

**City of Sheffield Lake Planning Commission  
Sheffield Lake, Ohio  
July 15, 2020**

The regular meeting of the Planning Commission was held Wednesday, July 15, 2020. Acting Chairman Rewak called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

**ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS:**

Present: Rewak, Eiermann, Siebenhar, Tollett, Mayor Bring, Law Director Graves, Council Representative Gee.

Absent: Pugh, Building Inspector Melbar.

Attending: Applicants, Councilman Erdei.

**MINUTES:** May 20, 2020 – \*Motion by Eiermann/Second by Tollett to approve the minutes with any noted corrections. Yeas All.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None.

**REPORT FROM COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE GEE:** Councilwoman Gee states tonight before you there are a couple issues that have already gone before Council. They are for the city of Sheffield Lake proposing a split lot behind Speedway and the referral from council for the rezoning of five lots on Cliff Dr. and Lake Rd.

**REPORT FROM ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEMBER SIEBENHAR:**

Member Siebenhar reports the June meeting was cancelled. At the May meeting there were four cases, three which were approved. The denial was for Paul and Claudia Morrow due to two non-buildable parcels.

**PRESENTATION: A) 20SFL-LSP001 City of Sheffield Lake proposes a lot split.**

Law Director Graves states this issue is due to the recent rededication of Community Rd. When the shopping center was originally constructed, the city vacated Community Rd. The city is now planning to improve that road. In order to adequately do so, the small portion of the road where it takes a bend around the Speedway property is too narrow. The city needs to acquire a small triangular piece of the Speedway property to adequately improve that road. We have an agreement to purchase that property from Speedway, but the first step is that Planning Commission would have to approve that split. We do have the provision in our code that prohibits a split that creates a non-buildable lot, so Zoning Board of Appeals will have to consider this tomorrow. The city could have taken this through eminent domain, but we were able to work out a favorable agreement with Speedway to buy it. We are asking you approve this split contingent on Zoning Board of Appeals tomorrow and then we will take it to the county for formalization. Acting Chairman Rewak asks if the city had simply taken the property and had to pay for it through eminent domain, this would not be an issue then, is that correct? Law Director Graves replies that would have been resolved in the litigation. The judge would simply order it. It would be a quick take. We have already established fair market values and

had appraisals. We have a signed issue to buy it, so there is really no issue to litigate here.

\*Motion by Siebenhar/Second by Eiermann to approve the split contingent on Zoning Board of Appeals approval.

ROLL CALL FOR APPROVAL: Rewak, Eiermann, Siebenhar, Tollett. Yeas All.

**B) Referral from Council for the rezoning of five lots. Paul Morrow and Robert Corna.**

Paul Morrow states I have lived here for over 23 years and raised 5 children here. I own multiple rentals and I've owned a business here for over 10 years. We moved here and bought a lot on waterfront property of approximately one acre. Over the years, I acquired a couple other houses and added to that property making it approximately two acres of land. I have presented multiple ideas for the use of my property including a lakefront restaurant. Various variances have all been denied. I have come up with a plan that will let me utilize my property to the (inaudible) potential and will give our community more diversity and character. We went out door to door acquiring 100 signatures out of the 101 people we asked about this. Robert Corna states we went door to door to see the public reaction and it was well received. I have a 3D model I presented, and part of this model is the land was a subdivision and we are building nine townhouses, a custom home and remodeling Paul's house. The entire complex is one plan done as a condominium project, so each owner will contribute to the upkeep of the maintenance. One thing we would like to do is have Buckeye Dr. We would take it over, maintain it and make it part of our landscaping. The plan is to have all the drives and parking centrally located and the views would be to the outside. They are designed to all have a view of the lake. They will be in the \$400,000 category. There is a creek that runs through the property and we are going to make that part of the view and clean it up. There is a house that sits in the middle and it's the only piece of property that is not part of this subdivision, that we don't own. The plan is very sensitive to the home as it sits. We have left so that there is plenty of room for that house to breathe. We have allowed so it can maintain its views as best we can. The thing that is unique about this property is that the lots are non-conforming right now which means they don't meet the requirements of a typical lot. In examining all the existing ordinances of Sheffield, we found the best fit is to treat this as an R-2. It allows us to do what we want without any variances. The R-2 here is very restrictive. You are only allowed to build two stories, you can only cover like 35% of the lot, which we are way under. We are under all of the setbacks that are required. With R-2 we can make this project work. It is not spot zoning, it's what we would call transitional zoning. We are transitioning from this high rise (The Perch) to a soft R-2. I call it that because it's residential. These are designed to have the character of a seaside community. All the units will have a 2-car garage downstairs and two spaces in the driveway, so four cars for every unit. R-2 only requires one space. The second floors will have rooftop balconies. It fits into the architecture of Sheffield. They will have fireplaces, hardwood flooring, etc. Member Eiermann states 100 people is

