plans in PDF format to [commdev@cityofoxford.org](mailto:commdev@cityofoxford.org)

## BOX 1 | APPLICATION DETAILS

Property Address/Location 124 Pin Oak Drive	
Total Site Acreage 0.517	Total Building Square Footage 1,400
Project Description Garage and Deck Addition	
Requested Variance(s) 1143.01(c)(2) Side and Rear yard Setback Variances Cite Zoning Code Sections	

## BOX 2 | APPLICANT INFORMATION

Is the applicant also the current property owner? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (You may skip Box 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No (Do not skip Box 3, and include a <a href="#">Letter of Agency</a> with your submittal)
Applicant Name Scott webb
Applicant Company Name Scott Webb, Architect
Mailing Address 103 W Walnut St. Oxford, OH 45056
Email Address scott@scottwebbarchitect.com
Telephone Number (513) 523-3838

## BOX 3 | PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION Check if same as Applicant

Property Owner Name Alan & Matri Kyger
Property Owner Company Name
Mailing Address 6164 Contreras Road
Email Address akyger64@gmail.com
Telephone Number (513) 461-9383

## BOX 4 | ATTACHMENT CHECKLIST Submit all contents in PDF format. No printed copies are necessary.

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Narrative/Cover Letter</b> addressing all components required by <a href="#">Section 1139.02(a)(1)</a> – more information on Page 3 <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Site Plan(s)</b> including all details and information required by <a href="#">Section 1139.02(a)(2)</a> – more information on Page 3 <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Building Elevations</b> of any proposed or modified structures, including dimensions and exterior material details <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Floor Plans</b> of building interior(s), and/or typical floor plans if the project involves multiple residential units <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Photos</b> of existing site conditions and surroundings <input type="checkbox"/> Copy of <b>Preliminary Zoning Review</b> or <b>Permit Zoning Review</b> containing reference to Code section(s) where variance relief is now being requested  <b>Note:</b> Upon checking an application for completeness, staff may require additional information and/or materials above and beyond the items listed above in order to perform a complete evaluation for compliance with relevant Code provisions. You are welcome to contact Community Development at 513-524-5204 ahead of submission to determine whether additional items may be required.
---

**BOX 5 | APPLICANT SIGNATURE**

*As the owner or owner's agent, I hereby agree all information contained in this application is true, accurate, and complete to the best of my knowledge. I acknowledge the application will first be checked by City staff for completeness prior to determining a hearing date with the Oxford Board of Zoning Appeals. I also acknowledge that one or more signs may be placed on the subject property advertising scheduled public hearings for this application, and assume responsibility for removing signs at the completion of the hearing(s).*

Applicant Name (Print) Scott Webb

Applicant Signature



Date 4/21/25

**Processing Fee**

**The appropriate processing fee amount will be determined during a completeness check by Community Development staff.** It may take 1-2 business days for a completeness check to be performed. The applicant will receive a digital copy of a processing fee invoice via email once it is ready. Fees may be paid in-person by check or credit card in the Community Development Department located on the first floor of the Oxford Municipal Building, 15 S College Avenue, Oxford OH 45056. For credit card payments, the City accepts Visa, MasterCard, or Discover, and such payments may also be taken over the phone by calling Community Development at 513-524-5204.

## Narrative/Cover Letter Requirements

For source text see Oxford Zoning Code [Section 1139.02\(a\)\(1\)](#)

- A description of the existing uses of the site.
- The zoning district in which the site is located.
- A description of the existing and proposed use.
- For a proposed commercial use, include: (1) a description of operations, including type of goods sold, services performed, and expected number of customers, clientele, delivery, and service vehicles; and (2) the hours of operation.
- The nature and magnitude of the requested Variance.
- The Code section from which the Variance is requested.
- Separate narrative statements that explain how the proposed Variance satisfies each of the Decision Standards required to grant a variance. If multiple Variances are being requested, including a separate list of narrative statements for each Variance sought.

