

**VILLAGE OF CHAGRIN FALLS  
BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS  
July 28, 2015**

Members present: Holdren, Herdman, Freshman-Johnson, Maersch  
Also present: Lane, Edwards

The meeting was called to order at 8:05 p.m. by Mrs. Freshman-Johnson.

Mrs. Lane swore in new member Karl Maersch.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said Wade Fricke, who is normally the chairman of the board, is not available this evening and there will only be four people here to vote on all items. It does take a majority vote to be approved, which means you need three out of five members. Since there are only four members today I feel obligated to explain to you that three of the four of us would have to vote in favor of your variance in order to get it passed. Before you present your case if you feel that you want to wait until the fifth board member can be here to hear the case you can request a continuance of your case and we can move it to the next meeting when hopefully five of us would be available. If you have concerns you can bring those up as we address your item.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Moved by Herdman, seconded by Mr. Holdren that the minutes of the meeting held April 28, 2015 be approved. Carried. Ayes: Herdman, Holdren, Freshman-Johnson. Abstain: Maersch. Nays: None.

**SWEARING OF WITNESSES**

All were sworn in.

**RICHARD PAULSON, 255 BELL STREET - REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 1125.03(e)(f)(g)(h), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: MAIN BUILDINGS, AND SECTION 1125.04(b)(3), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: ACCESSORY STRUCTURES, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 931-19-012.**

Mr. Edwards said the applicant is proposing to build a new single-family dwelling on an existing parcel located on the north side of Bell Street. The lot is of substandard in depth it is 106 feet and 120 feet is required. The proposed dwelling does not conform to the following code sections: Section 1125.03(e), which limits lot coverage of the main building to 20% and the proposed lot coverage is 37.9%; Section 1125.03(f), which requires a front yard depth of 35 feet and the proposed front yard is 23 feet; Section 1125.03(g), which requires a minimum side yard setback of 5 feet and the proposed minimum setback is 3 feet; Section 1125.03(h), which requires a minimum rear yard

of 40 feet and the proposed rear yard is 22.3 feet; and Section 1125.04(b)(3), which limits driveway coverage to 30% of the rear yard and the proposed coverage is 57%.

Bill Joyce, Joyce Building Company, said Rick employed me to design a home on a lot that he purchased; the house and garage were torn down. Upon closing on the lot he received title work with the size of the lot. We took that title work to the architect and started creating the home. We got to a certain point and hired a civil engineer for him to stake the lot. After some time the engineer found that the title work was incorrect. My thought to Rick upon purchasing the lot was that we didn't want to go for a variance. We wanted a house that would fit in and meet his needs. We are here now because the title work was incorrect. The lot ended up being at least 24 feet shallower and somewhat narrower than what was on the title. We put the house on the lot as you can see on the site plan. What we have and what we are fortunate in having is that the existing neighbors are much closer to the street than what is required now, not only on the north side of Bell Street but on the south side. Even though we pulled the house forward to meet the larger back yard we are still behind the physical setback of the house that is east of this proposed house. We are in front of the westerly house. We are fighting a grade issue, the lot is much higher than the sidewalk and road. So, even though we have the required side yard dimensions to meet the minimum of twelve left and right, because we are fighting the topography of the neighbor to the west and getting a driveway past them to the garage we have the left side yard at 14.58, which pushes the house to the right. The original title work showed that the right property line was right up against the neighbor's garage and encroaching the garage so we thought we would have plenty of room to the right side of the house. But, fortunately the house that is designed is actually forward of his garage and leaves plenty of room between the facades towards the front.

Mr. Joyce said we looked at several ways of designing the house to incorporate a garage that didn't look like a big garage from the road as well as do something that was functional to what Rick wanted to design. His intent was to have a master down with first floor living and that is what we designed it for. In order to do that we had the attached garage and we bumped it into the house as far as possible, we narrowed it and it is only a 19 foot garage; we kept it pretty minimum. Instead of putting the garage to the right side of the lot where you can pull straight in we have a full reverse entry garage.

Mr. Maersch asked, why does a reverse entry garage help you? Mr. Joyce said even though we are exceeding lot coverage on the driveway it reduces the hard surface. If we had the garage to the right the whole back yard would be hard surface. Mr. Maersch asked, what if you had a detached garage? Mr. Joyce said that would be very similar surface to what we have now but it would create more foundation, more roof, and then more than likely we would have to be backing out on Bell Street and this lot is right on the bend so that was from a safety standpoint and having an attached garage for convenience.

