

Sheffield Lake Zoning Board of Appeals Minutes
Held February 18, 2021

The regular meeting of the Sheffield Lake Zoning Board of Appeals was called to order on Thursday, February 18, 2021 at 7:05 pm in Council Chambers with Acting Chair Reilly presiding.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Reilly, Tatter, Building Inspector Melbar, Law Director Graves, Council Representative Erdei.

Absent: Jancura, Harper, Mayor Bring.

Attending: Applicants and citizens.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 21, 2021. *Motion by Siebenhar/Second by Tatter to approve the minutes with noted corrections. Yeas All.

Correspondence: None

Council Representative Erdei report: Representative Erdei has no report.

Planning Commission Member Siebenhar report: Member Siebenhar reports there was one presentation from Superintendent Hastings to extend the Lake Rd. right of way. That was unanimously approved.

OATH ADMINISTERED

As provided in 1353.37 of the Sheffield Lake Building Code, procedure at hearings, an oath was administered by Law Director Graves to all members of the audience who would be speaking at this meeting.

CASE#20SFL-VAR002

John Ruddy, 4406 Edgewater Dr., proposing multiple variances.

Kirk Strodbeck, North Point Renovations and general contractor for the property states the lot is a narrow lot. At first, we started out doing an addition on the existing structure but came to find the foundation was only 3 ft. and no footers, so it cannot withstand any additional load bearing on the second floor or back of the house. In talking to the building inspector, he said he would let me know what we needed to go for to proceed. Currently, we would like to demo the existing structure and build new. Member Siebenhar asks what are the primary variances you are looking for? Building Inspector Melbar replies the first variance is every single-family dwelling shall be located on a lot of at least 9000 sq. ft. and having a width of not less than 90ft. The owner is proposing a lot width of 35 ft. The lot area is not an issue per 1171.05. The second variance is 1133.07, every single-family building shall have two side yards, combined total width of both to be not less than 30 ft., and the lesser of the two to be not less than 10 ft. The owner is proposing a west side yard of 1ft. 5 in. and an east side yard of 9ft. 3in. for a

total of 10ft. 8in. The third variance is no building shall be erected closer than 12ft. from another structure. The owner is proposing 6ft. 6in. away from the house to the west. Member Siebenhar asks what would the two side lots end up being off of your design? What would the distance be from house to house? Mr. Strodbeck replies on the westside it would be about 3ft. in between houses and on the eastside for both driveways, about 20ft. All the lots on that street are only 35ft. wide. Member Tatter states on the eastside of the lot is a house there now, I cannot tell what is the setback for the existing house on that lot line. You are going for 1 ½ ft. What is the setback of that house from the property line as it stands today? Are you moving the proposed house closer to the lot line or pretty much where the current foundation is? Mr. Strodbeck replies it is going right where this house is now, we are staying in the same parameters. Member Tatter asks so there is currently already a 1 ½ ft. setback from the property line? Mr. Strodbeck replies yes. On the northside of the structure, we are staying at that same elevation but adding to the back half of it. Member Tatter states the total square footage can't possibly be met. Law Director Graves states the total square footage/lot size is not an issue because of the exception in 1171.05(c). The 90 ft. frontage, side yards and then the 12 ft. from another structure are it. I believe it states it is 6ft. 6in. from the nearest house. Member Tatter asks isn't there something in city code where you can build on the same foundation without getting a variance? Law Director graves replies no. You are allowed one expansion or reconstruction up to 10% increase, but you can't make a structure that is non-conforming, more non-conforming. For example, let's say a structure is non-conforming due to a side lot and they want to add on to the rear, so it won't make it more non-conforming. Let's say they want to add on to the side, that would make it more non-conforming and would require a variance. Member Siebenhar asks is it currently single story and you are going to two story? Mr. Strodbeck replies yes. Member Siebenhar states 1 ½ ft., you know fire codes, etc. that is small. If someone lights a cigarette, you are gonna know about it. That is a big deal if something were to ignite, what is in place for the firewalls? Mr. Strodbeck responds we wanted to see if we were going to get approved first before we proceed further with the permits and then submit the drawings. Lonnie Hanchosky, neighbor to the east states I think it would be a good improvement to the neighborhood and I would be happy for him. Bonnie Robinson, neighbor to the west states it is a small space between the two houses, but we have managed it. As long as it doesn't get any smaller, I am ok with it. The only thing that makes me nervous is the demolition. There is such a small space to do it. Is that something to be worried about? Member Siebenhar replies I would personally say no.

*Motion by Tatter/Second by Siebenhar to close the discussion.

Internal Discussion:

Member Tatter states this is a unique entity onto itself and I think the preservation of the character of the neighborhood is very important. I think by granting the variances we would be preserving what we have there historically. I think it is a good thing for the city to have such a unique neighborhood. Acting Chairman Reilly states I believe there is practical reason for finding hardship due to the circumstances of the lot. Member Tatter states there are no alternatives with that foundation. It certainly would create a hardship and create an unusable piece of property.

*Motion by Tatter/Second by Siebenhar to close the discussion.

*Motion by Tatter/Second by Siebenhar to approve the variances as requested.

ROLL CALL FOR APPROVAL: Tatter, Siebenhar, Reilly. Yeas All.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: Law Director Graves states I would just like to report our ongoing efforts to revise the zoning code. We continue to have Zoom meetings with our consultant. I think the finished product is going to be very good. We meet again next week, and I will keep you apprised. It is an update of the code as a whole, an overall comprehensive work.

CITIZENS COMMENTARY: None.

MEETING ADJOURNED: With no further business before this board, *Motion by Tatter/Second by Siebenhar to adjourn at 7:25 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 council’s office.

CLERK OF COUNCIL

Brandy Randolph

I, Brandy Randolph, duly appointed Clerk of the Zoning Board of Sheffield Lake DO HEREBY CERTIFY that this is a true and exact copy of the Minutes of the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of February 18, 2021.

CHAIRPERSON

Diana Jancura

PRESIDENT OF COUNCIL

Rick Rosso