Meeting Minutes of
Board of Zoning Appeals
Held March 21, 2019

Members Present: Miller, Gess, Tyo, Norton, Young

Excused: Burke and Bruno

Also Present:

Audience:

*Full recording of the meeting is permanently available on the City of Bay Village website under City Government /Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Norton called the meeting to order at 7:47 p.m.

Motion by Mr. Tyo, second by Mr. Miller to approve the minutes of the meeting held March 7, 2019, as prepared and distributed.

Motion passed 5-0.

Colleen Harding
30508 Salem Dr.

The applicant is requesting a variance per C.O. 1153.02 to build porch another 6'8” into the front yard setback

Mr. Norton discussed the second agenda item and noted that the applicant nor their representative was in attendance for this meeting.

Mr. Norton asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Miller stated that prior to the meeting there was discussion as to why there was an established 60’ setback previously when the house was built. He explained that the survey shows the house was built an additional 10’ into the buildable lot.

Ms. Young asked for clarification on when changes are made to grandfathered variances. She wondered if the grandfathered variance would no longer stand due to the fact that the homeowner wants to go an additional 6” into an already 10” setback. Would the homeowners request now change to a 16” setback variance?

Mr. Tyo stated that he was not aware of that happening.

Mr. Norton explained that if a setback is grandfathered in, a homeowner can replace up to that point without a variance.
Mr. Miller clarified if what Mr. Norton was saying was that if the homeowner wanted to encroach more to the side, uniformly across the front of the house and not encroaching any further, it would be acceptable.

Mr. Gess agreed that no further encroachment is allowed but wondered if the setback variance for this application would be considered 6” or 16” feet due to the purposed porch sketch in the application.

Ms. Young stated that her only concern is it not matching the style of the other homes on the desirable street. If one house on the street is granted a variance to move forward, it could open it up to other houses on the street to do the same.

Mr. Tyo explained that the surrounding neighbors were notified of the application and chose not to come to the meeting to voice concern.

Mr. Miller described that as he sees a porch, it is mostly transparent with a roof and some vertical obstructions but the provided sketch by the applicant shows four columns and a roof that ties in to the current gable roofing line. He stated that neighbors would be looking at a mostly opaque surface projecting forward.

Mr. Tyo explained that Salem Drive is a unique street in that when it was designed all of the houses resemble homes that could be found in Colonial Williamsburg. He stated that the proposed porch would change the character of the street. He thought asking for a better rendering would give the Board a better idea of what the porch would look like.

Mr. Norton stated that his dilemma has two sides. He is a big believer in usable front porches and sees them as a positive thing for a neighborhood. He wonders if the Board is exceeding their boundaries by setting this as a precedent.

Mr. Norton stated that if the porch is as opaque as you can get with open railings and open sides, then he sees this as a positive precedent to set within the city. He would be inclined to say yes to this application.

Mr. Miller stated that architecturally, spanning the entire front of the house would change the character of the home. He thought a solution would be to keep the porch tapered to the center of the house and just to the entry space and leave what is already exiting on the sides.

Ms. Young showed the Board a photo of a home on Saddler as an example.

Mr. Norton explained that a smaller porch would provide both a shelter to the door and a place for people to sit out front.
Board of Zoning Appeals  
March 21, 2019

Mr. Norton stated that he would like the Board to ask the applicant or their architect to make a better rendering of what they are proposing so they can have a better understanding and be able to ask better questions at the next meeting.

Mr. Tyo and Mr. Norton discussed the proposed measurements of the porch versus the Board’s thinking. (35’ vs 8’-12”)

Mr. Miller discussed that their gutter may need to be changed with the Board’s proposed projection in the center of the house due to the slope.

Mr. Gess stated that they might have to do that regardless.

Mr. Tyo suggested the application be tabled.

**Motion** by Mr. Gess, **second** by Mr. Miller that the Board will table the application at the property 30508 Salem Dr. until the next meeting or until the applicant and/or architect can be present to answer more specific questions with additional renderings.

**Roll Call Vote:**
**Yeas** – Gess, Miller, Tyo, Bruno, Norton  
**Nays**-  
**Motion Carried** 5-0

There being no further business to discuss the meeting adjourned at 8:02 p.m.

Jade Norton  

Kateri Vincent, Secretary