great, but I think that is a small portion size compared to the population of Sheffield Lake. Who owns the house that it is going to be next to? Are they one of the owners also building everything or is that a separate homeowner? Mr. Corna replies separate homeowner. That lot was part of the subdivision. If the city allows us the street, we would allow her access of course and we would do the snow removal, etc. Acting Chairman Rewak asks just to clarify, we aren't doing anything with the street today correct? Mr. Corna replies I just want to paint a picture for you guys today that says what we want to do. We will build what you see, there will be no deviation. What you see, is what you will get. Member Eiermann states it looks great, but maintenance, are you saying that you guys are maintaining that? Mr. Corna replies the idea is to treat this as one piece of property so it can be maintained by the owners as an association. The taxes that will be generated are probably close to \$125,000 a year. There are no services that this project will demand. I'm thinking it will be more elderly. It is designed to maintain itself and not be a burden on the city. Law Director Graves states this has been referred from council because they put in a request for rezoning. The ordinance requires that when council receives a request for rezoning that the resolution be forwarded on to planning commission. This is somewhat different because they are also proposing a subdivision and typically the approval of the subdivision goes hand in hand with the rezoning. Under our subdivision regulations, that is a multi-step process. There is an optional concept plan review, there's a preliminary plan review, there's an improvement plan review and then final plan review. So, I wouldn't think you would want to rezone it before this commission and council were on board with the subdivision plan. Then they could just walk away from the project and the city is left with rezoned property. I want to make you aware of the general standards that you are required to consider when reviewing proposed subdivisions. You are to review whether the proposed subdivision complies with all the ordinances of Sheffield Lake in accordance with the comprehensive land use, the master plan, storm drainage and sanitary sewer plan and other city maps adopted. That the proposed subdivision is designed to be harmonious with existing immediate or surrounding area and keeping with the intended character of the area. That the proposed streets are in accordance with the master thoroughfare plan and have been coordinated and adequate measures have been taken to provide ingress and egress to minimize traffic congestion. That the proposed subdivision will not adversely affect any delivery of government services. And moreover, comply with the general purposes of the zoning code that encourage the most appropriate use of the land, conserve and stabilize the value of the property, provide for adequate open spaces for light and air to prevent fires, prevent undue concentration of population, lessen congestion of streets, facilitate adequate and economical provisions for community utilities and facilities and to promote the general health, safety and welfare of the community. Member Eiermann asks we are looking at condos, right? At about \$400,000 per space? Mr. Corna replies yes. Member Eiermann states I think for me it makes me say wow. This isn't Rocky River or Bay Village. I think if we had the traffic and other