## Site Plan Requirements

For source text see Oxford Zoning Code [Section 1139.02\(a\)\(2\)](#)

- North arrow.
- Scale.
- Vicinity map.
- All existing and proposed lot lines within the site.
- Dimensions of all lots and of the entire site and any adjacent rights-of-way.
- Location, height, and use of all proposed and existing structures.
- Location and design of all proposed vehicle management areas.
- Location, size, and type of all proposed signs.
- Location, height, and type of all proposed screening and landscaping.
- Distances to residential zoning districts if within 1,000 feet.
- The use of land and location of structures on adjacent property and across adjacent rights-of-way.
- An indication of the regulation from which the Variance is requested.
- Other information as required by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

## Decision Standards

For source text see Oxford Zoning Code [Section 1139.02\(c\)](#)

The Board of Zoning Appeals will consider the effect of the request on the public health, safety and welfare.

Variances shall be granted only upon a determination that **practical difficulties** exist with respect to the property in question that would render strict application of the Zoning Code unreasonable. This determination shall be made without regard to the existence of variances and nonconformities on other land, sites, or structures not presently under consideration.

**In determining whether practical difficulties exist sufficient to warrant a variance, the Board shall consider and weigh the following factors<sup>1</sup>:**

- Whether the property in question will yield reasonable return of whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;
- Whether the variance is substantial;
- Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance;
- Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e. water, sewer, garbage);
- Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction;
- Whether the property owners' predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a variance;
- Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance.
- Any other relevant factor.

<sup>1</sup> The first seven factors are collectively known as the "Duncan standards" and are commonly referenced by municipal zoning jurisdictions in Ohio following the State Supreme Court's decision in [Duncan v Middlefield, 23 Ohio St. 3d 83 \(1986\)](#)

# 124 Pin Oak Drive

## Adjacent Property Owners

Parcel #	Address	Property Owner
H4000018000041	122 Pin Oak Drive	Edwin & Bonnie Stephenson 122 Pin Oak Drive Oxford, OH 45056
H4000018000039	126 Pin Oak Drive	Janet Ziegler 126 Pin Oak Drive. Oxford, OH 56056
H4100018000038	130 Pin Oak Drive	Ann Bulleit Kirby 130 Pin Oak Drive Oxford, OH 45056
H4100018000002	126 Hilltop Rd.	Verne & Mary Troxel 126 Hilltop Rd Oxford, OH 45056
H4100018000003	122 Hilltop Rd.	Allan Skillings 122 Hilltop Rd. Oxford, OH 45056
H4100022000005	6224 Contreras Rd..	Oxford Country Club Inc. 6224 Contreras Rd. Oxford, OH 45056

City of Oxford  
15 South College Avenue  
Oxford, Ohio 45056

April 17, 2025

RE: Letter of Authority


Dear City Staff;

Mr. Scott Webb, of Scott Webb Architect, has authority to act on my behalf on all matters of Zoning and Planning with the City of Oxford for the following property:

124 Pin Oak DR.  
Oxford Ohio  
Butler County Parcel # H4000-018-000-040

G. Alan Kyger has authority to speak on my behalf with City staff and before the Oxford Board of Zoning Appeals for the same property.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Martha K. Kyger', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Martha K Kyger Trustee

Board of Zoning Appeals  
City of Oxford  
101 East High Street  
Oxford, Ohio 45056



**SCOTT  
WEBB**

**A R C H I T E C T**

103 West Walnut Street  
Oxford, Ohio 45056  
(513) 523-3838

[www.scottwebbarchitect.com](http://www.scottwebbarchitect.com)

Re: Variance to Rear and Side Yard  
Setback Requirements  
Proposed Addition & Remodeling  
124 Pin Oak Drive

April 21, 2025

#### Board Members

Please accept this letter as a formal petition for a Board of Zoning Appeals review hearing for variances to the Rear Yard Setback Requirement for a New Deck & Future Pergola, and to the min. Side Yard Setback for a Garage Addition.

The existing, modest 2-bedroom house was constructed with a single car carport on the Golf Course of the Country Club in 1957 near the end of Pin Oak Drive. The new owners purchased the property last year, looking to downsize from their current home.

Per the Feb. 7, 2025 Preliminary Zoning Review provided by Zach Moore, the following Variance is required:

1143.01(c)(2) Provides for a Min. Side Yard setback of 10'. Though unknown at the time of the permit application Mr. Moores' review, a new survey revealed that the house was not actually centered on the lot as the original site plan indicated. Construction of the proposed new garage replacing the carport requires a side yard setback variance. The proposal would reduce the Side Yard Setback to 5'-6".