Mr. Joyce said the houses to the south of Bell Street their front yard setbacks are between 18 feet and 23 feet because they don't have back yards and their lots fall down to Cleveland Street. Most of them have walk-out basements or fall flat. Our house up on that hill aligned with our neighbors even

though we are at 23 feet is very consistent with the north side properties and actually larger setbacks than the south side. Mr. Maersch asked, are you saying that the house to the east also has a 23 foot setback? Mr. Joyce said I think it is 21 ½ feet; it is a little bit closer to Bell Street.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said the idea is to line up similarly even though it is different setbacks because the lots are there on the curb so the lots angle as they go west. Mr. Joyce said correct, there is a bend in the road. The colonial to the west of us has definitely got a setback that is at least 7 feet further back but it is well landscaped and it is tucked back in.

Mr. Maersch asked, how many square feet is the house? Mr. Joyce said 2,100 and it is 1,969 on the first floor of living space.

Mr. Herdman asked, did you do any calculations to determine what the first floor footprint would have to be in order to achieve it with no variances? Did you even try that? Mr. Joyce said yes, we designed the house before we had the title work. Mr. Herdman asked, but after you had the subsequent title work done and you were able to confirm the lot size? Mr. Joyce said we didn't. Mr. Herdman asked, do you have any estimate as to what that would be? Mr. Joyce said we would have to reduce the footprint not so much left to right because we are very close left to right but front to back we would have to reduce it by 24 feet so the house is 46 feet so you would be cutting it in half.

Mr. Maersch asked, that answer to that question was with respect to no variances on lot coverage? Mr. Joyce said not on lot coverage but setbacks. Mr. Maersch asked, did you consider a redesign of the house when you learned of this property line discrepancy to attempt to minimize the variances you would need from us in terms of lot coverage, driveway, etc. Mr. Joyce said we didn't but the homeowner's full intent was to design a house that would work for him and looking at the neighbors north and south and east and west we thought we weren't out of bounds by asking for the variances.

Mr. Herdman asked, did you do elevation drawings for this? Mr. Joyce said yes.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson asked, just from a safety perspective standpoint being so close to Bell Street, is the entrance to the house going to be up this driveway on the west side of the house? Mr. Joyce said no, the main entrance is going to be through the garage door and back porch. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson asked, so there is no front entrance? Mr. Joyce said there is but it would go down to Bell Street. You are not going to get out of the car and walk to the front door.

Mr. Maersch said so actually as I read this the first floor is 1,969, the second floor is 1,197, and the bonus room is 271 so that is actually 3,437 square feet. Does that sound right? Mr. Joyce said that is correct.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said it is a pretty decent size house for the lot. So even though you would be cutting the house back to make it smaller and have less of a variance, the variance and the setback in the rear is almost 50%. If you look in the bylaws of zoning one of the factors we are looking at is materiality. Now realizing that you would have added the 24 feet should have the owner know

about the size of the lot it would have made a difference so there is some issue there. Has the owner considered reducing the size of the house? Mr. Joyce said we have in some respects. For example, if you notice on the first floor plan we have the north porch next to the garage. The porch was originally preferred to be 14 to 16 feet and we brought that back in line with the garage. We set back the master from the country kitchen to leave a little more porch space and reduce the square footage.

Mr. Maersch said I note that on the second floor it seemed to have a significant amount of attic space that is somewhat unutilized of living space. Would you consider reshuffling the design? I guess you would have to start with the exterior of the house to take advantage of some of that attic space that isn't usable as it is currently drawn. Mr. Joyce said the attic space is a knee wall situation and it would be unnecessary space. We don't have a formal dining room, we don't have a living room, just a great room that allows us to have the first floor laundry and the first floor master suite, which when you put a master on the first floor you are looking at 600 to 800 square feet right of the bat. This type of home, and for the homeowner, was a necessity to design the first floor with a master. The rooms upstairs are already really too large. We just made them to make the windows work and to fit under the roof. There are some adult children that come and visit and there are some grandchildren. That is the reason for the rooms and the multiple bathrooms on the second floor.

