MINUTES

Planning and Zoning Commission & Architectural Board of Review City of Willoughby Hills, Ohio April 17, 2008

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT:

Chairman Charlotte Schryer, Mayor Robert Weger,

Council Representative David Reichelt and John Lillich

ABSENT:

Madeleine Smith, Vice Chairman James Michalski (on leave of absence)

ALSO PRESENT:

Building Commissioner Mario DiFranco, Architect Bill Gallagher, City Engineer Richard Iafelice, BZA Representative Frank Cihula

and Clerk Katherine Lloyd

MOTION:

David Reichelt moved to excuse the absence of Madeleine Smith

Seconded by John Lillich Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous

Motion Passes

Disposition of Minutes:

Meeting of April 3, 2008

MOTION:

John Lillich moved to accept the Minutes of April 3, 2008 as submitted.

Seconded by David Reichelt Roll Call: Aves Unanimous

Motion Passes

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

Public Portion

Public Portion opened at 7:02 P.M.

None

Public Portion closed at 7:02 P.M.

1. Eaton Family Credit Union

Contractor: Conrad Signs, Inc.

28954 Chardon Road - New Sign East & South Elevation - PPN: 31-A-008-G-00-002-0

Plans stamped received in the Building Department 3/26/08 Plans stamped approved in Building Department 3/31/08

Present: Mark Zamiska, Branch Manager for Eaton Family Credit Union

Owner/Representative Comments

We would like to remove our old sign with the former name and replace it with a new sign and our new name, Eaton Family Credit Union. The name change is due to a merger in October, 2007.

Architectural Comments

Is this your corporate name and headquarters? Yes. We do have other branches

Board Comments

(Lillich) Will the directional sign stay? Yes. We need it to avoid confusion at the entrance with another business

MOTION: John Lillich moved to accept the plans as submitted.

Seconded by Mayor Weger Roll Call: Aves Unanimous

Motion Passes

2. John and Mary Stempihar Contractor: John Stempihar

29111 Chardon Road - New Garage - PPN: 31-A-008-E-00-020-0

Plans stamped received in the Building Department 3/31/08 Plans stamped approved in Building Department 3/31/08

In House Review approved 4/11/08

Present: John Stempihar

Owner/Representative Comments

- Pictures of the house and existing garage were distributed. When his father built the house, he never changed the old garage.
- A new 24 x 38 foot garage is proposed. Old garage will be taken down.
- Siding will match the orange brick. Maple color is first choice.
- Shingles will be brown Timberline dimensional.
- Depending on cost, he may put hand split shake style siding on the front. The color would be close to the color of the rest of the siding on the sides.

Architectural Comments

- Shake on the front will be better than the vertical rib siding that is on the old garage.
- What is on the house? Brown cedar siding
- The house needs upgrading. It was built 40 years ago. We plan to paint or change it next year.
- A change in color similar to the new garage would be good. I plan to paint the gutter overhang and wood
- We would like the ridge vents to extend the full length of the roof. Okay
- What is the size of your overhangs? 12 inches on the sides. 18 inches in the front to match the house.
- The foundation materials on the garage should match the house. We would prefer brick over the cement block in a color to match the house. It could be difficult to match the brick and the color. Do the best you can. The garage is not close to the house. A slight difference would not be noticeable from the street.
- What about the garage door? It will be a white 16-foot door with embossed panel and no window same type that we have now.
- What color is the trim? Everything will be white.
- The garage is a nice fit with the house. Colors and materials need to match. The house needs to be upgraded.

Board Comments

(Lillich) What type of trim do you plan? 6-inch around the garage door and brick mold on the mandoor. What about the rear gable? Same as the front.

MOTION: John Lillich

John Lillich moved to approve the plans as submitted with the following provisions:

brick above grade and the overhangs on the garage will match the house.

Seconded by Mayor Weger Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous

Motion Passes

3. James J. Farley Contractor:

2803 Oak - Detached Garage 24 x 24 - PPN: 31-A-006-A-00-027-0

Plans stamped received in the Building Department 4/11/08 Plans stamped approved in Building Department 4/11/08 In House Review approved 4/11/08

Present: James and Pamela Farley

Owner/Representative Comments

- They distributed pictures
- We want to build a 24 x 24 pole barn to use as a garage. It will be the exact color of the house.
- The shingles will be exactly the same as the house: Resawn Shake (brown) in Landmark series

Architectural Comments

- Ridge vents should extend all the way across.
- The foundation with stone gray block will be okay since there is no brick material on the house.
- How much overhang will be on the garage? 12-inches on all sides, even the front. It will match the house? Yes. (Schryer) The plans say 2-foot.
- What color are the rake and gutter boards? *They will match the house?*
- As a matter of record, there are corner boards on the house but no window detail, so there is not a need for trim details on the garage.
- The shingles will match the house? Yes
- The gable end shows vertical siding. It should be horizontal to match the house. Okay
- What is the reason for offsetting the man-door? *More working room inside*.
- The color and materials of the garage should match the house the best they can.

Board Comments

(Reichelt) According to the GIS, there are two lots. The house is on one and the driveway for the garage will be on the other. Have you considered consolidating the two lots into one? Yes. We were told that we could not do it by Mayor O'Ryan at the time sewers were put into Oak Street. We have two easements and we are paying two sewer assessments.