This section also provides for a Min. rear Yard setback of 40', including "...porches, stoops and decks, inclusive of those attached to the principal structure or detached..." The Proposed New Rear Deck and Future Pergola extends 8'-8" into this required 40' setback.

The existing residence provides a glass rear wall facing the cart path near the 9<sup>th</sup> tee with a beautiful view over the pond toward the clubhouse. However, this glass wall faces due west, creating glare inside the house and a potential outdoor area without shade. The proposed deck and pergola will improve this outdoor space in the evenings and provide some shade for the house year round.

Though common for its time, carports are not common for homes in this type of location and price range. The location of the house prevents the improvement of the property by the addition of a garage without a setback variance.

In both cases, the practical difficulty here is the location of this home on its lot prevents the improvement and investment to provide a garage or a rear deck facing the Golf Course.

The following are responses to the decisions standards outlined in the application;

- a) *Whether the property in question will yield reasonable return or whether there can be any beneficial use of the property without the variance;*

While the house has always been occupied and could continue to be, improvements to provide common current amenities expected of modern homes, require variances.

- b) *Whether the variance is substantial;*

The Side Yard Setback Variance is not substantial, given the location and orientation of the home to the south. The adjacent house does not sit "side by side" with this home in a rhythmic street pattern that would be altered or crowded by a reduction on the side yard.

The Rear yard Setback Variance is likewise not substantial, given that it backs up to the golf course, and not a "back to back" neighbor, reducing separation.

- c) *Whether the essential character of the neighborhood would be substantially altered or whether adjoining properties would suffer a substantial detriment as a result of the variance*

The essential character of the neighborhood would not be detrimentally affected by the proposed garage addition. Most homes in the neighborhood have garages and the proposal maintains the existing driveway for access to the new garage. Improving the property as proposed would increase the property value for this property and the neighborhood.

The deck addition to the rear would not affect the essential character of the neighborhood, hidden by the house and not visible from the street.

- d) *Whether the variance would adversely affect the delivery of governmental services (i.e., water, sewer, garbage);*

All utilities and arrangements of governmental services are existing and would not be affected.

- e) *Whether the property owner purchased the property with knowledge of the zoning restriction;*

The owner of the property was made aware of the necessity of the Side Yard Set Back Variance when they commissioned a new Survey and found the discrepancy in the house location on the lot.

The owner is aware of the Rear Yard Setback.

- f) *Whether the property owners' predicament feasibly can be obviated through some method other than a variance;*

The requested variances are necessary for each of the proposed improvements.

- g) *Whether the spirit and intent behind the zoning requirement would be observed and substantial justice done by granting the variance;*

The spirit and intent of the Zoning Code is observed, allowing a variance process for practical difficulties where owners are limited in the improvement of their property.


Substantial justice is done by the ability of the Board of Zoning Appeals to recognize a practical difficulty and allow the property to be improved to current common standards.

- h) *Any other relevant factor;*

This redevelopment project aligns with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan, encouraging Infill development and redevelopment of underutilized sites as a priority, locating new residences where infrastructure is in place, and encouraging walkability access to public transit, open space, and the Uptown, and Stewart Square commercial districts

Thank you for your consideration of this application. If you have any questions or need any additional information, please call.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott Webb", is written over a light blue rectangular background.

Scott Webb, Architect

Site Photos



Front of House showing Existing Carport



Rear of House Facing Country Club Golf Course




Rear of House in Full Afternoon Sun





Sample Manufactured Pergola Installation

1/2" IRON PIN  
FND @ BASE  
OF BRACE



Bearings shown hereon  
are based on state plane  
coordinates, Ohio south  
Zone, (Ground) Feb.  
2025.

