

MINUTES
Planning and Zoning Commission & Architectural Board of Review
City of Willoughby Hills, Ohio
October 2, 2008

CALL TO ORDER: 7:01 P.M.

PRESENT: Chairman Charlotte Schryer, Vice Chairman James Michalski,
Mayor Robert Weger, Council Representative David Reichelt, Madeleine Smith,
and John Lillich

ALSO PRESENT: Building Commissioner Fred Wyss, Architect Bill Gallagher, City Engineer
Richard Iafelice, BZA Representative Frank Cihula and Clerk Katherine Lloyd

Disposition of Minutes: Minutes of September 18, 2008

MOTION: David Reichelt moved to approve the minutes of September 18, 2008 as submitted.
Seconded by James Michalski
Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous
Motion Passes

ARCHITECTURAL BOARD OF REVIEW

Public Portion

Public Portion opened at 7:03 P.M.

None

Public Portion closed at 7:03 P.M.

1. Chardon E. G. E.
Contractor: Be Next Awning & Graphics
28292 Chardon Rd – Subway sign and Awning – PPN: 31-A-008-C-00-003-0
Plans stamped received in Building Department 7/25/08
Plans stamped approved by Building Department 7/28/08

Present: Vic Patel and representative from Be Next Signs (arrived 7:17)

Owner/Representative Comments

- Everything is pretty much the way I presented it the last time. Everyone seemed to like it last time.
We did not get a decision last time
(Schryer) That was a Work Session. It allowed everyone to look it over and discuss it. One adjustment was made. The depth was changed from 3- feet to 2-feet. It is still 3-feet high,

Architectural Comments

- There is a difference in drawing in the overhead clearance. One says 8-feet from grade to overhead. Another says 10-feet high. *Be Next is not here yet. He drew plans according to specifications of the city.*
- It projects 2-feet out into the traffic lane. There is a concern about possible damage to the property from vehicle impact. (Lillich) There is also a difference in how far it projects out. One drawing says 2-feet; another says 3-feet.
- I think he is committed to 2-feet. *Yes. I will do what needs to be done. But I like this style of sign. Stick with what you have submitted. Architecturally, it is an improvement. It wraps the building and has good planning.*

- Think about the traffic lane and possible damage. *A car went into my store last week.*

Board Comments

(Schryer) Everyone is looking at safety issues. I took pictures of the store from every angle. It shows how far out the canopy would protrude out. I also took photos of two other Subways in the area. None of them have a canopy.

(Lillich) It is a handsome design. The bottom of the awning seems to be even with the top of the windows. Whatever the height is on the drawings, it seems to be the most compatible architecturally to maintain that balance.

(Reichelt) I like the design and the improvement. I am fully supportive of what the business owner wants to do.

(Smith) I am happy to see that the landlord is in favor of it. It finishes off that corner. It gives more detail. *Subway came up with this design layout because we have a corner spot .It would not fit in the middle of a plaza.*

(Smith) Will the landlord allow you to install posts in front of the shop to prevent damage from vehicles? *Yes, we have had two incidents already.*

(Lillich) Bill, what is your opinion of the canopy height? *(Gallagher) There is an elevation with a front view that shows the height at the level you are describing. They are matching it. I agree. Whatever the height happens to be, that level is what I want to see.*

MOTION: David Reichelt moved to approve the plans as submitted.
Seconded by John Lillich

Discussion:

(Schryer) Should there be anything in the motion about the height?

(Lillich) This is what they submitted. They should do whatever the height happens to be.

(Wyss) You can describe it as being aligned with the current sign. You might also want to consider installing curbs along the corner of the building to prevent vehicles from getting close

Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous

Motion Passes

2. George Kraincic

Contractor: David Ianiro

34000 Chardon Rd - - Ice Cream Store – PPN: 31-A-006-0-00-007-0

Plans stamped received in Building Department 9/26/08

Plans stamped approved by Building Department 9/26/08

Present: David Ianiro

Owner/Representative Comments

- Nothing has changed. I submitted a rendering of the house when it is completed.
- There is an awning on the drawing. I have met with Ohio Awning, but we would prefer to come back to the Board in the winter to get approval on the awning after the deck is built.

Architectural Comments

- If you plan to plan an awning, we would want it to look like it belongs. What type of construction would you plan? *It would be a canvas awning from Ohio Awning. Steel supports or wood supports to match the wood deck? Steel. The only thing you would see is the posts coming down to the deck. The frame would be covered. We could cover them with wood if necessary. Maintaining the same materials would tie everything together and keep the quality design approach you have started.*

- Are you doing anything with the wood deck to keep it looking new? *It will be wolmanized wood. We would like to keep it natural, but plan to treat it after a year.* I suggest that you stain it so the deck always looks like new. Because it is a commercial building, staining would help with maintenance and cleanliness and the Health Department and washing it down.