(Schryer) What size lots do they have? They could sell the other lot?

(Reichelt) One is .33 acre and the other is .344 acre. It's not buildable. They said it is buildable. I would just have to move my driveway around.

Your pool is on the other lot also.

(Reichelt) The plans say 65-foot clearance to the property line, but that is not the real property line.

(Weger) Right now you are grandfathered and you have two sewers. It you combine them, you cannot redivide them in order to sell off the second lot. Even if combined, you will still pay for 2 sewers. There had been three lots. Two were combined. The other could not be combined.

(Lillich) The City Engineer said that other property owners on the street did combine.

(Weger) It could have been the timing. Perhaps they did it before the assessment.

(Reichelt) How do we approve a garage that is accessed from another piece of property?

(DiFranco) The garage makes the 15-foot setback to the real property line. The only thing that encroaches is the above ground swimming pool that could be moved and the driveway.

(Lillich) If you frame in the other end of the garage with a header, you could always put a door on that end and access it that way.

(Cihula) If you join the properties now, there won't be any savings until they do the new re-evaluation.

MOTION: John Lillich moved to approve the plans with the materials matching the materials of

the home.

Seconded by David Reichelt Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous

Motion Passes

Mr. Gallagher and Mr. DiFranco left at 7:33 P.M.

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Public Portion Opened 7:33PM

• Faye Sivazlian, 37250 Chardon Road

Regarding the Protected Areas Regulations, I always try to protect and care for my property and I hope that regulations will not be put on me that will be burdensome and expensive and devalue my property.

Frank Cihula, 35060 Dixon Road

The wording of 1167.08 (c) (2) may be misleading to the applicant. I suggest that it read "advise applicants of their *right* to seek a variance. Otherwise, it may sound like they are being told to seek a variance.

Public Portion closed at 7:38 PM

Unfinished Business

• Review of Proposed Chapter 1167 Protected Areas Regulations

(Weger) If you read both sentences [of 1167.08 (c) (2), it makes sense. Everyone has a right to seek a variance. We could wordsmith this forever. It does not change the intent.

(Schryer) Dave Reichelt has made note to discuss this at Council.

(Reichelt) We could add the word 'conceptually' to the end of the recommendation so Council would know that we are not expecting a verbatim approval.

(Lillich) No one expects that.

(Cihula) Unless there are deep seated issues, it should go to Council 'ready to go'.

MOTION: John Lillich moved we recommend the Proposed Chapter 1167 Protected Areas

Regulations to City Council with Planning Commission's approval that it meets and contains all the safeguards, regulations and criteria we deem necessary to protect these

sensitive areas.

Seconded by David Reichelt

Discussion

(Iafelice) I would suggest that a copy of Proposal be sent to Council reflect all the revisions (Schryer) None of revisions you sent to us have the date that it was revised. I believe this is version IV-3. We will confer and get the right date in there. We will send a copy to Council with the motion and we will put a copy in the Archives.

(Iafelice) I would like to submit it so that that I can point out all the revisions.

(Schryer) Vicki (Council clerk) needs one for her records and we (Planning and Zoning Commission) need one for ours.

(Lillich) I amend my motion to reflect the comments of the City Engineer that it shows with the latest revision.

(Reichelt) I second that amendment

Amended Motion:

John Lillich moved we recommend the Proposed Chapter 1167 Protected Areas Regulations to City Council with Planning Commission's approval that it meets and contains all the safeguards, regulations and criteria we deem necessary to protect these sensitive areas and that a copy of the Proposed Chapter 1167 Protected Areas Regulations containing all the revisions discussed by this body also be forward to Council.

Seconded by David Reichelt Roll Call: Aves Unanimous

Motion Passes

New Business

None

Mayor's Report

I would like to let Richard Iafelice, the City Engineer, present an idea that is in its conceptual stage for the west side of the city

(Iafelice) We have had numerous inquiries from developers about the west side of the city. I have recommended to the Mayor that we have a discussion about higher density development for that area. The developers want to do something attractive, good for the city and residential in nature. The area is south of White Road, which will have sewers. It is residential. It is adjacent to the airport, east of Bishop and potentially runs to Rockefeller the area has significant wetlands and a creek but there will be sanitary sewer service. I need guidance about legal procedure to discuss with the developers.

There was a group discussion about Conservation Development and the land under discussion, the Master Plan, what is permitted under the Zoning Code (overlay, R-1, R-2, districts, high density residential, industrial park), and the requirements of the City Charter. Development is desirable and attractive for the City. Discussion with the Law Director was recommended. Also, the Charter Review Committee meets every two weeks. The Law Director is at their disposal.

Council Representative's Report

None

Building Inspector's Report

None

Chairman's Report

Mr. Reichelt, will you let us know when the Council Planning and Zoning Committee will meet next? Members of this Board may wish to attend.

(Reichelt) Council will hold a public hearing on this ordinance this Thursday, 4/24/08. Our committee meeting will be afterward to take into account comments from the public.

Adjournment

MOTION:

John Lillich moved to adjourn Seconded by David Reichelt

Voice vote: Ayes unanimous

Motion passes

Meeting adjourned at 8:16P.M.

Minutes – April 17, 2008 Planning and Zoning Commission & Architectural Board of Review Page 6 of 6

Katherine D Llayd
Clerk

Chairman

5-1-2008