# Plat of Survey

Congress Lands West of the Miami,  
Miami University Lands, Lot #1253,  
City of Oxford, Lot 5, Fairway Subdivision,  
Butler County, Ohio

For: MARTHA K KYGER TR DTD 7/10/2001

KYGER MARTHA K TR

Date: 2/17/2025


Scale: 1"=40'

## LEGEND

- 5/8" IRON PIN SET
- I.P. FOUND
- WOOD STAKE SET

### TOTAL LOT COVERAGE

EX. HOUSE 1975 SQ. FT.  
CONCRETE DRIVE 760 SQ. FT.  
BRICK PATIO 256 SQ. FT.  
CONC. STAIRS 34 SQ. FT.  
3025 SQ. FT. / 13102 SQ. FT. X100=23.09%



### LOT 1253 CLOSURE SHEET

PntNo	Bearing	Distance	Northing	Easting
3			558759.54	1331309.62
103	N 02°10'40" E	100.00	558859.46	1331313.42
102	S 87°49'20" E	131.50	558854.47	1331444.83
109	S 02°10'40" W	85.00	558769.53	1331441.60
Radius: 15.00 Chord: 21.21 Degree: 21°58'19" Length: 23.56 Delta: 90°00'00" Tangent: 15.00 Chord BRG: S 47°10'40" W Radius PntNo: 111 N: 558770.10 E: 1331426.61				
110	S 47°10'40" W	23.56	558755.11	1331426.04
3	N 87°49'20" W	116.50	558759.54	1331309.62

Closure Error Distance > 0.0000  
Total Distance Inversed > 456.56

Area: 13102 Sq. Feet, 0.301 Acres

### NOTES

- 1) Source documents are as shown hereon.
- 2) Occupation in general fits Survey except as shown.
- 3) Monumentation found is in good condition.
- 4) Reference Surveys used this project: FAIRWAY SUBDIVISION



By: Brosey Land Surveyors LLC

-----513-863-0237-----

I certify that the hereon platted property  
was measured to acceptable Survey  
Standards only.

Registered Surveyor, 6492/8823 in Ohio

521.58' PLAT  
N 2°10'40" E  
521.44' M

5/8" IRON PIN FND.  
0.5' EAST

131.50'

100.00'  
N 2°10'40" E

PIN: H4000018000039  
OWNER: ZIEGLER JAMES T CO TR ETAL  
LOCATION: 126 PIN OAK DR  
ACRES: 0.307 LOT #1252  
DEED BOOK: 8415 PAGE: 935

100.00'

5/8" IRON PIN FND.  
0.79' EAST S 87°49'20" E  
131.50'

PIN: H4000018000040  
OWNER: MARTHA K KYGER TR  
LOCATION: 124 PIN OAK DR  
ACRES: 0.301 LOT #1253  
DEED BOOK: 10116 PG: 708

5/8" IRON  
PIN SET

PIN OAK 50'

100.00'  
N 2°10'40" E

HOUSE  
BRICK  
PAVER  
PATIO  
CAR  
PORT

5/8" IRON  
PIN SET

Chord BRG: S 47°10'40" W  
Rad: 15.00' Chord: 21.21'  
Length: 23.56'

PIN: H4000018000041  
OWNER: STEPHENSON EDWIN W & BONNIE  
LOCATION: 122 PIN OAK DR  
ACRES: 0.517 DEED BOOK: 9994 PAGE: 1602  
LOT #1254

PIN: H4100022000005  
OWNER: OXFORD COUNTRY CLUB INC  
LOCATION: 6224 CONTRERAS RD  
ACRES: 58.4

3/4" PIPE  
IN CONC.

