

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARINGS
BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
RALPH W. BIGGS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – BRECKSVILLE CITY HALL
SEPTEMBER 13, 2021**

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

Absent: None

Others: Building Inspector Synek, 24 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 2021-35

David & Denise Beach for a variance from Section 1151.06(f)(3) to allow a chicken coop to be 30 ft. from the side lot line, and 29.5 ft. from the rear lot line, instead of the minimum required 40 ft. from all residential lot lines located at 7535 Bristol Lane, PP# 604-03-065.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Beach to explain what had changed from the last time he was in front of the Board. Mr. Beach stated that John Chyla from the City came out and inspected their lot, and it was his recommendation to move it in 10 more ft. Mr. Rose confirmed with the Beach's that the change was the location, and asked if the chicken coop had already been moved. Mr. Beach stated that they hadn't moved it yet, they wanted to wait for the approval. and then they will move it. Mr. Beach stated that his hardship is his irregular shaped lot, and that there really was no area to place it that they wouldn't of had to cut down trees. Mr. Beach felt that the ordinance was written for a standard shaped lot. He went on to explain, that when his house was built, there was a variance provided, and there is no viable space to put it. He wasn't sure where the 40 ft. came in to play, but believed it was to keep it away from other neighbor's houses. Mr. Beach stated that they did their best to keep the chicken coop as discreet as possible. He had letters of support from his neighbors, and passed them out to the Board, i.e., Megan Bender, Mike Mandela, Alex Kemna. Mr. Beach explained that Alex and Stephanie Kemna, who are impacted the most, stated that they would do anything they needed to help them get their approval, and were excited to see that they had chickens. Mr. Beach stated that they were not able to attend the meeting, but his name is included in letter. Mr. Beach felt that the variance request stems from a condition unique to their property, because of the shape of their property.

Mr. Rose asked what they were doing to keep the chickens on their property. Mr. Beach stated they let them free range, but their youngest son, Edison, feeds and waters them every day, however, he doesn't have them free range every day. He went on to stated that there are hawks in the neighborhood, which present a danger, so his son is out there with them every day, and doesn't let them go into the neighboring properties.

Ms. Roberts asked how many chickens the Beach's had. Mr. Beach stated that they currently have seven chickens.

Mr. Rose asked if there were any roosters. Mr. Beach stated that there were no roosters.

Mr. Hasman confirmed that the neighbor to their left was okay with this arrangement. Mr. Beach stated that was correct. Mr. Hasman stated that he noticed they had some plantings in front of the chicken coop, and asked if they planned on planting anything in addition, to screen it from the street. Mr. Beach stated that he had planted some grass last year, but they have not taken off. Mrs. Beach stated that they planted three or four trees that they are hoping will grow. Mr. Hasman asked if this coop was more of a school project or hobby for the children, and wanted to know if it was going to be a permanent structure, or will the children outgrow it. Mrs. Beach stated that they will probably outgrow it, and they are not planning on having any other farm animals. Mr. Beach stated that his son was in Cub Scouts, and part of receiving merit badges, was that they learned to work with a hammer and nail, so they did it as a family project. Mr. Beach explained that there was a playset in the yard, and he repurposed it, and didn't move the location of it either. When he read the ordinance, it stated that a playset needed to be 10 ft. from the property line, so he just converted it. Mrs. Beach stated that it was during COVID, and when she try to find information on it, she looked in the wrong place. She was looking at the information, for an accessory structure, not a structure that housed farm animals, so it was partly her fault. She went on to explain that it wasn't maliciously placed there. Mr. Hasman confirmed with them, that it will eventually be moved. They stated that was correct.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience.

Bob Ganley, 7530 Bristol Lane, spoke to the Board, He stated that they live directly across the street from the Beach's. He went on to state, that the street has no issue with the chicken coop. He explained that he had never heard nor seen them, and all the kids are all happy with the chickens. He wanted to express to the Board, that all the neighbors are on board with this, and he would like the appeal to be approved.

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

APPEAL 2021-38

City of Brecksville Building Engineering Department for a variance from Section 1151.25(d)(1) to allow 2266 sq. ft. instead of the permitted 660 sq. ft. for a detached garage located at 8997 Highland Drive, PP# 601-33-002 and 601-33-003.

