

Minutes of a Meeting  
of the  
City of Bay Village Planning Commission  
Held January 4, 2012

Present: Bruckman, Dzienny, Krause, Majewski, Miller, Persanyi

Also Present: Clinton Keener, Superintendent, Bay Village City Schools  
David Newsome, Bay Village City Schools  
Daryl Stumph, Bay Village City Schools

Chairman pro tem Persanyi called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. The following members responded to roll call: Bruckman, Dzienny, Krause, Majewski, Miller, Persanyi.

**MOTION** by Dzienny, second by Krause, to approve the minutes of meeting held October 12, 2011, with correction by Mr. Bruckman on Page 3, bottom paragraph, to “Mr. Bruckman stated that having conditional approval in principle is a recourse to resolve a potential situation in the future that the Planning Commission is likely to encounter.” **Roll Call Vote: Yeas- Bruckman, Dzienny, Krause, Majewski, Miller, Persanyi. Nays – None. Motion carried 6-0.**

**Discussion and Selection of Commission Leadership**

The members of the Planning Commission submitted ballots for their choice of Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission. Mr. Majewski asked that he not be considered for either position at this point in time. Mr. Krause had previously indicated that he not be considered, and Mr. Miller is a representative of the Council and not eligible to be chairman or vice chairman according to previous discussion by the members of the Planning Commission. The selection remaining was for candidates Bruckman, Dzienny, and Persanyi.

The results of the poll indicated a tie for Andy Dzienny and Abe Bruckman for the position of Chairman of the Planning Commission. At the suggestion of the candidates, Mr. Miller conducted a coin toss with Mr. Dzienny being the winner for the position of Chairman. Mr. Bruckman will assume the duties of Vice Chairman.

**Bay Village Board of Education  
Installation of Modular Classrooms – Normandy School  
26920 Normandy Road**

Mr. Clint Kenner, Superintendent of Schools, and Mr. Daryl Stumph, Assistant Superintendent for Buildings Operation, Bay Village City Schools were present to address the commission.

Mr. Stumph advised that the district is proposing to add a four classroom modular construction addition that will be connected to the west side of the existing building. The unit will be placed on a foundation to eliminate the need for ramps, platforms and other structures. However, in finalizing the plans with the architect today, it was learned there will have to be one ramp because of the elevations on the west side.

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

The principal will seek input from the central office and then determine which students will utilize the new classroom areas. Spacing is approximately 3600 square feet with each classroom having approximately 800 square feet. A hallway will be included as well. Since the restrooms in the main building are so far apart there would be restrooms for staff and students in the modular facility.

There was a state requirement that required all-day Kindergarten which has been rescinded. However, area districts and the Bay Village District have, for a long time, considered offering all-day Kindergarten. The Board has decided to pursue that offering for the district.

Utilities will be all-electric. First Energy has confirmed that the transformer within 40 feet of the proposed site has the needed capacity. A letter from First Energy confirming this was provided to the Planning Commission.

The exterior of the building will be Hardi-Board panels. Mr. Stumph displayed a sample of the material. The color of the exterior has not been finalized, but consideration is being given to something that would blend with the brick exterior of the existing building. The stucco type finish is preferable to the plain panel, and Mr. Stumph noted that it would be mostly maintenance free. Mr. Persanyi confirmed with Mr. Stumph that the material is asbestos free. Discussion took place regarding the durability of the material, and Mr. Persanyi asked for assurance that the finish is not a problem if hit with a baseball. Mr. Keener noted that he was informed that if the material is hit with a large rock it would be damaged, but replacement of panels is possible. Mr. Persanyi asked if the material can be cleaned if marked by graffiti. Mr. Newsome stated that the schools have a power washer designed to clean the brick which can be used on this material as well. It is also a paintable surface. Large panels to show the Architectural Board of Review will be painted with the two preferable colors.

Screening will be arborvitae bushes to the south for the length of the unit. The north side is wooded and the property line is 223' to the property line and approximately 275' from the actual home. Woods are present and the distance is significant. If required, a white pine or similar tree would be planted.