116.50'  
N 87°49'20" W

# PROPOSED REMODELING & ADDITION


# Alan & Marti Kyger

124 PIN OAK DRIVE  
OXFORD, OHIO 45056



**SCOTT WEBB**  
ARCHITECT  
103 West Walnut Street  
Oxford, Ohio 45056  
(513) 523-3838  
www.scottwebbarchitect.com

- A. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**
1. THE AIA DOCUMENT AND GENERAL CONDITIONS OF THE CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION IS HEREBY MADE A PART OF THESE NOTES. A COPY OF WHICH MAY BE OBTAINED FROM THE ARCHITECT BY REQUEST OR FROM THE AIA OFFICE (LONGGREN HALL) 1900 F STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036.
  2. ALL WORK SHALL COMPLY WITH OREGON AND CAROL CODES WHERE APPLICABLE. WORK SHALL FOLLOW OWNER OR MANUFACTURER'S AND INSTALLATION DRAWINGS AND MANUFACTURERS INSTALLATION INSTRUCTIONS.
  3. ALL CHANGES SHALL BE APPROVED IN WRITING BY THE ARCHITECT AND THE OWNER PRIOR TO BEGINNING AFFECTED WORK.
- B. PERMITS & TESTS**
1. THE OWNER SHALL OBTAIN AND PAY FOR THE COST OF THE BUILDING PERMIT AND TESTS AS APPLICABLE.
    - a) GENERAL CONTRACTOR IS TO OBTAIN INSPECTIONS AND APPROVALS PER LOCAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS. THE COST OF THIS WORK SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE BID TO THE OWNER.
    - b) ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING, AND HVAC SUB-CONTRACTORS SHALL OBTAIN AND PAY FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE PERMITS AND INSPECTIONS AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND DRAWINGS REQUIRED TO GET SUCH PERMITS. THE COST OF THIS WORK SHALL BE INCLUDED IN THE BID TO THE OWNER.
- C. STATE & LOCAL TAXES**
1. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR AND EACH SUB-CONTRACTOR SHALL PAY ANY APPLICABLE FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES.
- D. CONTRACT DOCUMENTS**
1. THE CONTRACT DRAWINGS AND SPECIFICATIONS ARE INTENDED TO DESCRIBE AND PROVIDE FOR A FINISHED PIECE OF WORK. THEY ARE INTENDED TO BE COOPERATIVE AND SHALL BE CALLED UPON BY EITHER PARTY AS BEING UPON THE CONTRACTOR AS CALLED FOR BY EACH.
  2. IF ANY PERSON CONTINGENTLY SUBMITTING A BID FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE WORK IS IN DOUBT AS TO THE TRUE MEANING OF ANY PART OF THE PROPOSED CONTRACT DOCUMENTS OR FINDS DISCREPANCIES IN OR OMISSIONS FROM ANY PART OF THE PROPOSED CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, HE MAY ASK THE ARCHITECT FOR INTERPRETATION THEREOF.
  3. IT IS UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED BY THE CONTRACTOR THAT HIS WORK SHALL BE COMPLETE IN EVERY DETAIL, EVEN THOUGH EVERY ITEM NECESSARILY INVOLVED IS NOT INDIVIDUALLY MENTIONED IN THE CONTRACT DRAWINGS OR THE SPECIFICATIONS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL LABOR AND MATERIALS NECESSARY FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE WORK. REVISIONS WILL BE CONSIDERED, AND SHALL NOT BE A RESULT OF ANY HARBOR ERROR OR OMISSION, SHOULD SUCH EXIST.
- E. EXISTING CONDITIONS**
1. BEFORE SUBMITTING A BID, EACH BIDDER SHALL CAREFULLY EXAMINE THE DRAWINGS, READ THE SPECIFICATIONS, AND ALL OTHER PROPOSED CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, AND VISIT THE SITE OF THE WORK. EACH BIDDER SHALL FULLY INFORM HIMSELF PRIOR TO BIDDING AS TO ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS AND LIMITATIONS UNDER WHICH THE WORK IS TO BE PERFORMED, AND HE SHALL INCLUDE IN HIS BID A BAY TO COVER ALL COSTS OF ALL ITEMS NECESSARY TO PERFORM THE WORK AS SET FORTH IN THE PROPOSED CONTRACT DOCUMENTS. NO ALLOWANCE WILL BE MADE TO ANY BIDDER BECAUSE OF LACK OF SUCH EXAMINATION OR NEGLIGENCE. THE SUBMISSION OF A BID SHALL BE CONSIDERED AS CONCLUSIVE EVIDENCE THAT THE BIDDER HAS MADE SUCH EXAMINATION.
- F. LOCATE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES**
1. PRIOR TO BEGINNING OF ANY WORK ON THE SITE, THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR IS TO LOCATE ANY AND ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES INCLUDING GAS LINES, WATER LINES, SEWERS, UNDERGROUND ELECTRIC, TELEPHONE, CABLE TV, OR ANY OTHER PRIVATE OR PUBLIC SERVICE.
- G. INSURANCE**