Mr. Holdren said I know you said the side yard came in about a few feet on the survey, how much did that come in? Mr. Joyce said the minimum 24 feet on the westerly line. The real advantage here is the neighbor to the east owns the property behind this property. It is pretty much green space. He maintains it beautifully and that green space then butts into the green space over here to the woods. You really have 100 yards plus before you are even into a back yard neighbor. Even though we would be very tight to the rear yard with the driveway it seems like the yard goes on for another half acre.

Mr. Holdren asked, did the current owners tear down the house? Mr. Joyce said it was torn down by the realtor developer and he resold the lot.

Mr. Maersch asked, where there any plans that were proposed by the developer? Mr. Joyce said I don't believe so.

Steven King, 291 Bell Street, spoke in opposition to the variances requested.

Margie Welder, 272 Bell, said I can't really tell in my mind what it might look like without actually seeing it.

The resident at 270 Bell Street spoke in opposition to the variances requested.

Rick Paulson said Sue Scott, 65 Maple Street, and I are building the house together and it was our intention to build our forever house. We are going to move there and hopefully finish our lives there and that is why the first floor is the size that it is because we don't want to do steps any more. I am not a savvy real-estate investor. We attempted to do this once before by buying a home on East

Washington that we got all the way to the end with the bank and the bank couldn't get an appraisal on it because it was a three-family home and we got shot down and we couldn't move. So this lot came up out of nowhere all of a sudden on Bell. I called the investor and rightly or wrongly I bought the lot from him and paid cash for it. They did the title work and per the county's records it came back wrong. All I could go on at the time was what the county had. It was laid out after the fact and it came out that it didn't fit on the lot. In terms of what the house is going to look like I can appreciate, unless you see it you don't know. That is why we love Chagrin because of the homes that are in Chagrin, uniqueness of them and the quality. We are going to build a very nice country farm house that is going to fit in very well to that neighborhood. It is not going to be some giant sprawling colonial that you find in Hudson or anywhere else. It is going to fit the fabric of the neighborhood and we intend to be part of that fabric of the neighborhood. The house is much smaller than the house on the corner, which is a monster compared to the house that we are going to put up. We would just like to be on that street and that is why we are here today hoping you will approve. It will be a whole lot better than what was sitting there before when it was torn down.

Mrs. King, 291 Bell Street, said I think that the consideration of having the Architectural Review Board work with them to find how it could fit appropriately to the lot size.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said at the BZA normally the ARB has looked at plans, however it is not a requirement. We do not opine on look, feel, style, or anything of the nature of architecture. We are only reviewing code variances so if they wanted to build the ugliest, purple, green, lime, octagon house we can't opine on that. We do not make decisions on any of those things. However, all of our variances, whether approved or not, let's say if they are approved they do need to also get approved by the ARB for those variances to take effect. So it is contingent on approval with the ARB as well just to make it clear that just because a variance may be granted doesn't mean that this will push through and the house will get approved through all of the other steps it needs to take. They are related but they are not required or contingent on one another. This does have to go through ARB and they will have their own set of review and approvals that they will have to submit to Council as well. I just want to make sure that is clear because we do not vote on look, feel, or architecture. The size is a concern because that is the variance that we are looking for and whether or not that fits in the neighborhood is something we will seriously, obviously consider today. That is a factor but the look, style, and the country versus the colonial is completely irrelevant to our decision making today.

Mr. Herdman asked, what is the current dimension of the lot? Mr. Edwards said the front yard width is about 83 feet and the back yard is 69 feet.

An audience member asked, how many cars could you park back there at one time? The answer was two.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said there is a patio planned and it is essentially no grass, very little. Mr. Joyce said but the whole back of that lot is nothing but grass all the way down to Hamlet Village.