Placement of the unit will be where the existing playground is now, coming out an additional ten feet. The length of the modular addition will be two to four feet short of the existing building, giving the appearance that it is an extension of the building.

The classroom unit will have gutters and will be connected into the existing 6" storm drains. A storm drain with a 6" line exists in the current field.

The current blacktop is 80' x 45', or 3600 square feet. The new structure is 72' x 55', 3960 square feet. The new proposed blacktop is 70' x 40', 2800 square feet. The new black top will be sloped toward the drain. The net hard surface change is 3160 square feet. Mr. Stumph has viewed the areas after heavy rainfall and the school property is the low elevation and the neighboring properties drain to the school property. As such, the building addition will not add

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

water to the neighboring yards as the black top and school addition runoff will be sent to the storm drain system.

Entrance to the building will be through the Normandy side or by walking up the path from the K.T. Allen Building. There will be a 20 foot ramp to meet ADA compliance. In the morning very few students enter the west side of the building. Most students enter the front of the building. When the school day starts the entrances are locked down and anyone needing to have access must use the buzzer system on the front entrance.

Further review of plans and distribution of photographs followed.

Mr. Persanyi asked how the water from the 3500 square feet of roof will be handled. Mr. Stumph stated that the water will tie into the existing storm water drain which has enough capacity to handle the additional rain water. It will be tied into the underground storm inlet just west of the proposed addition. The roof will slant to the edge where the playground now stands.

Mr. Persanyi asked about the roofing structure. Mr. Stump stated that the modules come with a rubber, black, Firestone type roof from the factory. Mr. Stumph will attempt to get the roof in a color other than black.

Mr. Dzienny asked why additional classrooms are needed if all-day Kindergarten is no longer a mandatory requirement for schools. Mr. Dzienny expressed disappointment in the Hardy Board material and commented that the look of the modular classrooms is not suitable as a permanent addition to the building. Mr. Keener stated that the schools would like to have a more permanent solution which is why these modular units are proposed for the west end of the building. A permanent building addition would be added to the east end or north end of the building. Even if a bond issue is passed in a year or two, any type of construction would be four years out.

Mr. Keener continued, stating that there has been extreme interest in the all-day Kindergarten option for a number of years. When it was initially required by law there was an operating levy on the ballot which created great expectation for it but people now understand they will have to pay a fee to have the all-day Kindergarten. In order to accommodate all-day Kindergarten for one-half of the Kindergarten students, two classrooms are required. The modular addition will have four classrooms. Normandy School currently has 571 students, the largest number of students that have ever been in the building. This opportunity will give the schools four rooms to allow them to get music off the stage and into a classroom and to be able to provide additional classrooms where needed. There is no indication based on the Kindergarten sizes that there will be a huge influx of enrollment. Three or four classes in a row have reached enrollment of 200 students which is why the building has so many at one time.

Mr. Dzienny asked the plan for the lifespan of the modular addition. Mr. Keener stated that the School District will be interviewing architects. A study of each building will be done to evaluate the life of each building. If it is determined that Normandy School should be replaced in ten or twelve years, then they would not build a permanent addition because the cost of the modular units is 40% of the cost of building a permanent addition. If it is determined that Normandy

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

School does need to stay in service and they want to put money into it, then on the north or east end they would put a more permanent building addition. A master plan must be done for all of the buildings. One thing that is known is that they want to save the high school. They do not want the community to have to build a new high school within the next ten or twenty years. A decision must be made regarding the elementary schools.

Mr. Keener stated that the modular addition will be well maintained. The rubber is a 20 year material with a seven or eight year warranty. He is confident that it will stay in good repair through any period of time it will take to do any other improvements.

Mr. Dzienny noted that the city is accustomed to the Middle School quality, and this addition looks more like a shed. The former proposal for Westerly School was to be clad with brick and made to look like it was part of the building. Mr. Keener stated that they could foresee that the Westerly structure would have been used longer.

Mr. Stumph stated that there is climate control with this unit and that is an important factor for the children who struggle more with the 90 degree heat than the older children. He noted that Normandy School has been spaced challenged for a long time, and this addition would be necessary even without the Kindergarten expansion. All of the special need students are no longer in individual places, and there are orthopedically handicapped and high special-needs students who need more space and rooms.