businesses those areas had, I would say yeah. We have a younger population growing in Sheffield Lake and I don't see this bringing in a younger population to be sustainable for this city. It looks beautiful, but it's kind of in the back and not a forefront eye grabbing situation. Correct me if I'm wrong. Mr. Corna replies what attracted me to the property was as you enter from the east and drive down the street and all of a sudden you come to the high rise, it sits back, but it is so apparent as you come from Abbe. My impression was it's just large enough, it can be it's own thing, it's own entity. It's something that I think can excite other things in your city. It's going to attract people who want to live here. When I did Cashelmera in the 80's, it enhanced the city and created a lot of momentum. I think if you do nothing to your city, it lays dormant. I know 100 people doesn't seem like a lot, but to have 100 out of 101, I've never seen that. We don't believe we are going to approach this as a subdivision, that's not what we are after. We want to build this. Member Tollett asks you mention the house in the middle and that you want to help out with the road, and everything else would be homeowners association, to assist that house, would you be putting them in that homeowners association? Mr. Corna replies if she wants to be, she is welcome to be part of the process. She would have a free ride on all the maintenance on the street. It could be easy for her to become part of the landscaping company that maintains the property. We didn't do this to hurt her, we left her room. Member Tollett asks will it be built in phases, as far as the first three will be going up and they will be sold before any (inaudible)? Mr. Corna replies most will be sold before they are built. Member Eiermann states what I keep hearing from you that makes me pause, is that that is its own separate community. For me, I don't think that is what Sheffield Lake is trying to become in our master plan. Mr. Corna replies I did Dr. (Inaudible)'s house and his property is the same size as this. It's a separate piece and as you drive down there it is magnificent and well maintained. It does have an eye-catching appeal when you drive by. Acting Chairman Rewak asks that is a one family home, correct? Mr. Corna replies it has multiple buildings on it. Acting Chairman Rewak are there more than one family living in that? Mr. Corna replies it is one family, but multiple buildings. Acting Chairman Rewak states my question was then the difference between that and this being one family vs., how many bedrooms are these units? Mr. Corna replies two bedrooms. Acting Chairman Rewak states assuming two to three people per unit, plus the two houses in the back, it is a substantial number of people in a small space. Council Representative Gee states there was a concern about not separate areas in our city already, if you remember by where Vian's motel is, that is done basically like this, just an older version. Also, Mariner's Watch. Member Tollett states as far as separating, I think a lot of communities in certain areas are already there. Member Eiermann asks before we take a vote on the rezoning, I'm curious to know what that homeowner has to say about this happening. Law Director Graves states she is here and can speak on it. Mr. Morrow states I would like to point out there are two homes on the property here right off of Lake Rd. These two homes will be leveled. (Inaudible, sidebar talking.) The street will be resurfaced, probably stamped concrete. This has never

been paved and the sewers don't work. In this plan, we will take care of those. (Inaudible) Mr. Corna states if you look at the page with the statistics, there is less than 24% of the lot covered. You're allowed 35%. The setbacks are done to keep it compacted. The way we did the driveway and garages, they are all centered in the middle. So, you won't even see them. You will see the beauty of the houses and that's what we are trying to achieve. The sq. ft. of each building is only about 1600 sq. ft. with a 2-car garage. It's designed like a split-level. The bedrooms are down below. We stack the living level on top. It will have 12 ft. high ceilings and a view. The bedrooms aren't in the basement so to speak, they are built into the hillside. That is why our height is very low. It allows us to get good sq. ft. in a small footprint. The impact is minimal. Law Director Graves asks can you explain with the diagram how everyone is going to park? Every unit is going to have a 2-car garage? Mr. Corna replies yes. Law Director Graves asks show where the driveways are and where the additional parking for guests, etc., can you just show all the parking and how they will access that? Mr. Corna replies parking is a single access. Every unit has a 2-car garage and a 2-car driveway, there are also spaces developed here for extra visitor parking. It's confined in a courtyard area. People can also park on Buckeye. Acting Chairman Rewak asks I'm looking at the spacing of the units on the map and I see clearly, you have the 2-car garages and spacing between unit one and nine. I see no issue with their being two extra cars outside those garages. Unit 2 and 8, having two cars there right next to each other, in front of the garage, I can see there still being a way through. As we get into units 3, 7, 4 and 6, I wonder and maybe I'm not seeing it, is there space for two cars to be parked side by side? That is where I wonder if there will be difficulty. Mr. Corna replies there is a community similar to this in Rocky River called Hidden Valley and the parking is similar. You have to look at how people park. It's obvious the parking in front of some of the garages. We have additional spaces here and here and this one has a driveway coming from the side. We contemplated another way, but we wanted to avoid a lot of garages from the street side. We can do a little maneuvering with these to make sure it happens. We have areas to do it. 6 and 4 are questionable because of (inaudible). We have identified that as there is enough room there that you do have to do some jockeying around, so somebody is not blocking your garage. We could move the garage and fix that. Acting Chairman Rewak states one of the things mentioned to consider in a subdivision was the drainage and storm sewer (inaudible). I was looking at your map and you do have marked off as to the regulatory floodway. Is that the area that is marked that would normally be the easement for the floodway for that drainage? Mr. Corna replies actually, it's called the floodplain. Fortunately for this area, a flood study has been done and we are not building in that or disturbing it. We will be 6 ft. above the floodplain. We created a 20 ft. what we call, (inaudible) rights, which we will give the city. They could come in anytime they wanted to and wouldn't need our permission. Law Director Graves states that is a natural drainage corridor. The city has an easement to ensure that the water drains. Even if it is privately owned, the duty to maintain the land, would go to the private property owner

