

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
RALPH W. BIGGS COUNCIL CHAMBERS
September 8, 2020**

Present: Roberts, Caruso, Hasman, Hruby, McCrodden, Rose

Absent: None

Others: Building Inspector Synek, 18 guests

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mr. Rose started the meeting with an explanation of the code, the job of the Board of Zoning Appeals Committee, and the process of appeal.

APPEAL 2020-27

William Campbell for a variance from Section 1323.03 maximum 4 ft. fence height to allow 70 linear feet of 6 ft. fencing for a pool located at 8645 Dunbar Lane, PP# 601-26-037.

Mr. Campbell spoke to the Board regarding his appeal. He explained that he is in the process of installing a pool, and fencing, that is required. He is asking for a variance on the rear yard portion of the fence to be 6 ft. instead of 4 ft. There are primarily two reasons that he is making this request. The first, is for additional privacy between their property and the property that abuts on the back side, which is part of Settlers Passage. The second reason, is because his neighbor in the rear utilizes the space behind his shed to leave trash, pallets and miscellaneous trash. The reason his neighbor puts it there, is so he doesn't have to look at it. Mr. Campbell stated that his neighbor is a nice guy, but unfortunately he has the view of all the stuff. Any view from the back of their house, he is able to see it, and it looks a mess. They would like the fence for privacy, and also for additional screening, because the deck is elevated, a 4 ft. fence won't hide it.

Mr. Rose asked what the distance was from the house on Settlers Passage to his pool. Mr. Campbell stated that where the pool will go, there is a wooded area between him and his neighbor. He stated that it is approximately 75 to 100 yards, it is an odd shaped lot, everything runs diagonal. Mr. Campbell stated that he talked to his neighbor, and he was given notice, and understands the situation, and why he was asking for a 6 ft. fence. His neighbor has absolutely no objection to a 6 ft. fence, and understands why he was asking for it. Mr. Rose asked about the neighbor on his left side. Mr. Campbell stated that his neighbor, Kathy, had no objection. Roger & Michelle, who are good friends of theirs, on their right, had no objection.

Mr. Rose clarified with Mr. Synek that the type of fencing was no problem. Mr. Synek stated that was correct.

Mr. Rose clarified that the reason for the fence was privacy, and screening. Mr. Campbell stated that was correct, that an extra 2 ft. would screen the debris from the rear of the property. Mr. Rose asked if the debris, was from the nature of the lot, because of the extra acreage, and a lot of trees, it lends itself to things that need cutting, etc. Mr. Campbell stated that it is the nature of the lot, but his neighbor has a slew of wooden pallets, garbage cans and miscellaneous items that he doesn't put in his shed. It is an eyesore.

Mr. McCrodden asked Mr. Campbell that in the backyard there is a stake with an orange flag, and asked if that was the back of his property where he would install the fence. Mr. Campbell stated that there were a few stakes. The plan is to run it along the property line and then over. It was the one closest to the yard. He did obtain a survey. Mr. McCrodden asked if Mr. Campbell would have a problem if the Board amended the variance to specify it to be consistent with it as shown in the sketch. Mr. Campbell stated that he wouldn't have a problem with it, but the original sketch that was submitted, was inaccurate, it didn't account for the addition that was added.

Mr. Hasman asked Mr. Campbell if he considered a natural screening, such as arborvitae. Mr. Campbell stated that he did. His concern, was that because the fence is back in the woods, there is no top soil, and large trees there, and there is no sunshine. He was concerned that they wouldn't grow there.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. There were none.

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Ms. Roberts to close Public Hearing.

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-28

Parkview Homes for a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum roof area over 30 ft. is limited to 20% of ground floor to allow 24.6%, for the construction of a new house located at 10209 Woodview Way, PP# 605-24-025.

Roger Puzzatiello spoke to the Board regarding his variance. The reason for the variance is because of the topography and the walkout basement.

Mr. Rose clarified with Mr. Synek that it was a calculation issue because of the walkout, and if he didn't have the walkout, it would be code compliant. Mr. Synek stated that it definitely contributes to the reason why they were in front of the Board.