Mr. Dzienny noted that Kindergarten students are supposed to have toilet rooms accessed from the actual classroom, one per classroom. Mr. Stump stated that even though this extra space is needed, the principal will have the discretion and has contemplated using the space for second graders. The additional space does not necessarily mean the Kindergarteners will be in that facility. Some of the first grade rooms have the toilet room facilities accessed from the classroom and those rooms are the ones that will most likely be used for the Kindergarten students.

Mr. Dzienny stated that he believes the egress path is blocked according to the plans. There is a travel distance that is required and the school does not have sprinklers. Mr. Newsome stated that the architect did measure the travel distance and they are within regulation.

Mr. Miller referred to the ramp proposed to come out of the modular units on the west side. He asked the elevation of the school compared to the elevation of the modular buildings. Mr. Stumph stated that the plan is to set the units into a foundation with a difference of 18 inches having to be made up on the west side. The hallway of the modular unit will be the same level as the Normandy School hallway. The elevation does start to drop another ten inches or so toward the storm sewer on the west.

Mr. Miller asked about the weather sealing of the modular units to the Normandy building, and how they will handle the doors that are currently swinging out to the exterior and will now be swinging into the next corridor. Mr. Stumph stated that his understanding is that there will be one set of doors. Mr. Persanyi stated that currently the doors swing out for escape purposes.

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

The people that are going to be west of those doors, if they have to go east to escape, will be going into a door that will be swinging the wrong way. Mr. Dzienny commented that now that there is access back into the building there needs to be doors that go either way, one way out and one way in.

Mr. Miller asked how the concerns about fire separation, fire detection, and fire alarm are going to be addressed. Mr. Stumph stated that they have checked with Ptacek, their fire vendor, and the new system was put in six or seven years ago and has the capacity to receive the new strobe horns and all requirements to tie into the existing building.

Mr. Miller asked if the change in the exterior finish is purely a cost measure, or because of the units being located at Normandy rather than Westerly School. Mr. Keener stated that it was partly a cost measure and there was no intention initially to use brick at Westerly.

Mr. Miller asked about the previous discussion about moving grades Kindergarten through Grade 2 to Westerly School, and Grades 3 and 4 at Normandy School. Mr. Keener stated that if they were required by law to have all-day Kindergarten for all of the Kindergarten students they would have needed more classrooms immediately and would have considered moving half of the second graders to Westerly. They did not go with that because that is not the way they want to do it in the long term. If someone chooses all-day Kindergarten they will have to pay tuition and know that they are making a choice.

The modular buildings will have a footer for the entire perimeter. Brick is sometimes used halfway up and is doable. Mr. Persanyi stated that if brick was used and the unit was built well enough there could still be an addition to the building later and it would blend in with the current building better than Hardy Board. If a footer is being used around the entire perimeter it lends itself to brick veneer going up to the windows or matching some line on the existing building with the brick work.

Mr. Dzienny reiterated his disappointment with the proposal of a Hardy Board addition, noting that the addition will be visible to the neighbors and is a permanent addition to the building.

Mr. Bruckman stated that there is a small building on Dover Center Road that looks like a residential structure. Mr. Stumph stated that the unit is a garage with two small rooms and heat. The building belongs to the owner of the home in front of it and it is not known if it is being used for residential purposes. The school is 225 feet from the neighbors on Wolf Road, and on the Normandy Road side from backyards and garages. On the Dover Center Road there are commercial properties and the one residential home. Mr. Krause commented that there should be some arborvitae planted as a buffer to that home.

Mr. Bruckman pointed out that additional screening might also be needed on the west side as well as the screening shown on the north and south sides. Mr. Keener stated that they could plant arborvitae along the fence at least along the part that is exposed to the neighboring home.