Mayor Hruby presented the appeal on behalf of the Service Director for the City of Brecksville Building Engineering Department. The Mayor explained that the Center for the Arts was closed some time ago and will start up again soon at the Human Services Department. They tried to decide an appropriate use for the building, and whatever the building would be used for would be quiet and minimal to not disturb the residential neighborhood that it was located in. There is quite a bit of equipment that relates to the work that the four employees do in that building Monday thru Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Mayor Hruby stated that they felt it wouldn't be intruding upon the neighborhood in the evening like the library or Center for the Arts had. The reason for the variance, is to build a garage on the property to house the city vehicles. They are located under cover, because sometimes they get called out in the winter, and are able to access the vehicles

immediately, instead of cleaning off the vehicles that would get full of snow and ice. The garage would help extend the life of the vehicles. The building will be located in the rear of the property and a hillside that goes towards Chaffee Court, that is somewhat wooded. The property to the west have trees there, they have talked with the property owner and there is no objection. The neighbor to the east had no objection either, and there are trees and plantings that buffer the location there. They won't be doing any work inside the garage, it would strictly be used for the vehicles. The request for the variance is for is 2266 sq. ft. instead of the permitted 660 sq. ft.

Mr. Rose asked Mayor Hruby to confirm the amount of vehicles that will be stored there. Mayor Hruby stated that there will be four trucks.

Mr. Caruso asked what type of trucks will be stored there. Mayor Hruby stated that they are smaller trucks, one being a van. Mr. Caruso confirmed that these trucks are meant to be used during the day mostly, not at night. The Mayor stated that is correct, most of them are at the service garage and some are outside.

Mr. Hasman stated that one of the neighbors, that lived on Chaffee Court, was concerned about the lighting especially at night. Her balcony and bedroom faced the direction where the building will go, and asked the Mayor if any consideration had been given to that. The Mayor state that there will be no lighting on the rear of the building, and on the front, just one light in the middle of the garage, that will only be illuminated if they go get the vehicles at night. There will be no adverse lighting that lights up the neighborhood, and no security or pole lights.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience.

Carol Van Duyne, 8991 Highland Drive, spoke to the Board. She lived next door to the Building Engineering Department, where the proposed garage will be built. She stated that she had not been contacted by anyone from the City, with the exception of the notice she received in the mail. She wants to object to the structure being built, she felt that it was very large. Her house is the closest to this property, and will be the most affected by this structure. She works from her home, and stated that the Center for the Arts was a quiet neighbor and now the City trucks are there, and there is more noise already. She also had questions regarding the current lighting as well as the additional lighting that might be added, that the Mayor answered, and stated that if any lights were intruding on her property, they could see if they could do without them. The Mayor asked her address, and stated that there may have been some miscommunication, because the Service Director told him that he spoke with the neighbors. He must have missed her, and apologized. Ms. Van Duyne stated that the Service Department has been very respectful and the noise has not bothered her. She asked the Mayor if they would be cutting down any more trees, and the Mayor stated that they would not, but they would be adding some trees on the west side, and asked her if she would like more screening, to which she answered yes. She asked what the building was going to look like, to which the Mayor answered it would be wood framing with siding, and a shingled roof, not metal, the building would look like a residential garage, other than the size. They discussed what will be housed in the garage, as well as the walking trail in the rear. Ms. Van Duyne stated that just she is concerned about having that large of a structure in her back yard. The Mayor stated that the property was not a residential use. Ms. Van Duyne stated that she understood, but as Mr. Rose mentioned in the beginning of the meeting, zoning

laws are put in place for a reason, and she was worried about her property value, and she is objecting to the variance. The Mayor stated that by having this use, it will be less traffic than what was there before, but he understood her objection and it will be so noted. The Mayor went on to say to Board, that whatever they can do to make it better, they will try, and if it's too much, they will go to an alternate plan for the building, and utilize it in other ways. Mr. Rose explained to Ms. Van Duyne, that her neighbor had been a business for several years, and it is a factor, because of the use. Ms. Van Duyne stated that it is not a private business it is The City of Brecksville, and the City has several different locations to build the structure. There was discussion about the property use under a different ownership.