but the city has the right to go in there to make sure the water doesn't become obstructed and cause flooding. Acting Chairman Rewak asks the area marked in red and green on the map, marked as the regulatory floodway, your saying any building on this part is 6 ft. away from that? Mr. Corna replies we have an area marked here and we do find a 20 ft. recurring rights area. Now this usually comes up in engineering when you go to get final approval. Law Director Graves asks can you show how the city would access that drainage corridor. Mr. Corna replies there's access. We have a 10 ft. setback from the property line over here, a 10 ft. setback over here, we also have the ability to get in this way, etc. I do want to point out there's a 17 ft. drop from here to the lake, the bottom of the culvert. The lake would have to go up 17 ft. to ever impair the movement of this. The creek has never flooded, there is no history of it flooding. Member Eiermann asks not only are we talking about a subdivision here, but also about rezoning, so what has been the marketability? Is there a percentage like x amount of people interested? We hired a salesman, Tony Benedetto, and he would come in and give you an evaluation. I think the quality of the architecture and maintaining the character is very important here. Mr. Morrow states as far as the marketing is concerned, there is another place in Rocky River on the lake that is very similar to this and they went for \$1.2 million each. Law Director Graves asks you're familiar with the Residence condominiums in Sheffield Lake? Mr. Corna replies yes. Law Director Graves asks familiar with how the market has been in selling those units? Some have sat on the market for a while. They are priced significantly lower and have a private beach, etc. Mr. Corna replies the difference is they sold immediately the lakefront. (inaudible) They are big units and that's kind of their downfall. People don't want that size. 1600-1800 sq. ft. is the magic number. They are getting rid of the big houses and want something that is small and easy to maintain. Another problem with that project is that only some have a view. They also don't have good access. Member Eiermann asks to be clear, is it no, there is no official number or guesstimate of how marketable this is? Have we not had it officially assessed or valued yet? Mr. Corna replies we have. Member Siebenhar states I don't think the subjective value that we all put on the property is really... Somebody could come in and pay \$200 for it, somebody could pay \$600 for it. My biggest concern is the rezone. Is the house in the middle getting squeezed out? I know you mentioned subdivision a couple then said it's not a subdivision, it seems like you are wavering on whether it is or isn't. If it is, there are some things you need to do. Mr. Corna replies this is just the zoning. We expect our engineers when we go in for approval, to sit down and work with you. In a subdivision, you go in and put streets and fire hydrants, etc. This already has streets, it's not a subdivision. It has already been divided into a smaller lot from before. This is one parcel that we are consolidating smaller parcels into. We are taking an existing subdivision and making it better. Acting Chairman Rewak states on the color vs. black and white drawing, 5 is different. What is that difference? Mr. Corna replies one difference is we are maybe going to take this unit and slide it forward so it will have a view. Member Eiermann asks going with member Siebenhar and talking about all the