Someone in the audience asked for an explanation, and he explained it to him on the overhead screen.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. Dave Williams, 11310 Snowville Road, spoke to the Board. He felt that it was a very small lot, with a monstrous house. He asked if they could shrink the roof, he felt it wasn't necessary. Mr. Rose asked Mr. Synek if the tallest part of the

house is code compliant. Mr. Synek stated that it was, the overall height was 40 ft., and that is the maximum allowed.

Mr. Hasman asked Mr. Synek about the hardship that was written on the application, the roof over the average grade is 16.8%, and asked if there was a difference in the way the contractor was calculating it vs. how the City calculates that amount. Mr. Synek stated that he didn't review the hardship, he reviewed the drawings that were submitted. Mr. Puzzatiello stated that they are 6 ft. higher than the 30 ft. based on the calculation. Mr. Rose clarified that his office did do the calculation, Mr. Puzzatiello agreed.

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mr. Caruso to close Public Hearing.

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-29

Ken McGuire for (1) a variance from Section 1185.03(a) fences not allowed in the front yard, to allow a post and rail fence in the front yard, and (2) a variance from Section 1185.03(a) maximum fence height of 4 ft. to allow 6 ft. for 176 linear feet of fencing, and (3) a variance from Section 1181.03(a) maximum fence height of 4 ft. to allow 10 ft. for 48 linear feet of fencing, and (4) a variance from Section 1185.02(d) to allow 6 ft. & 10 ft. tall solid board type of fencing (not allowed) located at 7960 Brecksville Road, PP# 601-02-024.

Mr. McGuire spoke to the Board regarding his appeal. He explained that there is a group home on one side of him, with a lot of traffic, that has car alarms going off, lights from the cars, as well as cars idling. He went on to explain that he is a 20 year union carpenter, and he does things by the book. He stated when he has to see things that are not done by the book, and with complete disregard, it causes conflict, especially when it affects his property, and they get away with it. When the subject was brought up with the neighbors, they acted as if it wasn't an issue, and he didn't like his intelligence questioned. He went on to explain the different fences that he was proposing, and their intended locations. Mr. McGuire stated that he had no privacy from either side. Both neighbors can see into his yard.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. McGuire if it was fair to say, that privacy was the main driver for the variance request. Mr. McGuire stated that yes, privacy and noise pollution. Mr. Rose explained the reason behind the 4 ft. fence, and that Brecksville was not a stockade fence type of community. There are not even 10 ft. fences in an industrial area. He asked Mr. McGuire if he thought about planting pine trees or arborvitae instead. Mr. McGuire stated that it would take up an area of ground that he would like to use.

Mayor Hruby asked how long he owned the property. Mr. McGuire stated that he will be living there three years this month. The Mayor asked if anything had changed, or if the conditions had worsened. since first buying the house. Mr. McGuire stated that the conditions have worsened, from a relationship standpoint. The Mayor asked him why he was asking for a 10 ft. fence, instead of 6 ft. or 8 ft. Mr. McGuire stated, that it was so he didn't have to look at his neighbor's downspouts, that causes a monsoon running thru his yard. Mayor Hruby asked if he sought any relief from the Building Department. Mr. McGuire stated that he had. Mayor Hruby asked with no resolution to the problem, Mr. McGuire stated that was correct.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. John Hagen, 7003 Wallings Road, spoke to the Board. He stated that he lived directly behind Mr. McGuire. He brought a visual aid, which was a tall pole showing what 10 ft. looked like. He did have a problem with the 10 ft. privacy fence, and the manner in which he was going about it. The Mauser's asked him about installing a 6 ft. fence a year ago, and they were o.k. with it, and then Mr. McGuire took the fence down and put a 10 ft. fence in its place. He felt that Mr. McGuire's actions were deplorable, and he should have to pay for the fence that he tore down. Mr. Hagen stated that he had no problem with the front fence as long as it wasn't in the right of way.