Joe Wochna, 6861 Chaffee Court, spoke to the Board. He said he was the closest property, and he wasn't contacted by the City either. He stated that it may look nice, but it is a big eyesore, and he didn't buy his condo to have a 2200 sq. ft. service structure 100 ft. from his deck. He felt that the size in a residential area is too large, and felt there were many other locations to place the structure.

Steve Demko, 9013 Highland Drive, spoke to the Board. He stated that he purchased the home a year ago and they are doing extensive renovations to it. When they moved in, they were well aware of what the use of the property was going to be, and shortly after they moved in, learned there was a potential for this project to be undertaken. He asked to see a rendering of what the building would look like. They showed him on the overhead screen. He went on to ask if the structure had to be so large. He stated that no one from the City came to his home to talk to him either.

After speaking to several residents about the variance, the Mayor stated that he would like to withdraw the request for the variance, and explained that if there were valid objections presented to the Board, they would not go through with it. After Mayor Hruby withdrew the request for a variance, Mr. Demko stated that he had no objection, but was concerned about the size. He also mentioned the light pollution that he would like the Mayor to look at.

Motion by Mr. Caruso, seconded by Ms. Roberts to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED TO WITHDRAW THE APPEAL. (Mayor Hruby abstained).**

APPEAL 2021-39

Danielle Sampliner for (1) a variance from Section 1151.06(i)(2) maximum length of 27 ft. for trailers to allow 35 ft., and (2) a variance from Section 1151.06(i)(2)(B) to park a recreational trailer in the backyard behind the driveway instead of the rear yard screened from view, located at 8691 Riverview Road, PP# 602-28-014.

Mr. and Mrs. Sampliner spoke to the Board. Mrs. Sampliner stated that they are in front of the Board because they have an RV. She explained her back yard backs up to the national park/ metro parks and it is as hidden as they can have. They do store the RV during the winter months, and keep it on the property from April until October because they travel in the summertime. To park it up elsewhere, is very difficult. Their yard is at an angle, and if they angled it more behind the home, it would be hitting their large oak tree, and if they tried to push it back further it would be too close to the ravine. They only have it in the driveway when they are packing it up for a day.

Mr. Rose stated that the Board received a letter from John Schnell, 8669 Riverview Road, and Art Glaser, 8703 Riverview Road that don't object to the RV where it is currently parked.

Mr. Caruso asked if the storage facility, where they parked it in the winter months, was in close proximity to Brecksville. They stated that it was not, Mr. Sampliner stated that it is in Wooster, Ohio. They keep it in a heated garage. Mr. Sampliner stated that they have two large pine trees and from the street view there is a very small section of the RV that is visible. Mr. Caruso asked if there was anywhere else they could place the RV, so it would not be seen, because he felt that it was pretty visible from the street. Mrs. Sampliner stated that if they angled it anymore they would hit the oak tree and if it went back further, you would still see it, and it would be too close to the valley.

Mr. McCrodden stated that it came to the attention of the Building Department by way of a complaint, and ask if there were any details on the complaint. Mr. Synek stated that the complaint just stated that it was parked on the property.

Mrs. Sampliner stated that the person that complained, has complained about multiple neighbors on the street for various reasons.

Ms. Roberts asked if they had ever physically attempted to move the RV, like Mr. Caruso stated. Mrs. Sampliner stated that they would be too close to the oak trees. Mr. Sampliner stated that in the next year or two it will probably be placed in an indoor storage. They are trying to build a large garage on a property that they don't live in, they are just asking for a few months of consideration.

Mr. Rose stated, that what Ms. Roberts had originally asked them, was if they physically tried to move the RV to a different spot on the property. Mr. Sampliner stated that he could, but if it rains, the truck and the weight of the trailer would rut up the back yard pretty bad. It's not that it isn't doable, but they would literally have to park in the middle of the back yard, and it would ruin their grass.

Mr. Caruso asked if they could store it where they plan to build the other garage. They stated that they have renters there. They were just asking for a little consideration, and stated that if it isn't okay, they will find another place for it. They didn't feel that it was that big of a deal, but if the Board feels it is too much, and there is no other option, they will remove it, it is just convenience for them in the summer months.