testing, EPA, etc., that hasn't been done yet, correct? So, should rezoning be done before that? Mr. Corna replies it is not a new subdivision, we are replacing an existing one. Acting Chairman Rewak asks has this land always been zoned R-1? Do we know when the Perch was zoned R-3? Law Director Graves replies I think it was the late 60's that it was built. Mr. Corna states where this is was all subdivision. In 1973 you created an ordinance that pretty much disallows 50 x 100 ft. lots. Then they all became unbuildable because of the size. We did a study of the city and there are 3300 non-conforming lots that are unbuildable right now. There are only 91 conforming lots. Acting Chairman Rewak states there will be one remaining R-1 lot that will be encompassed by R-2. Is there a negative impact having signed onto R-1 zoning and whether that's a large house, small house, church playground, whatever could be built on that property vs. now 20-30 people living in a close area? Mr. Corna replies whenever Trump was building his casino, there was one house in the middle that they could not buy, so they built around it. What happened to that house is that it is now worth 7 times its initial value. This lot in the middle here is going to triple in value. We have done everything we can not to affect her views and give her breathing room. She has a 6 ft. high fence around her entire property. Law Director Graves states I want to clarify that there is no plan on the part of the city to vacate that street. So, when talking about incorporating that in or maintaining that street, there is no plan to vacate. Mr. Corna replies we do not have to own the street, we just want the right to maintain it, because it is not being maintained. Councilwoman Gee asks Mr. Graves can you refresh everyone's mind as to what planning is to be doing with this before it moves onto zoning? Law Director Graves states this would not go to zoning board, it would go back to city council. The specific referral was to consider the rezoning. However, that has to be taken into consideration in conjunction with the overall development plan. You are rezoning it because of the proposed subdivision. Member Tollett asks once this has been rezoned, if that project is stopped, what would be the backlash? It can't go back to R-1 from R-2? Law Director Graves replies there are already single-family homes on the property. If this is rezoned, that means the existing homes would now be R-2. If they abandon the project, the existing homes could be multi-family. Mr. Corna states I am defining what will be built. If it's not this, it doesn't get built. This will be the plan that gets filed. If it does not get built, it reverts back to what it used to be. (inaudible) Mr. Morrow states as zoning goes to R-2, if for some reason it fails, David, does it go to the contract like the group homes that if they are no longer group homes, it goes back to the regular zoning? Law Director Graves replies there is a provision for limited use rezoning where you have a period of time to complete the project or it reverts back to its original zoning. Acting Chairman Rewak asks were the group homes going to more restrictive zoning or less restrictive? Law Director Graves replies to more restrictive. In this case, it would be going to less restrictive. Member Eiermann asks Law Director Graves what could multi-family mean to R-2? What's the difference between a single family vs. multi-family? Law Director Graves replies R-2 permitted uses include R-1 uses as well as multi-family dwellings,