Ken Mauser, 7946 Brecksville Road, spoke to the Board. He is the next door neighbor. He showed pictures to the Board, of the side of his property, which showed a panoramic view of the privacy that exists between him and his neighbor. He stated that natural privacy, is why they bought their property in 2006. Mr. Mauser stated that there has never been a need for a fence since the house was constructed, and nothing has changed since he moved in. He stated that if Mr. McGuire installed the front yard fence, it would be half way thru his property, and he is not fond of the idea. Mr. McGuire did knock down their fence, and the 10 ft. fence is ridiculous. He also built a 12 ft. structure. He felt the other section of backyard fence was reasonable, he could live with it. He stated that he is trying to be neighborly. Mr. Rose wanted to clarify, with Mr. Mauser, what he would be comfortable with, a 6 ft. vs. 10 ft. and board on board vs. a stockade fence. Mr. Mauser explained that he was concerned with the concrete post holes for the fence, and that it would damage the root systems of the trees, and by adding all the concrete, it would alter the soil as well. Mr. Mauser wanted to know if trees started falling, who would be liable. Mr. Rose stated that Mr. McGuire was within his rights to drill a post hole, it was the type of fencing that the Board was talking about He stated that he would be o.k. with a 6 ft. fence and board on board type of fencing.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. McGuire if he would be willing to amend his variance to a 6 ft. board on board fence. Mr. McGuire stated that he didn't want a shadowbox fence. The neighbor has a dog that barks every time he sees him and he would prefer not to be seen, it's unwelcoming. He stated that they installed an electrical fence on his property, as well as a panel fence, and that is why he took it down. He felt that he was being bullied by his neighbor, and it wasn't pleasant. Mr. Rose stated that he empathized with him, but asked Mr. McGuire again, would he consider amending the variance to a 6 ft. fence. Mr. McGuire stated that he would consider an 8 ft. fence, he felt that would still give him privacy. He didn't feel 6 ft. was tall enough. Mr. Rose asked if he would amend the type of fencing. Mr. McGuire stated that he could amend it to an approved type of fence.

Motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mayor Hruby to close Public Hearing.

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-30

J. Scott Broome, for Jerome & Cynthia Ann Yurch for a variance from Section 1151.23(a) from the maximum 70 ft. front yard setback to allow 100 ft. to 105 ft. for a single family dwelling located at 5559 Woodmill Circle, PP# 601-26-055.

Scott Broome spoke to the Board regarding the Yurch's appeal. He stated that he was representing both the Yurch's and Mr. Labassi. Since they were in front of the Board in June, they were able to reduce the amount of the request for the variance. The Yurch's purchased it in 1989, with the idea that they would move from their current house to Woodmill Circle. They ended up not moving, and adding on to their house. He passed out a drawing for the Board to look at, and explained the study they had done with regards to the Army Corp of Engineers, and the wetlands. The Army Corp declared that the front of the lot was wetlands, and could not be built on. He stated that the standard 60 ft. building line is right in the middle of the wetlands. Initially, their request was to be able to build at the 125 ft. line, but they went back to the Army Corp of Engineers, and they allowed an exception to allow the Yurch's to fill .099 of an acre of the wetlands, so they could move the house up. Mr. Broome went on to explain that their goal is to build the house at 105 ft., they were able to move the house up 20 ft. Without that, you couldn't build anything there. Theoretically, they looked for mitigation credits, but there are no mitigation credits available in this area right now. He went on to state, that one of the things that the Board was concerned about, was the location of the house on the lot. The orientation of the house, and the curvature of the circle, the houses will be lined up. This house will be towards the rear of Mr. Mack's house, but will not be directly looking into each other's house, it wouldn't be situated all the way behind the house. Mr. Broome stated that this is the only really practical solution that they have. They can't build at the 60 ft. building line, the Ohio EPA won't let them do it. They moved the house up further, and tried to minimize the amount of variances that they can. He went on to state that the Yurch's and Libassi's are willing to do whatever they can to put natural screening up between the two houses. There was also a concern about the trees. The intention is to leave as many trees as they can. They want to build a house that is good for the community, and it fits well there.

Mr. Rose stated that the last time they were in front of the Board, they wanted to see pictures of this house in relation to Mr. Mack's house. Mr. Broome passed out a drawing, and some pictures to the Board that they had taken.

Mr. Hasman asked if the owner would agree to the condition of screening on the west side. Mr. Broome stated that it was probably the north west side in between Rex Mack and the Yurch's house. Mr. Hasman asked if there were houses on both sides of the vacant lot. Mr. Broome stated that there was. Mr. Hasman and Mr. Broome concluded that a privacy issue doesn't exist on the other neighboring property.