Mr. Collin asked them when they purchased the house, they answered 3 ½ years ago. Mr. Collin asked when they purchased the RV. They answered 2 ½ years ago.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience.

Edward Fitch, 8694 Riverview Road, spoke to the Board. He stated that granting this variance would mean that there is no need to screen from view, a very large structure, that is 35 ft. long trailer. To put it into perspective, it is as long as a tractor trailer, and when you would pull in and out, it would block Riverview Road completely, which has a fair amount of traffic. There is also

a sign at the end of Rt. 82, that there are no panel trucks allowed, and this is larger than a panel truck. He felt granting this would set a precedence for others. He also stated that their existing driveway collects a lot of snow in the winter, and if the Board would grant this, they should grant it with a very limited time frame, because of the snow and the winter months. He stated with the length of the driveway, if they can't push the snow back where the RV is located then it would come across Riverview Road. He went on to say if hardship was a reason for granting a variance, then the cost of an RV this size, seems to negate granting a variance for hardship.

Diane Finley, 8725 Riverview Road, spoke to the Board. She stated that she is against granting the variance, 35 ft. is very large, and it would be an eyesore. She was also opposed to the second variance. She felt that the property values on Riverview Road may diminished if this variance was granted. She also didn't agree that an inconvenience constitutes a hardship. There are many other people that pay for garages and store their campers elsewhere, and this should be upheld to the same, and she didn't want this to start a precedence.

Mr. Sampliner stated that they had no idea that any of their neighbors had an issue with it, and stated that if that is the case, they will just move it. No one has ever said anything to them, and he doesn't want to fight with his neighbors.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Sampliner if he chose to withdraw his appeal. Mr. Sampliner stated that he will withdraw his appeal, because he doesn't want to argue with his neighbors over something this silly. He wished someone would have said something to them, and was only aware of the person complaining, who didn't even live on the street.

Motion by Mr. Caruso, seconded by Mr. McCrodden to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED TO WITHDRAW THE APPEAL.**

APPEAL 2021-40

Kevin DiGeronimo for (1) a variance from Section 1326.02 to allow a generator in the side yard instead of the rear yard as required by code, and (2) a variance from Section 1326.01, to allow an air conditioner in the front 50% of the side of the dwelling, and (3) a variance from Section 1119.09(b), maximum 20 ft. driveway width to allow a 62 ft. x 58 ft. pad, and (4) a variance from Section 1151.23(a) maximum 317.6 ft. front yard setback to allow 327.4 ft. for a new single family dwelling located at 8524 Wiese Road, PP# 602-09-058.

Mr. DiGeronimo spoke to the Board regarding his appeal. He stated that he was requesting four variances. The front yard setback that was previously approved, was due to final design and engineering. They centered the home to have proper distances away from the slope, it is a unique shaped property surrounded on all sides by a ravine, which dictates the engineering design requirements, one of them, was a full slope stability study done. As part of that slope stability analysis, they determined that they should stay 50 ft. away from the slope.

Mr. Rose asked if that analysis was done after the original variance was granted. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that was correct, the original variances were approved conditionally on the engineering. That dictated everything from the topography to the original engineering, but for tonight's purposes the original setback. The second and third variance was for the generator and the air

conditioning unit located on the side. The City code dictates that the front yard is anything towards the front door of the house, no matter how its oriented to the street, even though the house is angled, the units are on the southwest side of the house and will be facing my new neighbors and in laws in the house next to it. Mr. Rose asked the rationale behind placing the generator within code. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that its more of the dictation of the structural elements of the home, and not wanting to put additional items further back towards the slope, and there is a walk out basement as well.