lodging houses, boarding houses, hospitals, clinics, dormitories, persons suffering from mental distress, public and semi-public institutions, educational, charitable, tourist homes, etc. Again, you have to evaluate this in conjunction with what they propose to build. If nothing else happens, you have two homes there, his home and we may build one more home. *Peggy Ledyard, 274 Buckeye/Cliff DR.* states I own the home that sits in the center. I have been living there for almost 27 years. I have worked hard to get it where it is. I am building a garage right now. I am getting ready to retire and I wanted to retire in this home. I have never wanted to sell it. I put up a fence because I had problems. Claudia asked me about a year and a half ago if I wanted to sell my house for her mother in law. I said no. I know they want my property. At first, I heard it was going to be a home on the lake and a home behind me. I didn't understand it or see any plans. Now it's going to be zoned R-2 and there will be a home on the lake and condominiums on the other side. They want to make my street a private drive, which I will never agree to. I want to have access and I don't want them to have the rights to say what I can do when that is how I get out of my house. With their plans, they say it won't intrude on me, but that would be 5 ft. away from my property lines on both sides. Mr. Corna replies the red lines are what the ordinance allows us to have. Those are not our setbacks, they are greater. We are building behind this line here, at least 10 ft. off your lines. If there are condos behind me with rooftop views, they would be right over my house to see the view. It's really not lake property. There have never been problems with flooding except in 2014 when it backed up. It was cleaned and drains now. I thought it went to the street, but here it goes through their property to the lake. My concern is if they are going to be building and the drain goes through their property, would that affect the drain? Member Siebenhar asks when you bought your lot, it was the parcel when you purchased it, correct? Ms. Ledyard replies yes. Member Siebenhar asks so you knew you were carved into a bigger lot, so this could have happened at any time? You can't assume the land will stay vacant forever, right? Ms. Ledyard replies it has never been vacant, there was always a house on the lake and two on Lake Rd. Member Siebenhar states when someone else owns the parcels you know there is always a potential for something to be built. With that said, whether it's R-1 or R-2, they can always build to the same height. Ms. Ledyard replies I didn't know anyone could build anything other than the houses around me. I didn't know all the logistics when I moved in. I had to fight for a year to get my garage because they didn't want me to build it. I didn't know when I bought it that I couldn't have a garage. Member Siebenhar states the street won't be a problem because you can't just take over a street. I know you mentioned the height, but should they renovate their house, they could go to that same height. It doesn't change. Do you restrict someone else's growth because of the fear that they could look down on the property, when they could do it anyway? Ms. Ledyard replies I do not want to restrict their growth, but nine condominiums from two single family homes, going from an R-1 to an R-2 is a big difference for me as a neighbor. I went there knowing it was single family homes. I didn't know that could change. Member Tollett asks to the side of you where these



would go, what is there? Ms. Ledyard replies the two homes. I face The Perch, I knew that was there because I lived there first. Member Eiermann asks so are you really more worried about congestion with people, parking? Ms. Ledyard replies of course. There's going to be a driveway on either side of me if they build the other house too. Member Eiermann asks are you losing any of your yard? Ms. Ledyard replies no. Member Eiermann asks so there might just be some extra parking that you don't like? Ms. Ledyard replies it's not the extra parking, it's the nine condos. I have a privacy fence in the back, it's a picket fence in the front. It goes from 6 ft. to 5 ft. Member Eiermann asks so more cars could be using Buckeye to get to building 5 and building B? More traffic? Ms. Ledyard replies yes. Law Director Graves states part of the referral process is various city directors are asked to weigh in on it and you should have the correspondence from the Building Inspector attached. The superintendent who is the defacto service director, is on vacation. The police chief told me informally that he does not have any safety concern at this point. In the building inspector's opinion, the rezoning does not fit with the character of the area and his concern about it leaving the one parcel as R-1 surrounded by R-2 and R-3. Councilwoman Gee asks David, is our building inspector any relation here? To either of the parties? Law Director Graves replies not to my knowledge. There is no conflict of interest I am aware of. Ms. Ledyard replies no, not to me. Member Eiermann asks Law Director Graves, can you inform me what the process would be if we voted to accept this rezoning and if we voted against it? Law Director Graves replies planning is merely a recommending body. Regardless of whether you vote in favor or against it, it will go to city council for their final decision. If this board were to vote no, planning commission would need a 2/3 majority to override that rather than a simple majority. Ms. Ledyard states I noticed that the prints didn't match with number 5. So, if they do build, are they gonna be able to move that wherever they want? You said it could go closer to the creek because of the views. Acting Chairman Rewak asks would I be correct in saying they would not be able to build beyond the red area without specific variances for those? Law Director Graves replies I don't want to verify their measurements, etc. I can just say they would have to be within the code. Ms. Ledyard states he said he is going to sell these individually, so that means there is no guarantee he is going to sell all nine at once. It could be one year or four years. So, does that mean I would have constant construction next to my house? Acting Chairman Rewak replies as we have seen up and down Lake Rd., many of the older homes are being torn down and there is a year or more of construction. Given that there are three or more lots there currently that can be built on, there could be three separate builds by your property at any given time. Ms. Ledyard replies aren't these all connected? So, it's a constant adding on for who knows how long. Member Eiermann asks is that accurate, can they just build? I know it was said the Morrows could build three separate houses if they wanted on there. Law Director Graves replies yes. Not including her house, they have three houses, the one on the lake on the two on Lake Rd. Each of those is their own separate parcel zoned R-1. They could build, within the code, on those parcels. However,

