

Planning Commission
August 24, 2015
Minutes

The Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Chairman Stanard at 6:20pm.

PRESENT AT ROLL CALL: Mr. Bolek, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Pogatschnik, Mr. Stanard

ABSENT: Mayor Renda

Others Present: Rick Loconti, Building Commissioner, Aimee Lane, Assistant Law Director, Jeff Filarski, Village Engineer, Sherri Arrietta, Clerk of Council

Mr. Pogatschnik made a motion seconded by Mr. Stanard to approve the minutes from the Regular Planning Commission Meeting of July 27, 2015.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Bolek, Mr. Pogatschnik, Mr. Stanard

NAYS: None

ABSTENTIONS: Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz

MOTION CARRIED

Lyons Residence

55 Riverstone Drive

Deck

Mr. John Peterson with Exscape Designs was present at the meeting. Mr. Stanard stated that the plans were approved by the Village Architect. The Board of Zoning Appeals just approved a 42 inch rear yard setback variance for the deck just prior to this meeting.

Mr. Fritz made a motion seconded by Mr. Stanard to approve the deck located at 55 Riverstone Drive.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Bolek, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Pogatschnik, Mr. Stanard

NAYS: None

MOTION CARRIED

Richard Rule-Hoffman

36960 Chagrin Blvd.
Swimming Pool

No one was present at the meeting to represent this project.

Mr. Stanard made a motion seconded by Mrs. Cooper to table the request for a swimming pool located at 36960 Chagrin Blvd.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Bolek, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Pogatschnik, Mr. Stanard

NAYS: None

MOTION CARRIED

Immel Residence

45 Fox Glen Road
Renovation/Addition

Mr. Charles Immel, homeowner was present at the meeting. He stated that the existing structure will remain the same, but there will be an addition of a 2-car garage. Mr. Immel stated that they will also be adding windows, cedar shingle, and a front porch to the home as well as a 2-car garage. A mud room/laundry room area will be added as part of the interior renovation and will have a side entry. The front of the home will remain the same.

The addition to the footprint is the new 2-car garage off the front and the additional square footage is made up of one garage bay in the back. Mr. Bolek asked if Mr. Immel is keeping the existing one-bay garage. Mr. Immel stated that was correct. The rear elevation shows a bay window added to the great room that sticks out 2 feet 10 inches off the back of the home, but it is not a change in the actual footprint.

Mr. Fritz asked if the roof pitch on the garage matches that of home. Mr. Immel stated that it does.

Mr. Pogatschnik asked if roof pitches were detailed on the plans. It appears that there are three different roof pitches; 8:12, 6:12, 4.5:12. The Code excludes a "flat roof" not a low slope. Mrs.

Lane looked in the Code for the definition of a “flat roof.” She determined “flat roof” was not defined in the Code. Mr. Bolek stated that it all proportionally works well and thinks that it is acceptable, even if a variance would be required.

A discussion ensued.

Mr. Loconti stated that anything under 4:12 would be considered as a flat roof because a different type of roofing is required to be used. He stated that is how it should be defined in the future. Mr. Stanard stated the plans were approved by the Village Architect as submitted. There were no comments from the Village Engineer or the Building Commissioner.

Mr. Stanard made a motion seconded by Mr. Fritz to approve the renovation/addition located at 45 Fox Glen Road.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Bolek, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Pogatschnik, Mr. Stanard

NAYS: None

MOTION CARRIED

Discussion

Mr. Fritz welcomed Mr. Loconti. There was some discussion about streamlining the process for the technology. Board members gave Mr. Loconti several suggestions that would help it run smoother in the future.

Mr. Fritz stated that this meeting also brought to light the point he was trying to make regarding the request of a minor variance having to pay the BZA application fee of \$250.00, which was just recently increased from \$50.00. He stated that he believes it is unfair for an applicant of a minor variance to pay the same as someone with a more intricate variance and just wanted to plant that thought in the Planning Commission members. Mr. Fritz stated that it was discussed that they would look at it again in a year to see if it needs to be restructured. Mrs. Cooper asked if the Planning Commission had approved this change because she did not remember it. Mr. Stanard stated that it came from Council. Mr. Bolek asked if that fee will help by having people think through their requests more. Mr. Fritz stated that that was brought up at Council but his question to that was is it Council’s role to set financial parameters to make applicants reconsider. Mr. Stanard stated that Mayor Renda had stated that it had been a while since the amount was looked at and that Mrs. Cannon pointed out that the process is the same no matter how big or small the variance is; i.e. pre-meeting time, preparing letters, etc. Mr. Loconti stated that there is

a lot of work that you do not see that goes into preparing the variance for the meeting and \$250.00 is consistent with what other municipalities charge. Mr. Fritz stated the he only brought it up because the variance tonight was an example of what he was trying to point out.

Mr. Pogatschnik made a motion seconded by Mr. Stanard to adjourn the meeting at 6:55pm.

ROLL CALL:

AYES: Mr. Bolek, Mrs. Cooper, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Pogatschnik, Mr. Stanard

NAYS: None

MOTION CARRIED

Respectfully Submitted,

Sherri Arrietta, Clerk of Council