Board Comments

(Michalski) Do you plan any seating areas on the deck? *The deck will run into the existing porch. There will be seating on the porch. We might think about a high table on the deck. At this point, we are not seating inside. We need to make sure there is enough room for handicapped access.*

(Michalski) Is there a requirement for seating on a deck? (Gallagher) *There is no requirement for outdoor seating on any code that I am aware of. It would be the owner's preference.*

(Wyss) The design for the signs was submitted so he could get that approved as well. *I am not changing the size of the existing sign. I do plan to put a metal and vinyl on it like the Spa across the street. There is a gap between the top piece of wood and the main body of the sign. We would put in a grate to allow 4-inch letters to spell out 'Go Rebels' or the 'Special of the day'. Signs on the window will not cover the entire window. The sign shown on the drawing is larger than planned because it is covering the sign from the previous tenant. We will do it according to ordinance.*

(Lillich) The existing sign is acceptable. I like the sign on the rendered drawing. It is rectangular rather than the 48" x 48" square existing sign. *The owner likes the existing sign.*

(Smith) Are you putting anything around the sign? *I have rocks there so far, but I will put plants and flowers inside the rocks. The old wood on the sign has already been stained.*

(Schryer) On the elevation the faces out, are you extending the building out or just replacing windows? I will pull out the frames on the two existing windows and insert service windows into that same space.

(Schryer) Regarding the parking lot, there are notes from Mr. Wyss about improvement that need to be done on the grade. (Wyss) *That will be handled with the Engineer.* Okay

(Schryer) Are you following the landscaping on the rendered drawing? *We are putting in bushes. There will be no expansion of other landscaping.*

(Schryer) Are you putting up a new fence? *Yes, it will be a 6-foot high wood stockade fence, stained the same color as the deck. It will enclose the trash and the rest of the owner's property.*

(Schryer) You will have room for the picnic tables in the backyard? *Yes, the stockade is along behind the parking lot. The tables will be in a grass area behind the house.*

(Smith) Will you have a drive-thru? *No, we have no room.*

MOTION: John Lillich moved to approve the drawing as submitted.
Seconded by David Reichelt

Discussion:

(Schryer) Are we also approving the sign?

(Reichelt) Can we amend the motion to approve the drawings and including the signs?

(Gallagher) Will describe the material for the sign? *It is aluminum with a vinyl coating surface. It fits right over the existing sign which is currently white. It will be the same color with the logo, similar to the sign across the street.*

(Smith) Is it lighted? *No. I have not located the electricity that reportedly runs to the sign. We have no plan for lighting the sign at this time.*

(Schryer) Is that the same type of sign that goes in the front window? *I would like to put a vinyl sign on the glass of the front window.*

(Wyss) The ordinance is noted on the side of the sign drawing. The logo sign cannot be more than 20% of the total glass area of the building. It includes all of the windows.

(Gallagher) Do the other word signs shown on the drawing count toward the total signage? (Wyss) Yes.

(Ianiro) *Other businesses in the area have more window coverage.* (Cihula) They were grandfathered before the Ordinance.

(Reichelt) With the amount of glass on the front of the building, he will have enough room to do what he

wants. As long as it looks nice, I do not see a problem with it.

(Michalski) We are not addressing the window sign at this time

(Ianiro) *When I return to the Board, I will need to bring both the window signs and awning? Yes*

AMENDED MOTION: John Lillich moved to approve the drawings and the ground sign as submitted.
Seconded by David Reichelt

Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous

Motion Passes

3. Thomas C. Bregar

Contractor: Blossom Homes

2567 Hanna Rd – Addition & renovation – PPN: 31-A-011-A-01-009-0

Plans stamped received in Building Department 9/8/08

Plans stamped received by CT Consultants 9/8/08

Plans stamped approved by CT Consultants 9/17/08

Present: Thomas C. Bregar and Anthony Kucia (contractor)

Owner/Representative Comments

- We want to do an addition and a renovation in two phases.
- Phase I is an addition of a 3-car attached garage and family room coming off the back of the house.
- Phase II would be after Phase I is completed. We would renovate the existing home, putting on a new elevation and changing all the existing siding and roofing to match the addition.
- We are presenting the whole project so the Board has a good understanding of how the entire project will look.

(Lillich) You will live there during the project? *Yes*

(Schryer) What is the timetable between the two phases? *Phase II is pending the sale of my parents' home.* (Wyss) Depending on the length of Phase I, he may not have to reapply for Phase II.