those are non-conforming parcels that would probably need variances to build new homes. Acting Chairman Rewak asks essentially anything built on those properties would have to have some approval or variance? Law Director Graves replies most likely. Mr. Corna states the concept is to build the shells all at one time and then let people customize the insides. They won't be built individually because they are attached. Landscaping too would be done at once. Member Eiermann asks with the sewers there was a comment they weren't being maintained or they were backing up, and if you guys got this, it would be on you to maintain it? Or would it be on the city? I mean the stormwater, the drainage ditch and the storm drains installed with the project. Law Director Graves replies in terms of drainage, the homeowner is responsible to the curb and the city is responsible for the main line. When there is a natural drainage corridor that drains stormwater for the city, and this is the case with the day ditch, those are privately owned parcels. It is then a blended responsibility. The property owner has a responsibility to maintain it, however, the city has the responsibility and the right to maintain as far as the water flow. In the absence of a formal recorded easement, there would be an easement by implication or easement by necessity where we have to make sure the water continues to flow. If it became blocked, the city would need to go in and remove that. The superintendent would need to answer if there is adequate access or none. Mr. Morrow as of now, Buckeye Dr. is in such bad shape it doesn't drain. If we acquired the street, we would put in new storm drains. I would like to invite you down to see the property now. Member Tollett asks you said tax revenue would be about \$125,000? Mr. Corna replies yes. Member Eiermann states I am interested to hear concerns and thought processes from the members. Acting Chairman Rewak states my concern is you talk about changing the zoning and automatically talk about changing the character. The character of something is really important. Member Siebenhar states I know if this gets built, it will be done right. It will have to go through Bramhall and they will make sure of it. I have always enjoyed city growth; we just have to make sure we aren't squeezing any other citizens out. Member Tollett states I think it is an improvement to the city. I do feel for the existing structure that is there. I wouldn't approve anything that would increase her cost to live there. As far as change, it isn't always a bad thing. Acting Chairman Rewak states I am just weighing the fact that it looks nice and people will enjoy it vs. the impact on someone who bought into a home that (inaudible). Councilwoman Gee states we voted unanimously to bring it to you guys. Some members walked the property, I was one of them. My concern is you mentioned someone else was involved in this, D. Benedetto I think you said? I was not aware of that prior. Mr. Corna replies he is just the sales realtor. Member Eiermann asks is the recommendation from the building department merely that it is not necessarily not a good thing to do, but just that it is not in character with what's around it? Law Director Graves replies I think it speaks for itself that he doesn't think this is an appropriate project in this location.

\*Motion by Eiermann/Second by Tollett to approve the zoning change from R-1 to R-2 on the parcels in question.

ROLL CALL FOR APPROVAL: Eiermann, Siebenhar, Tollett.

Nay-Rewak

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**Master Plan**– Law Director Graves states council has a lot of questions and has been trying to schedule a combined meeting to go over it. Chairwoman Pugh is going to speak with President Rosso about a time to have that.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**CITIZENS’ COMMENTARY: None.**

**MEETING ADJOURNED:** With no further business before this committee, \*Motion by Eiermann/Second by Siebenhar to adjourn at 8:28 pm. Yeas All.

**CLERK OF COMMITTEE AFFIRMATION:** This meeting of the City Committee of the City of Sheffield Lake, Ohio was held and conducted under All Rules and Regulations Governing the Sunshine Laws of the State of Ohio as they may apply. All meetings are recorded and available in Councils Office.

---

CLERK OF COUNCIL/COMMITTEES  
*Brandy Randolph*

---

CHAIRPERSON  
*Cathy Pugh*

I, Brandy Randolph, duly appointed Clerk of Commission of Sheffield Lake DO HEREBY CERTIFY that this is a true and exact copy of the Minutes of Planning Commission of July 15, 2020.

---

COUNCIL PRESIDENT  
*Rick Rosso*