Mr. McCrodden stated that they submitted examples that were in line to the neighboring properties, and asked if their design would be similar, and if there would be floor to ceiling windows, standard windows or no windows. Mr. Libassi stated that he didn't drive up the neighboring driveways to see what kind of windows they had, but he is not intending to put in floor to ceiling windows on that side of the house. Mr. McCrodden stated that if he wasn't going to install floor to ceiling windows, what did he have in mind. Mr. Libassi stated that he was not prepared to answer that, but that would probably be their bedroom, bathroom area, so they won't have windows facing their neighbor, but did state that he intended to have some windows on that side.

Mr. Rose asked if they intended to have the garage on that side of the house. Mr. Broome stated that it would be on the opposite side.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. Rex Mack, 5555 Woodmill Circle, spoke to the Board. Mr. Rose stated that the Board received his email and will be part of the record. He stated that he had a chance to meet Mr. Libassi, and he had no reason to believe that he wouldn't be a great neighbor. His concerns were more a lack of clarity, as it relates to the structure. Mr. Mack stated that Mr. Libassi and he walked the property after that June meeting, and he shared some possibilities of what the structure might look like. His first concern was the possibility of the positioning of the house, and the location of the windows, and the view from both houses. There really isn't clarity on what the house will look like. He explained he had a deck and gazebo with two bedrooms, bathroom, kitchen and family room on the back side of the house. He was also concerned, that once this variance is approved, the layout of the house might change. His second concern was the line of sight. He felt that some of the trees would have to be cut down, and in the winter, you would be able to see very clearly. He felt the curvature of the cul-de-sac added to the site line issue. He bought the house knowing that the lot might be built on at some time, but thought it would be under the current zoning laws. Mr. Rose stated that in his email, he stated that he did not receive notice of this meeting. Mr. Mack stated that he didn't mean it wasn't sent, he just did not see the notice, he was out of town, and he didn't want the Board to think he was emailing his concerns at the last minute.

Jerome Yurch spoke to the Board. He stated that he bought the lot, and intended to build there, but never did. He went to talk about Mr. Libassi, that he was a gentleman, and wants to build a beautiful home, and felt he would be a good neighbor.

Pete Geringer, 5566 Woodmill Circle, he lives on the property next door. Two to three years ago, he bought the vacant lot across the street and cleaned it up and made it nice. He stated that because of the wetlands, there is tall grass on the next door lot, and it doesn't make a nice entrance to the cul-de-sac. He asked about the maintenance of the wetlands and if it could be maintained. Mr. Libassi stated that you can cut trees, and plant, but with only an approved type of plant for the wetlands. Mr. Libassi stated that he will make it look better.

Motion by Mr. Caruso, seconded by Mr. McCrodden to close Public Hearing.

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-31

Eric Sternad for a variance from Section 1183.15(a) not to install the required hard surface driveway for the construction of a detached garage located at 10447 Tanager Trail, PP# 601-11-034.

Eric and Kristen Sternad spoke to the Board. Mr. Sternad explained that he wants to build an oversized shed with a garage door placed in the back end of the property. He stated that it is extremely impractical to install a driveway approximately 120 ft. long to the garage. He wants to clear out the current things he stores in his garage, and have more storage. He got the idea from neighbors that are two doors down from him, that have the same exact structure that he would like to build. Ms. Sternad stated that they submitted a letter from The Leszkowicz's, 10435 Tanager Trail, and the neighbor on the other side is fine with it as well. They would prefer that they not install a driveway to the rear of their property.

Mr. Rose stated that the Board received an email from Timothy McNichols, 10502 Tanager Trail, raising a concern about storing a boat on the property. Mr. Rose asked if that was his intention. Mr. Sternad stated that he couldn't say that he will or will not have a boat on his property, but the structure he would like to build, has very little to do with it. It would be more for 4 wheelers, tractors, etc. Mr. Rose clarified that it wasn't intended for boat storage. Mr. Sternad stated that he could not commit, because he doesn't know if he will store a boat in the future. Ms. Sternad stated that it was not intended at this time. Mr. Rose stated that he would basically have to drive on their grass to get to the shed. Mr. Sternad stated there have never been any issues with that. Mr. Rose clarified that he will be storing lawn tractors, etc. Mr. Sternad stated that was correct.