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

Mr. Miller referred to the memorandum from Building Director Milburn to the Planning Commission dated December 28, 2011 regarding the Normandy School Addition. Mr. Milburn mentions, in Item 10 of the memorandum that, additional buffering appears necessary on the north side of the addition. Mr. Miller commented that it appears that three white pines are scheduled at 6 feet for planting; however, they do not appear to be close enough to qualify as buffering. Mr. Keener stated that the white pines were proposed because the homes are 225 feet away and all of the neighbors have wooden fences in their backyards. The trees were proposed because they would grow about one foot per year to fill in the area. During the summer there is a lot of cover.

Mr. Majewski asked what differentiates these modular units from the one that was installed at Westerly School. Mr. Majewski confirmed from the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting that the building code required a ten feet separation between the modular classroom and the Westerly School building, and in the case of the Normandy School installation the unit is being butted up right against the building. Mr. Keener stated that there will be a block fire wall constructed with the Normandy installation. Mr. Majewski asked if this meets the Bay Village code. Mr. Milburn interjected that construction plans have not been submitted yet for review, but the Building Department will make sure that they do comply with the Building Code. Mr. Majewski asked if there was a fire wall at the Westerly School. Mr. Stumph stated that there was a 30 feet separation with a hallway connecting at Westerly. Mr. Newsome added that because of the elevations it did not make sense to butt the unit up against the building.

Mr. Persanyi asked if there would be any kind of floor underneath the unit. Mr. Keener stated that the subfloor is built right into the units. There will be four separate units with the subfloor built in. The units will be sitting on block foundation. Mr. Persanyi asked if there would be a space under the unit and if the space will be sealed off from moisture. Mr. Newsome stated that there will be a moisture barrier underneath the unit. Those issues will be addressed in the plans that need to be submitted for the building permit.

Mr. Majewski asked about the sanitary connection. Mr. Stumph stated that off the existing Kindergarten room they have the connection off the side. The connection is basically in the back of the building and then along the Kindergarten room. There is a toilet and sink in each of the Kindergarten and First Grade rooms. There is a crawl space underneath the building with the exception of the last two rooms which were an addition. Those are on a slab and the connection would be run from the crawl space out the back.

Mr. Persanyi asked if there is any possibility that someone could challenge the ability of the Board of Education to charge tuition for all-day Kindergarten. Mr. Keener stated that the tuition is permitted in the law which was included when they rescinded the law requiring all-day Kindergarten. The law has been changed back to allow Boards of Education to charge tuition. The City of Westlake offers all-day Kindergarten and they are using their modular buildings installed temporarily while they are doing construction. Westlake, Avon Lake, and Avon are all charging tuition. The cost is just for the half-day that is optional. The first year the cost will be \$2250.00, then up \$250.00 per year to the actual cost of \$2600.00 to \$2800.00. By the third year the full day program will be fully self-supporting. Sixty percent of the parents of the children in

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

the half-day program have responded to a survey stating that they are interested and would pay the fee. The experience that other districts have had is that their numbers have gone down slightly because of the cost of the tuition. Bay typically has 170 to 180 Kindergarteners and expects to offer all-day Kindergarten to half of that number.

Mr. Majewski stated that earlier in the year when the Board presented to the Planning Commission they discussed both Westerly School and Glenview School for all-day Kindergarten accommodations. Mr. Majewski asked where the decision to involve Normandy School came from.

Mr. Keener stated that if they have to they will use classrooms at Glenview on the second floor. These rooms are 650 square feet and would accommodate smaller classes. All of those classrooms are now used with over 220 youngsters at the building for pre-school and after school care. Presently those rooms are full of furniture and video game equipment for after-school activities. Some of those things would have to be cleared out and the rooms shared. Separate transportation runs would also need to be established, as well as a separate food service person being set-up. It is doable at Glenview Elementary but more ideal to have the all-day Kindergarten at the same building with all of the Kindergartens because of the use of the library and similar things. Mr. Stumph added that electrical upgrades would have to be done at Glenview as well. Additionally, there is no air-conditioning on the second floor of Glenview Elementary School.

Mr. Majewski stated that it was mentioned that there are parents who use the K.T. Allen building parking lot to drop-off students. Mr. Majewski asked how this is done. Mr. Keener stated that the parents pull in and park, then walk their youngsters over to the side door of Normandy School. The side door of Normandy School is open the first thing in the morning when school starts; when school starts it is locked.