Mr. Herdman asked, at its widest point on the lot with that deck if it was a square or rectangular lot and didn't have that narrowing at the top it looks as if the largest house that could be built with the footprint on this lot without requiring a variance would be about 1,758 feet in the footprint and currently the first floor footprint is 1,969. Mr. Maersch asked, the garage would be calculated because it is attached? The answer was yes. Mr. Herdman said so that is part of the coverage for purposes of the variance because it is not detached, it is not an accessory building. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said the 1,758 would have to include an attached garage if that was the case.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson asked, there is a planned basement here as well on the plans? Mr. Joyce said yes. Mrs. Freshman-Johnson asked, so full floor of space, which isn't calculated in any of these square footage, which could make the house over 4,000 square feet? Mr. Joyce said correct.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said there is an email that was sent by Bruce Bechhold, 254 Bell Street, in favor. They met with the Mr. Joyce and Harry and they reviewed the plans and they submitted an email that we will submit into evidence that is supporting the home's design.

Mr. Edwards said I did have an immediate neighbor call me about a week ago but he didn't say aye or nay; he was more interested in what was going on. Mark Benson from Hamlet Hills also called me and he was just inquiring about it.

Moved by Mr. Holdren, seconded by Mr. Maersch to make a motion in favor of the variances to Sections 1125.03(e)(f)(g)(h) and Section 1125.04(b)(3). The applicants are asking for several variances and the variances will not affect government services. Also, the other criteria, the property owner did purchase the property not knowing the zoning restriction based on the size of the property. The variances are based on circumstances that are not self created or existed as a result of the action of the property owner.

Maersch: I am going to vote nay. I am going to preface this by saying that I've been sitting exactly where you two are sitting now having renovated a house myself in the village and put a substantial addition on it and it is not a fun process to go through. I also would like to say that I absolutely love development in the village. I am familiar with the house that you are replacing and I applaud your willingness to invest in the community and I think you are going to enjoy living here. Having said that, I find that these variances and these plans as presented are just too substantial. I am new here as you know having been sworn in this evening. I went back and looked at the variances and the plans that were presented to this council since 2011 and the most, in a residential property, that have been requested are three. I find that five is substantia. With respect to the variances specifically I find that 37.9% on a 20% lot is substantial. With respect to the front yard depth of 35 I can appreciate that houses on that street have frontages much less than that, in fact I think in 2011 we granted a variance for 291 Bell Street of 24 feet so if there is a plan presented that comes in with a front yard depth around 24

feet I would consider that a factor. All other factors, including the driveway coverage, I find to be substantial. I do find that the essential character of the neighborhood would be changed by the plans as currently presented. I can not find that facts have been shown that the property owner's predicament can not be obviated through any other means. I think that the house can be redesigned to take advantage of some of the design choices that were made to make better use of the square footage requiring less of a variance to meet the same square footage requirement including the first floor master. I find that the spirit of intent behind the zoning requirement would be undermined if these variances were granted and that is the basis for me voting nay.

Holdren: I vote nay also. I do feel that this is specifically the lot coverage. The code allows for 20% and this is almost double that. I think the other variances, as Karl mentioned, 23 feet for the front I can see that because it would line up with the other houses, side yard that is close, but I do think that the house as designed is too big for this lot.

Freshman-Johnson: I also vote nay and I wanted to state that the variances put forth most likely on this lot are going to need to be reviewed by any house that is built there. I want to say that I am positive about the ideas you have, we're positive about the rebuilding and the lot having a beautiful home there. We have seen lots of beautiful homes be developed here in town on some lots that homes have been razed but the materiality of these particular variances, it is not that you have five to me it is that the particular variances are almost 50% variance of code, which if you look in the history even way beyond 2000 in the modern times here that we are looking at these newer house they far exceed any variance. I think you can look at some other ways to reduce some of the size of the house. You are going to have a full basement and you are going to have a lot of living space. This is a four bedroom house on one of the smallest lots in the village. It is just one of those things that maybe your dream doesn't fit that particular lot but somebody's might and there is lots of opportunity in this town with real-estate and things like that. So, I encourage you to just go back to the drawing board and rethink it a little and come back with a new plan. I would love to hear your new ideas and see how they could fit better on this lot.

Herdman: Not that it matters much at this point but I would actually vote in favor of these proposals. I put a tremendous amount of weight in the property owner's knowledge prior to acquiring the property. And I think whatever the circumstances are behind it, it is quite apparent to me that this property was purchased without full knowledge of what the potential variances that would be required would be. I applaud the property owner for going forward with what this proposal would be. This is the house that you want and I think that

given the restrictions of this particular lot there would be a need for variances no matter what proposal was put into place. With that said, I am only one vote so it is not going to carry the day here but I would encourage you to come back with perhaps a slightly more modest proposal. I would have voted in favor for this one but that doesn't really matter that much at this point.