Ms. Roberts asked, if the size of their boat would it fit in the structure. Mr. Sternad stated that it could. He stated that there is no boat on his property, and he did not intend to have the boat on the property. He did not see a concern regarding the boat.

Mayor Hruby asked where the boat was being stored. Mr. Sternad stated that the boat is down the street on someone else's property.

Mr. Rose asked about the size of the garage. Mr. Sternad stated that he would comply and stay within the 640 sq. ft. Mr. Rose clarified that the only variance needed would be for the hard surface drive. Mr. Sternad stated that was correct.

Mr. Hasman stated that he had a concern, that the building has a garage door on it, and asked why he needed an overhead garage door. Mr. Sternad stated that it was ease of access. He has neighbors two doors down from him, that have the exact same thing.

Mr. Caruso asked if Mr. Sternad could speak, as to where his house and the current driveway is, and if he didn't get approved for the variance, where would he have to put it on his property, and how it would potentially affect the house to the right of him. Mr. Sternad stated that he has a letter from both the Leszkowicz's and the Chermonte's. He would have to completely re-do his flower beds, and he planted a few fruit trees right along the fence, he has a garden, and multiple large oak trees, that would all have to be removed from that side. On the Chermonte side he would have to cut a driveway more or less thru the middle of his front yard and it would basically border Chermonte's driveway, and go thru his entire back yard. Both neighbor's do not want anything to do with installing a concrete drive back there.

Mayor Hruby asked if the proposed structure would be code compliant. Mr. Sternad stated that it would be. Mayor Hruby, asked Mr. Synek, if there were any complaints regarding the boat, and moving it from one location to another. Mr. Synek stated that he wasn't sure.

Mr. Sternad explained that he had always wanted a boat, and was fortunate enough to marry someone that wanted the same dream as his. He made it happen, and it was in the middle of COVID season, and was not running at the time. The boat was being moved around, and he was not able to maintain a dock in the middle of the season, but he had no intention to use his driveway as a storage for the boat. He stated that the boat will be docked next year, but will it be stored in the garage for the winter time, he doesn't know, he never thought about it. He stated that this was supposed to be about a variance for a driveway, he never thought about the boat.

Mayor Hruby stated that the driveway comes as a result of them wanting to build a structure, they both relate to each other. The issue is that they had a complaint about the boat, and that is why he is asking. The Mayor wanted to make it clear to the person that is complaining, that in the future, whether or not the boat will be stored in that particular building, or the boat will be moved, the Board has a right to ask the question, because we do have a code that has to be followed regarding this.

Mr. Synek looked thru the property file and stated that he didn't see any complaints regarding the boat in the file.

Mr. Caruso wanted to clarify another thing in the email that was sent to him, it stated that if the boat wasn't coming and going, he wouldn't have been concerned.

Ms. Roberts stated that recreational vehicles are controversial, and explained that people pay attention to big trailers and boats, and it is not desirable, and is against the code.

Ms. Sternad stated that their intent was to never keep the boat there. They had to deal with it for a few months, because they were stuck at that point. They understood the neighbors didn't want to look at a boat, she didn't even want to look at it outside of her window.

Mr. Rose wanted to make it clear, that they had someone raise a concern about the boat, who isn't here this evening, so they were exploring it, because of the email. It hasn't turned into a variance regarding the boat, he wanted the Sternad's to not take it that way.

Mayor Hruby explained that if the Board grants the variance not to install a hard surface driveway, it sets a precedence for others that want to do the same thing, and asked Mr. Sternad how he would react to that. Mr. Sternad stated that in some cases it is practical and in some cases it is not. With the way his yard is, he looks at it, like every single one of his neighbors have sheds, some have two or three sheds in their yard, some have detached garages with no driveways. Mr. Sternad felt, why couldn't he do the same. Ms. Sternad stated that they have a unique lot, numerous trees. They want to build a very nice structure, but they don't want a driveway leading to the back. They spoke to their neighbors about their project, and the neighbors do not want a driveway in the back either.