The last one is the driveway width, the highlighted area you see that was shown on the overhead screen, was for the purpose of the setback, and the long driveway, to give a proper area for vehicles that are doing deliveries to be able to turn around. The typical is a circular drive, but he didn't see that as being practical, especially for vehicles that have to turn around, so they squared it off and will have some sort of landscape element to it. Mr. Rose asked why a circular driveway would not work. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that the standard width of a circular drive is not adequate for a the diameter of a truck, it would have a very difficult time turning around. Also if there are multiple trucks coming in or out at the same time that wouldn't work, other than to widen the driveway the entire length, and the circle would have to be made much larger, defeating the purpose. Mr. Rose stated that the circle would take up more of the front yard, but would not require a variance. The issue is mostly on hard surface. If you did the math and extended that circle appropriately, it would be about the same as the square pad. Mr. Rose stated that he answered his question, that the hard surface would be about the same. Mr. Rose asked if they considered the hard surface or permeable surface with relation to water runoff. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that portions of it will be pavers, and explained that he is not asking for any variances for engineering water quality or control. He explained the water control plan with the retention and detention on the overhead screen. Mr. Rose stated that he knew he was aware that it is his responsibility to take care of the water on his property, and not dump water onto his neighboring properties, and confirmed that he was working with the City and Engineering to make sure that happens. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that was correct, it is a very commercialized way of looking at it as opposed to a residential way.

Mr. McCrodden asked Mr. Synek, if the pad was not connected to the driveway, would he still need the variance. Mr. Synek stated that if it was still parking or part of the driveway, yes it would.

Mr. Collin asked if the colored area on the overhead screen was solid concrete pavers, and how is the drainage plan was going to work. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that it will be a combination of concrete and pavers. Mr. Collin asked if there was a reason that they needed that much solid surface instead of a turnaround. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that being set back that far, a turnaround was not that functional, especially if there were multiple vehicles. Mr. Collin stated that the reason he asked was because it looked like a helicopter pad.

Mr. Rose opened up questions to the audience.

Tim Calvey, 8473 Settlers Passage spoke to the Board. He stated that he sent out an email to the Board and wanted to make sure they got it. Mr. Rose stated that they did receive it. He stated that the section of driveway that he is installing looks like it will be a parking lot. The residential

code allows 20 ft. wide driveways, and he wants to pave an area about 3000 sq. ft. and felt that it is against the code to turn residential areas into a paved parking lot, and that is what Mr. DiGeronimo is doing. The paved area that he is requesting is on a top of a hill, and all that water rolls down the hill to Riverview Road. Riverview Road has been constantly closed with the increase of water. He felt that Mr. DiGeronimo has put in storm sewers, and regraded the area. Mr. Calvey also mentioned that he did not see a permit for him to install a retention pond. He went on to say that he needs to do something to stop the increase of water that rolls down the hill to Riverview Road, and felt this design will increase it. He stated that he objected to the variance for the frontage he is asking for, when all the other houses on the street are half or less than this distance. He wants an additional 10 ft., after he was already approved, and that is not a hardship, he felt it is more of a want, than a hardship. It will be more visible for Settlers Passage people and it will be closer to the valley behind him, which will cause further erosion. He is against both variances.

Jane Parks, 8606 Wiese Road, spoke to the Board. She stated that she was also concerned with the multiple changes, and said this was the fourth meeting on this property. She felt that it would be setting a precedence that might be used in the future for other builders. She was definitely concerned about the size of the concrete pad as well as water run-off and erosion that could occur from it, and felt it was noticeable from the street. With regard to the generator and air conditioner being placed on the side, she stated that you will be able to see them coming up Wiese Road, and even though it is set back from the street, it is unsightly. It is a new house, and she didn't understand the need for so many variances, she felt the architect could have designed it so they would not have needed them. Dennis stated that when a variance comes forward for generators or air conditioning units, they usually have screening, and asked Mr. DiGeronimo if he was planning on screening the units so it will not be seen from the street. Kevin stated that he is planning on putting in plantings. Ms. Parks felt that granting the extensive amount of variances, would be setting a precedence, and because it is new construction, the architect should have been aware of all the building codes.

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mr. Collin to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

A member from the audience wanted to speak before the Public hearing was closed.

Motion by Mr. Caruso, seconded by Mayor Hruby, to reopen Public Hearing on Appeal 2021-40. **MOTION CARRIED**

Elaine Bugada, 8580 Wiese Road spoke to the Board. She stated that she objects to the size of the pad, and asked if there was any way to decrease the size of it. Mr. Rose stated that the explanation that the appellant gave, was for normal size trucks to navigate and be able to turn around.