Mr. Edwards said this will go to Council for final action on Monday, August 10, 2015 at 8:00 p.m.

**DOUGLAS GONDA, 91 OLIVE STREET - REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 1125.04(b)(4), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: ACCESSORY STRUCTURES, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 932-04-026.**

Mr. Edwards said the applicant desires to improve his existing, nonconforming driveway. Currently it is a gravel driveway and he would like to make it concrete. The existing driveway encroaches on the neighboring property by 2.8 feet. Section 1125.04(b)(4) requires driveways to be setback 2 feet from the side lot line. The administration here recommends that he is going to have to get an easement for legal use from his neighbor and we haven't received that yet.

Doug Gonda said we purchased this house right around Thanksgiving of last year; it was a major renovation. I understand it was the worst home on Olive Street and certainly Mr. Edwards knows the property well. The renovation inside the house was fine they didn't touch the driveway and they didn't touch a lot of the yard and we are trying to make that happen right now. Currently the driveway is gravel and this is a 100 year plus old house; it is not a great driveway. It is rather large and you can't use a snow blower over it without throwing rocks towards my neighbor's home so one of the first things we want to do is put in a proper driveway. Currently we do not have space for an 8 foot wide driveway and a 2 foot setback per zoning and so what we would like to do is be able to put an 8 foot wide driveway, get an easement from our neighbor, and once we have that easement we would like to put in a proper driveway. However, we don't have the space for that 2 foot setback so that is why I am here today.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson asked, if you don't get the easement from the neighbor what would your plan B be? Mr. Gonda said we are kind of stuck and my neighbor is here today so I will let him speak to that but I guess there has been an implied easement on this driveway for ever; at least 100 years. The real problem is that it is a gravel driveway and there is just no space there. Literally from the property line to the house it is 6 feet 1 inch. And even if we try to do it on the other side there is no space on the other side as well and that is beside the fact that my garage is on the left side of the drive. Really, I am stuck having a substandard driveway in an area that is a developing street and a nicely renovated house but that driveway is always going to be an eye sore unless we do something.

Mr. Holdren asked if there is anything in our code that says a driveway has to be at least 8 feet? Mr. Edwards said yes there is a minimum for new driveways of 8 feet.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said, just to make it clear, on the renovated house it was an internal

renovation and there was no addition and no variances were sought at that renovation. This is an existing legal nonconforming gravel driveway situation and in order to put new material the code requires all things to be conforming so they are seeking the variance. A change in materials dictates that you become legal conforming. Essentially no footprint and nothing is changing but a change of material, which would require an easement which probably was just never done because everything was gravel 100 years ago and it has existed like that for eternity in this town.

Mr. Maersch asked, what is the procedure for getting an easement? Mr. Edwards said somebody is going to come out and do a survey and create a legal document that has to be signed by all parties and it is filed at the recorders office.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said the recommendation today will be that any motion for this variance will be required that it is contingent on the easement being received so if the easement is not received the variance becomes null.

Ryan Schmit, 85 Olive Street, said I have no real objections to it. We are reviewing the easement as it is presently. They did have a surveyor out there and they staked it all out. They are nice neighbors so we have no objects with any of those things. We see the issues that they have and the only thing we are working through is some of the language of the easement just to make sure that we are obviously protected legally and then just to make sure that the final design and it drains properly and all those sorts of things. In theory this should go through smoothly.

Moved by Mr. Holdren, seconded by Mr. Maersch to grant a variance for Section 1125.04(b)(4). I do not think the variance is substantial; it is about a 5 foot variance. The existing driveway is already 5 feet over the required 2 foot setback. I think this will only improve the character of the neighborhood. I would like to point out that the variance is contingent upon getting an easement from the neighbor. Most importantly, I do not feel that the owner's predicament can be obviated through any other method other than a variance.

Maersch: I am going to vote aye for all the reasons stated in the motion.

Holdren: Aye.

Freshman-Johnson: Aye.

Herdman: Aye.

Mr. Edwards said this will go to Council for final action on Monday, August 10, 2015 at 8:00 p.m.