Mr. Hasman asked if they would be interested in considering re-characterizing their appeal as an oversized shed and removing the garage door completely, preferably with double doors. Mr. Sternad stated that he hadn't thought about it, he felt that a garage door would be more convenient and would make more sense.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience. Mr. Ken McGuire stated that he agreed with the Sternad's.

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Ms. Roberts to close Public Hearing.

MOTION CARRIED

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
RALPH W. BIGGS COUNCIL CHAMBERS
September 8, 2020**

Present: Roberts, Caruso, Hasman, Hruby, McCrodden, Rose

Absent: None

Others: Building Inspector Synek, 18 guests

APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 10, 2020

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mr. Caruso, to approve the Regular Meeting minutes of August 10, 2020, as recorded.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Roberts, Caruso, Hasman, Hruby, McCrodden, Rose
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-27

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mr. McCrodden, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1323.03 maximum 4 ft. fence height to allow 70 linear feet of 6 ft. fencing for a pool located at 8645 Dunbar Lane, PP# 601-26-037.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: McCrodden, Roberts, Caruso, Hasman, Hruby, Rose
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-28

Motion by Mr. Caruso, seconded by Ms. Roberts, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1181.11(a) maximum roof area over 30 ft. is limited to 20% of ground floor to allow 24.6%, for the construction of a new house located at 10209 Woodview Way, PP# 605-24-025.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Roberts, Caruso, Hasman, Hruby, McCrodden, Rose
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-29

Before Mr. McCrodden read the appeal into the record, he asked Chairman Rose if he would like to offer the applicant the option to table his appeal, and reconsider his variance, given the discussion tonight, or would he like to move forward with the vote. Mr. Rose asked Mr. McGuire if he would like to table his appeal and consider a reduction of the fence to a 6 ft. height, and an approved type of fencing. Mr. McGuire chose to table it for this evening.

Motion by Mr. McCrodden, seconded by Mayor Hruby, that the Board of Zoning Appeals table the approval for (1) a variance from Section 1185.03(a) fences not allowed in the front yard, to allow a post and rail fence in the front yard, and (2) a variance from Section 1185.03(a) maximum fence height of 4 ft. to allow 6 ft. for 176 linear feet of fencing, and (3) a variance from Section 1181.03(a) maximum fence height of 4 ft. to allow 10 ft. for 48 linear feet of fencing, and (4) a variance from Section 1185.02(d) to allow 6 ft. & 10 ft. tall solid board type of fencing (not allowed) located at 7960 Brecksville Road, PP# 601-02-024.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Hasman, Hruby, McCrodden, Roberts, Caruso, Rose
Nays: None

MOTION TABLED

APPEAL 2020-30

Motion by Mr. McCrodden, seconded by Mr. Caruso, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1151.23(a) from the maximum 70 ft. front yard setback to allow 100 ft. to 105 ft. for a single family dwelling located at 5559 Woodmill Circle, PP# 601-26-055.

After the motion, but before the vote, Mr. Hasman asked Chairman Rose, if they should amend the appeal to include that the owner agreed to plant some sort of natural screening on either side in order to provide privacy for the neighbors. The Board agreed.

Motion by Mr. McCrodden, seconded by Mr. Caruso, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1151.23(a) from the maximum 70 ft. front yard setback to allow 100 ft. to 105 ft. for a single family dwelling, and provide some type of natural screening from both neighboring properties, located at 5559 Woodmill Circle, PP# 601-26-055.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Caruso, Hasman, Hruby, McCrodden, Roberts, Rose
Nays: None

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2020-31

Motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. McCrodden, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1183.15(a) not to install the required hard surface driveway for the construction of a detached garage located at 10447 Tanager Trail, PP# 601-11-034.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Hrubby, McCrodden, Roberts, Caruso, Rose
Nays: Hasman
MOTION CARRIED

REPORT OF COUNCILMEMBER CARUSO

No report.

REPORT OF MAYOR HRUBY

The Mayor reported that Shredding Day is this Saturday, September 12, 2020, from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m.

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mr. Caruso to close the Regular Meeting at 9:21 p.m.

MOTION CARRIED

THE BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

DENNIS ROSE, CHAIRMAN

ROBERT HASMAN, VICE CHAIRMAN

VACANT SEAT - SECRETARY

Public Hearing and Regular Meeting recorded by Gina Zdanowicz