1. PRIOR TO COMMENCING ANY WORK ON THE SITE, THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL PURCHASE AND MAINTAIN IN FORCE THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRE PROJECT UNTIL FINAL ACCEPTANCE BY THE OWNER SUCH INSURANCE AS TO PROTECT HIMSELF FROM CLAIMS WHICH MAY ARISE OUT OF OR RESULT FROM THE CONTRACTOR'S OPERATION UNDER THIS CONTRACT.
  2. ALL CONTRACTORS SHALL FURNISH TO THE OWNER PROOF OF HAVING IN EFFECT LIABILITY INSURANCE, INCLUDING:
    - a) WORKMENS COMPENSATION
    - b) EMPLOYER LIABILITY
    - c) PUBLIC LIABILITY, PROPERTY LIABILITY, AND PERSONAL INJURY
    - d) AUTO LIABILITY, PROPERTY DAMAGE, AND PERSONAL INJURY
  3. CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE FORM, ALL DOCUMENTS AND CERTIFICATE OF INSURANCE LATEST EDITION, SHALL BE USED FOR THE PROJECT.
- H. WORK OF THE CONTRACT**
1. PROCEDURES AND METHODS OF CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR.
  2. IT SHALL BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE ARCHITECTS ON-SITE OBSERVATION OF THE WORK IS NOT INTENDED TO INCLUDE REVIEW OF THE ADEQUACY OF THE CONTRACTOR'S SAFETY MEASURES IN OR NEAR THE CONSTRUCTION SITE.
  3. COMPLIANCE WITH ALL REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO SAFETY AND HEALTH IS THE SOLE AND COMPLETE RESPONSIBILITY OF EACH CONTRACTOR.
  4. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL SCHEDULE AND COORDINATE WORK OF ALL TRADES INCLUDING ELECTRICAL, PLUMBING, AND HVAC. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR SHALL MAKE ARRANGEMENTS FOR STORAGE OF MATERIALS. HE SHALL COORDINATE AND EXPEDITE THE WORK OF ALL TRADES SO THAT PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT SHALL BE KEPT ON SCHEDULE.
- I. TEMPORARY UTILITIES**
- a) PLUMBING CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE NECESSARY TEMPORARY PIPING AND WATER SUPPLY AS SOON AS PRACTICAL, AND UPON INSTALLATION OF FINAL SERVICE OR FITTINGS, REMOVE ANY SUCH TEMPORARY FACILITY.
  - b) OWNER SHALL PROVIDE AND PAY FOR WATER USED DURING CONSTRUCTION.
- ELECTRICITY**
- a) ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE NECESSARY TEMPORARY POWER SUPPLY TO BE USED AS SOON AS PRACTICAL, IN ACCORDANCE WITH POWER PROVIDER'S GUIDELINES AND UPON INSTALLATION OF FINAL SERVICE OR FITTINGS, REMOVE SUCH TEMPORARY FACILITY.
  - b) OWNER SHALL PAY FOR ELECTRICITY USED DURING CONSTRUCTION.
- J. CONSTRUCTION CLEANING**
- AS NECESSARY AND AS DIRECTED BY ARCHITECT, EACH CONTRACTOR SHALL REMOVE FROM THE PREMISES AND RECYCLE WHERE PRACTICAL, OR OTHERWISE LEGALLY DISPOSE OF ALL ACCUMULATION OF DEBRIS, WASTE MATERIALS AND RUBBISH CAUSED BY HIS/HER EMPLOYEE.
- K. PROJECT CLOSURE**
1. REPAIR PATCHES AND TOUCH-UP PAINTED SURFACES TO NEAR UNFINISHED QUALITY AND MATCH ADJACENT SURFACES.
  2. REPLACE FILTERS IN ALL HVAC EQUIPMENT OPERATING DURING CONSTRUCTION.
  3. FINAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE WORK WILL OCCUR WHEN THE WORK, AFTER BEING SUBMITTED TO THE OWNER IS DETERMINED BY THE ARCHITECT TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SPECIFICATIONS AND THE CONTRACT. FINAL ACCEPTANCE WILL BE EVIDENCED BY A DAILY AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVE OF THE OWNER AND ARCHITECT, AND IF THESE ARE ITEMS OF WORK REMAINING TO BE COMPLETED, FINAL ACCEPTANCE WILL BE SUBJECT TO A DETAILED PATCH LIST OF ITEMS OF WORK REMAINING TO BE COMPLETED ACCOMPANIED BY A SIGN-OFF LETTER DATED, EXECUTED BY THE CONTRACTOR AND THE OWNER.
  4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE TO THE OWNER:
    - a) FINAL CERTIFICATE OF INSPECTIONS REQUIRED FOR OCCUPANCY, CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY FROM GOVERNING AUTHORITY.
    - b) PLUMBING, HVAC, AND ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT OPERATING MANUALS, MANUFACTURERS PRODUCT INFORMATION, SHOP DRAWINGS, AND WARRANTY INFORMATION.
    - c) FINAL, AFFIDAVIT AND Lien Release will be required before final payment is made.
- L. GUARANTEES**
1. ALL WORK SHALL BE GUARANTEED FOR A PERIOD OF ONE FULL YEAR FROM THE DATE OF COMPLETION OF THE JOB, AND THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FIX ANY DEFICIENCIES WITHOUT COST TO THE OWNER FOR THAT FULL PERIOD.