**PETER AND ROBYN SHIMRAK, 68 EAST ORANGE STREET - REQUEST FOR A VARIANCE TO SECTION 1125.03(e)(f), AREA, YARD, AND HEIGHT REGULATIONS: MAIN BUILDINGS, PERMANENT PARCEL NO. 931-13-047.**

Mr. Edwards said the applicants are proposing an addition to the rear of their existing dwelling. The existing dwelling sits almost entirely in the front yard. Section 1125.03(e) allows 20% lot coverage to the main building and the proposed coverage is at 29.5%. Section 1125.03(f) requires a front yard setback of 35 feet and the existing dwelling is set back 8.8 feet and the proposed addition encroaches into the front yard setback by 2.2 feet. Section 1145.02(b) requires additions to nonconforming dwellings to conform to the yard, coverage, and height regulations.

Rebecca Pantuso, architect, said we are asking for a front yard setback variance even though we are doing a rear yard addition. There is clearly a hardship if we can't go forward, we can't go to the side, from the existing. The 2.2 foot setback is behind the house. We are not asking to push the porch forward. The other variance we are requesting is the lot coverage. Right now we are at 20.9 % of the 20% required and we are asking for a 9% increase to that. We have tried to maintain the massing and keep the massing down so that it doesn't negatively impact the character of the beautiful village.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson asked, can you explain more of the nature of the room? Is it a three-season porch? Is it a closed-in sun room? Mrs. Pantuso said we are adding a family room off of the rear, it will enlarge the kitchen as part of that, and there is a screened porch off of that. We are also adding a double deep tandem garage.

Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said, just to clear up a little bit of confusion, there is an existing nonconforming variance. Essentially the entire home sits in the front of the lot so they are increasing that by 2 feet even though they are adding on to the back of the house. I also want to state that this also has not gone to the ARB but like we mentioned before, they are not contingent on one another. There are two separate steps in the process of approvals in this town and will be looked at independently. There is a topography plan that show essentially on this street and the house where it stands today is clearly in line with every other house on this street. It is clear that every other house most likely has a front yard setback legal nonconforming variance. The back of the house is being extended to be relatively in line with other lot coverages on this street as well, some bigger, some smaller, some in between; it varies. Evidence shows that it is in line with the neighborhood from the topography perspective and footprint.

Mr. Herdman asked, what is the current square footage of the house? The answer was just slightly over 1,800 and 2,500 with the addition. Mrs. Pantuso said this does not have a walk-out basement so all that added square footage that adjacent homes have is not existent in this particular incidence. I think there might be about 1 foot of the bay that is conforming with the setback and there is a sizeable deck that we are taking down so there is something there now. We are just replacing it.

Mr. Maersch asked, the area of the new porch is 105 square feet and that is not part of the lot coverage because it is screened in? Mrs. Freshman-Johnson said because it is attached it is considered. Mr. Maersch asked, the 40 foot rear building setback you are not requesting a variance on that? Mrs. Pantuso said that is correct.

Ellen Hunt, 56 East Orange Street, asked how far back the garage goes? Mrs. Freshman-Johnson

said 17.2 feet from the current back of the house.

Moved by Mr. Holdren, seconded by Mr. Herdman to approve a variance for Section 1125.03(e)(f). The front yard setback is only a 2.2 feet variance and that is not significant. I do, however, feel that the 20% lot coverage going to 29.5% is significant. However, I don't think the essential character of the neighborhood would be altered and actually I don't even think that you will be able to see the addition from the front. I don't think the property owner's predicament could be obviated any other way. Every single house on that side of Orange Street not only are they all within the 35 foot setback but because the lots are pretty shallow this house and every house could only be if they are within code they would only be a 15 foot house, therefore, that is why these houses were built probably before our code.

Maersch: I would vote aye for the reasons stated in the motion.

Holdren: Aye.

Freshman-Johnson: Aye.

Herdman: Aye, and I also have one other point which is that I think the tandem garage addition solves a problem that I would see with this particular setup here at the house. If you only have a one-car garage and a relatively short driveway it seems to me like you are running out of parking and that just reminds me of other issues that the village may or may not have with respect to parking.

Mr. Edwards said this will go to Council for final action on Monday, August 10, 2015 at 8:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

---

Rachel Freshman-Johnson, Secretary  
lgb