Motion by Mr. Collin, seconded by Mr. Hasman to close Public Hearing. **MOTION CARRIED**

**MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS
RALPH W. BIGGS CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS – BRECKSVILLE CITY HALL
SEPTEMBER 13, 2021**

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

Absent: None

Others: Building Inspector Synek, 24 guests

APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 9, 2021

Motion by Mr. Collin, seconded by Mr. McCrodden, to approve the Regular Meeting minutes of August 9, 2021, as recorded.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Roberts, Caruso, Hasman, Collin, McCrodden

Nays: None

Abstain: Hruby, Rose

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2021-36 (Tabled from August 9, 2021 Meeting)

Motion by Mr. McCrodden, seconded by Mr. Collin, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for (1) a variance from Section 1151.24 from the minimum required 80 rear yard setback to allow 70 ft., and (2) a variance from Section 1151.24 a minimum 30 ft. total side yards required to allow 19.8 ft. for the construction of a rear yard addition located at 10946 Tanager Trail, PP# 602-06-006.

Before the vote, Mr. Rose stated that Board received additional information after the public hearing took place from the appellant and from the neighbors, and the information has been reviewed.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Collin, McCrodden, Roberts, Caruso, Rose

Nays: Hasman

Abstain: Mayor Hruby

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2021-35

Motion by Mr. Caruso, seconded by Ms. Roberts, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for a variance from Section 1151.06(f)(3) to allow a chicken coop to be 30 ft. from the side lot line, and 29.5 ft. from the rear lot line, instead of the minimum required 40 ft. from all residential lot lines located at 7535 Bristol Lane, PP# 604-03-065.

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

MOTION CARRIED

APPEAL 2021-40

Motion by Ms. Roberts, seconded by Mr. Collin, that the Board of Zoning Appeals recommend to City Council approval for (1) a variance from Section 1326.02 to allow a generator in the side yard instead of the rear yard as required by code, and (2) a variance from Section 1326.01, to allow an air conditioner in the front 50% of the side of the dwelling, and (3) a variance from Section 1119.09(b), maximum 20 ft. driveway width to allow a 62 ft. x 58 ft. pad, and (4) a variance from Section 1151.23(a) maximum 317.6 ft. front yard setback to allow 327.4 ft. for a new single family dwelling located at 8524 Wiese Road, PP# 602-09-058.

Before the vote, Mr. Rose gave the appellant a chance to vote on the variances separately or as one total vote. Mr. DiGeronimo asked to have all three variances voted on together.

The Mayor wanted to confirm with Mr. DiGeronimo, that the setback for this house has not changed, before he voted on the appeal. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that his has changed 9 ft. past what he was previously approved for. As a result of a study they did, they reconfigured the house to make it further away from Settlers Passage, but the corner of the house which is the dictating factor, actually got a little further towards it. The house was reconfigured to keep a 50 ft. boundary all around it.

The Mayor stated that when he met with the City Engineer, he indicated that his house had not changed, he believed it was the other house, and that it moved closer to Wiese Road, not closer to Settlers Passage. Mr. DiGeronimo believed that was true. The Mayor confirmed with Mr. DiGeronimo that the City Engineer stated that his house moved due to geotechnical reasons, based upon the soil report. Mr. DiGeronimo stated that was correct.

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

MOTION CARRIED

REPORT OF COUNCILMEMBER CARUSO

Mr. Caruso reported that Council met last Tuesday, and at the end of the meeting, a gentleman from Pershing raised some good points about different things the City should take time to look at, regarding a study done on how older homes are being developed in the community. Some things were positive and some can have a negative impact. Mr. Caruso encourage the Board of Zoning to watch the meeting or read the minutes. Mr. Caruso also reported that the City clambake was very successful, and gave kudos to the Fire Chief and to the Service Director.

REPORT OF MAYOR HRUBY

Mayor Hruby reported that Shredding Day in the City is September 18, 2021 from 9:00 a.m. until 12:00 p.m. in the Muni lot. Also, there will be a City wide garage sale on September 25, 2021.

Motion by Mr. Hasman, seconded by Mr. Collin to close the Regular Meeting at 8:57 p.m.

MOTION CARRIED

THE BRECKSVILLE BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS

DENNIS ROSE, CHAIRPERSON

ROBERT HASMAN, VICE CHAIRPERSON

KATHLEEN ROBERTS, SECRETARY

Public Hearing and Regular Meeting recorded by Gina Zdanowicz