- The new brick is #905 Flash Engineering Kensington by Redland Brick.
- The roof is driftwood dimensional shingles by Owens-Corning.
- It will have tan Pella windows with tan siding and soffits that match.
- The prints show the new addition as it relates to the existing house.

Architectural Comments

Is this a setback or a breezeway? It is a dining room. We are putting a bedroom above it. I will take out the living room window and replace it with the new front door entry.

You are going to build up the rake boards, cornices, the returns on the front elevation? *Yes*

How will you get the depth on the roof?

Will match on the bedroom? *Yes, there are gables that match.*

- Will you center the garage door and build up the masonry piers on the garage? *We are putting in new electric service. The utilities will be underground.*
- Is the new brick the same as the foundation brick for the addition? *Yes*
- Materials will match throughout? The roof on the addition will be matched with the new roof on the existing house? *Yes*
- On the brick, you are putting on coins for transition on the corners? *Yes*
- How close is your neighbor's house on the Right elevation? I am concerned about their view of a long vinyl wall? *It's about 6-8 feet away, but they have a 7-foot high fence. It sits on land that is 3-feet higher than mine. It has been landscaped for privacy*

The front has great detail and thought, but the rest of the addition does not. There is not much continuity. *There are not many windows in the family room because I do not have a good view and I do need interior wall space.*

Board Comments

(Lillich) You will need to drive through the old garage to get to the new garage? *Yes, because of the setback. There was no need to tear down a good garage.*

(Smith) The garage seems small compared to the house. *We considered building above the garage, but we do not need the space and the existing garage is lower than the house.*

(Michalski) Are you putting on a new second floor with a new roof? *No, we are putting a dormer on the back of the house and are extending the peak about 40-45 inches higher.*

(Schryer) Are you eliminating the existing fireplace? *Yes, there will be a new one on the other side of the house*

(Michalski) On the Right elevation where there are two windows, would it be more architecturally pleasing to put in a large window and add smaller windows in the garage? *I considered a triple window, but it just looks at a wood fence. It is a television room with good wall space.*

(Gallagher) What is your access to the garage during this process? *During Phase I, we will cut the doorway on the back of the existing garage, put a garage door on the back of the garage and put in the driveway. Will the opening be offset? Initially, yes. It is a 24-foot garage*

(Michalski) The application is for the entire project. What happens if Phase I is done but Phase II does not get done?

(Gallagher) Even though Phase I will look completely different, it is behind the house. However, the selling point of the entire project is Phase II. I don't know if we can allow them to start one without the other, especially if it is contingent on selling another house.

(Wyss) The project permit has a time limit, as does the Board approval.

(Lillich) Is there a completion bond? (Wyss) There is a \$250 bond for completion of the project. We could put the project on extension.

(Schryer) The application is written for the entire project. *I cannot do Phase II until the house sells.*

(Michalski) Does Mr. Gallagher have architectural concerns? (Gallagher) My concerns were addressed.

MOTION: James Michalski moved to approve the plans as submitted.

Seconded by John Lillich

Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous

Motion Passes

4. Robert C. Acker

Contractor: Storage Buildings Unlimited

30634 White Rd - -Outbuilding (Barn) – PPN: 31-A-005-G-00-016-0

Plans stamped received in Building Department 9/22/08

Plans stamped approved by Building Department 9/23/08

Present: Robert C. Acker

Owner/Representative Comments

I am building a barn. We are trying to match the barn stain to the aluminum siding on the house. The barn stain sample is caramel.

Architectural Comments

- The caramel stain blends, but I prefer that a barn be red to look like a barn. If you do the caramel color, put some black accents on it and paint the cross bucks and put some detail into it.
- What are the shingles? *They will be gray.*
- It looks like a kit with T1-11 siding and an overhang and projection? *Yes*

- Is the loft door operable? *No, it is just for appearances.*
- The more detail you put on it, the better it will look.

Board Comments

(Schryer) Do you have shutters? *No, those are just on the drawing that came with it.*

(Acker) There is one other change on the plans. The Drawing says 36-inches. We will do 42-inches because of frost code.

(Smith) I would like to see the barn red to match the brick on the house. *I will discuss it with my wife.*

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

Seconded by Madeleine Smith

Roll Call: Ayes Unanimous

Motion Passes

PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

Public Portion Opened 8:03 PM

George Kraincic, 3010 Marcum

Thank you for your patience.

Public Portion Closed 8:03 PM

WORK SESSION

1. Rosemary LaConte or Dick LaConte

Contractor:

29126 White Rd – Proposed Subdivision – PPN: 31-A-007-G-00-018-0

Plans stamped received in Building Department 9/17/08

Present: Stan Lockwood with Aztec, representing Mr. LaConte.