**SITE PLAN**  
1. ALL AREAS COVERED BY GRAVEL SHALL BE EXCAVATED AND REPLACED WITH SOIL OR SEED.

**ZONING (R-1A ZONING DISTRICT)**

**SITE DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS**

OVERALL LOT AREA: (5,000 SF MIN. FOR SINGLE-FAMILY) 14,800 SF  
 OVERALL LOT WIDTH: (30' MIN. FOR SINGLE-FAMILY) 100 FT

**LOT COVERAGE REGULATIONS**

EXISTING BUILDING: 1510 SF  
 NEW ADDITIONS: 798 SF  
 NEW WOOD DECK: 383 SF  
 DRIVEWAY / SIDEWALKS: 498 SF

TOTAL: 3246 SF

ACTUAL FRONT YARD: 3,000 SF / 14,800 SF = 20.3%  
 ALLOW FRONT YARD: R-1A = 25%

ACTUAL ENCLOSED BUILDINGS: 2,368 SF + 16.0%  
 ALLOW ENCLOSED BUILDINGS: R-1A = 25%

ACTUAL LOT COVERAGE: 3246 SF / 14,800 SF = 21.9%  
 ALLOW LOT COVERAGE: R-1A = 35%

**INDEX OF DRAWINGS:**

COVER SITE PLAN, GENERAL NOTES, CODE REVIEW

A-1 ELEVATIONS

A-2 FLOOR PLAN, NOTES & DETAILS

A-3 FOUNDATION PLAN, NOTES & DETAILS

A-4 SECTIONS, DETAILS, & NOTES



L. SCOTT WEBB, LICENSE #11193  
EXPIRATION DATE 12/31/2025




MAXIMUM ALLOWABLE SPANS FOR HEADERS SUPPORTING WOOD WALLS IN FEET				
SIZE OF WOOD HEADER	ALLOWABLE SPAN OF HEADERS IN FEET			WALLS NOT SUPPORTING FLOORS OR ROOFS
	ONE STORY ABOVE	TWO STORIES ABOVE	N.A.	
2 - 2x6	4 TO 6	6 TO 8	N.A.	6 TO 8
2 - 2x8	6 TO 8	8 TO 10	N.A.	8 TO 10
2 - 2x10	8 TO 10	10 TO 12	4 TP 6	10 TO 12
2 - 2x12	10 TO 12	12 TO 16	6 TO 8	12 TO 16

BASED ON TEN FOOT TYPICAL FLOOR AND ROOF LOADS IN OPEN JOIST DESIGN AS SHOWN IN ILLUSTRATION. VERIFY FOOT SPACING ON JOISTS LOCATED IN TRUSS BEAMS. VERIFY FOOT SUPPORTING TEN FOOT SPAN ON EITHER SIDE.

BASED ON HEADER SPACING SUPPORT TO WALL HEIGHT EQUAL TO OR GREATER THAN SPAN OF JOIST.

SPANS ARE BASED ON USING NO. 2 SOUTHERN YELLOW PINE LUMBER OR BETTER.



**SCOTT WEBB**  
ARCHITECT  
103 West Walnut Street  
Oxford, Ohio 45055  
610-523-3838  
scottwebbarchitect.com

NO.	REVISIONS

PROPOSED ADDITION & REMODELING  
**Alan & Marti Kyger**  
124 FIN OAK  
OXFORD, OHIO 45056

Feb. 6, 2025

A-2