Owner/Representative Comments

- Our project is in two different communities. The rear of the property is in Highland Heights. The existing entrance is off White Rd in Willoughby Hills.
- We need feedback on where we are bringing the entrance in off of White Rd. and where he is developing the land in the back. He proposes lots for single-family housing.
- He has a 35-foot strip. He has spoken with Cuyahoga County and the Airport Greens about possibly getting either an easement or acquiring land from them in order to widen the 35-foot strip.
- There is a building and hydrant for an existing water line on proposed lot 10.
- There is an existing sanitary sewer that runs through the property between lots 2 and 3 and lots 12 and 13. It comes from Parcel # A-2105002 toward the Stonewater Country Club.
- The owner has had informal talks with Highland Heights. He came to Willoughby Hills first because of the entrances.

City Engineer's Comments

We need dialogue and thought about this unusual situation. The property and project crosses both municipal and county lines. The Airport Greens (Cuyahoga County) is on the west. The county property and property line to the east. Also on the east, there are bowling alley long property lots along White Rd. There will not be a new curb cut on White Road. We do not see any problems with traffic or public safety at that location on White Road. Utilities bisect the property. Sewer is the North trunk line sewer owned by Cuyahoga County. The water reportedly comes from Lake County Water. It is uncertain whether the pipe

is a 6-inch or 8-inch. The existing frontage [on White Road] is 35-feet wide. When Stonewater was developed, his property was cut off in Cuyahoga County and left with its only frontage in Willoughby Hills. It is unclear whether Willoughby Hills and Lake County were consulted. This is a request for a dedicated public road with a variance for a 50-foot ROW rather than 60 foot because there are no fronting properties. The owner has attempted to purchase property in Willoughby Hills without success. A sanitary sewer is being built on White Rd. But they already have a sewer line on the property.

Issues with this project include Services (maintenance, garbage, snow plowing) and Safety (fire, police, mail) for property owners in another city which is in another county. It would be 1000-feet of road running south from White Road which would create frontage for development which would be built and approved by someone else. Benefits to Willoughby Hills would be property owners' rights and it would give 1000-feet of road with frontage on a road built by someone else. There is an access drive to the golf course now.

Board Comments

(Schryer) Does he want a dedicated or private road? *(Lockwood) Dedicated.*

(Michalski) If it is a dedicated road, there is property that can be sold off as build able lots

(Lillich) That property is in another county.

(Michalski) Who would be responsible for services?

(Weger) Access from the western side of the property in Highland Heights would be better. If the road came off White Rd, there would be no access for emergency services to the development from Highland Heights except to come through the White Rd.-Bishop Rd. intersection.

(Michalski) There are three county lots on the western side.

(Reichelt) Those are unoccupied. *(Lockwood) I don't know how feasible they would be.*

(Lillich) He may need to buy a lot with a house on it.

(Michalski) The lot with the large diameter sewer going through it would be low value.

(Lockwood) What about a private road off White Road?

(Schryer) There would still be the same problem with fire and police

(Lillich) Homeowners would be responsible for maintenance. It would be better to come in from Bishop.

(Michalski) I agree. He locked himself in when Stonewater Country Club did not buy his property.

(Iafelice) This location is prime for higher density development. If it were a private road, he would have to work out something with two cities.

(Cihula) Back in the early 90's, there was a proposal for a Lockwood subdivision for lots along that road that would extend into Highland Heights.

(Reichelt) The County Commissioners bought the property.

WORK SESSION PUBLIC PORTION

Open: 8:33 PM

None

Close: 8:33 PM

Mr. Gallagher dismissed at 8:35 PM

Unfinished Business

Richard Iafelice gave updated information about the sign for the Gateway Professional Building. In the past, it was approved for on the wall. Now Gateway is putting in landscaping at the top of the property because of people who park to watch the fireworks. Gateway now wants a ground sign, rather than the one on the wall. They will submit the sign to the Building Department so we have a record.

New Business

None

Mayor's Report

None

Council Representative's Report

None

Building Commissioner's Report

None

Chairman's Report

1. Master Plan

Watch for emails about tonight's Master Plan meeting that was missed.

2. Priority Development Areas & Priority Conservation Areas for the Chagrin Valley Watershed

Brochures from the Tuesday night meeting were passed out to all who could not attend.

Adjournment

MOTION: John Lillich moved to adjourn
Seconded by Mayor Weger
Voice vote: Ayes unanimous
Motion passes

Meeting adjourned at 8:40 P.M.


Clerk


Chairman

Oct 16, 2008