Mr. Persanyi asked if the proposed ramp for access to the west end of Normandy School would be an open ramp or enclosed with two concrete walls. Mr. Keener stated that it would have to meet the building code with rails and a bumper along the edge. Mr. Persanyi asked if there are maintenance issues with a ramp, e.g., things getting caught between the ramp and the building. Mr. Keener stated that there is usually a piece that lays over where the ramp connects. He noted that the worst ramps for maintenance are the wooden ramps which deteriorate. A platform may be required from the door to the ramp. The ramp could also go sideways if there enough room to turn.

There will be sidewalk all along the south side and going north to the entrance so that the building can be accessed without using the ramp if coming from anywhere on Normandy Road.

Mr. Miller commented that if the ramp exceeds 1:20 it could be considered a slope and handrails would not be required.

Mr. Milburn's memorandum of December 28, 2011 states that following this initial Planning Commission meeting a public hearing must be scheduled. The applicant has requested that the

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

hearing be held on January 18, 2012, which would allow the applicant to submit application and be placed on the Architectural Board of Review agenda for the February 8, 2012 meeting. Final Planning Commission review and approval could then take place on March 7, 2012, unless approval was given at the February 1, 2012 meeting contingent upon ABR review and approval, to which the Building Department would have no objections.

Further discussion followed.

Mr. Miller noted that the application of the Board of Education does not indicate that the modular classrooms will be for the purpose of all-day Kindergarten. He noted that Mr. Milburn's memorandum states that the classrooms will provide space needed for proposed all-day Kindergarten students. Mr. Miller stated that this meeting discussed second graders. Mr. Stumph stated that flexibility is required in order to use the modular units as needed for the building. Mr. Miller commented that Mr. Dzienny did raise a good point in noting that if it is decided to use these units as Kindergarten classrooms those toilet rooms need to be accessible from the classroom. Mr. Keener stated that there was never any intention to put Kindergarteners in the modular units because of the restroom issue.

Mr. Persanyi commented that plans will be required for the public hearing that will indicate the appearance of the modular addition. Color renderings will be required as well and different options for construction, e.g., masonry versus Hardy Board. Additional screening to the west border would also be favorable for the residential property owner.

Mr. Miller added that he did not believe there was any exception for distance from view, and even though the property to the north is a great distance at 225 feet, the buffering is still required at a certain density on the north side just as it might be on the west and the south. If the existing 6' fence is taken down by the property owner the buffering is still needed. Mr. Keener asked how far back the buffering needs to be placed. He asked if the buffering can be placed by their fencing. Mr. Persanyi stated that in many ways it is preferred to have it close to the property line. Mr. Dzienny added that there could be less buffering closer to the unit.

Mr. Stumph asked if there is a requirement to screen the neighboring commercially zoned property. Mr. Milburn stated that it is not required by ordinance but the last paragraph of the buffering ordinance states that the Planning Commission has the right to modify any of the requirements in the chapter that they feel necessary to provide buffering. There is a residential property on that site.

Mr. Persanyi commented that if the building is made to look attractive it will be acceptable to the community and there won't be too many complaints.

**Motion by Majewski**, second by Bruckman that the Planning Commission will hold a special meeting on January 18, 2012 to facilitate a public hearing for the Board of Education application for modular classroom units at Normandy School. **Motion carried 6-0.**

## Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

Mr. Majewski noted that it is important that public notice go out because there are many parents that will be interested in hearing the plans for this project, especially the parents who are interested in the all-day Kindergarten.

Mr. Majewski referred to the memorandum from the Fire Department dated December 27, 2001 commenting that the plans need to be sent for review, an outline for the tie-in to the fire alarm and detection system is needed and more detailed prints with fire separations and life safety system details and also needed. Mr. Majewski asked that a representative of the Fire Department be present at the January 18, 2012 meeting relative to these comments.

Mr. Dzienny suggested that in addition to the legal notice in the newspaper and the notice to abutting property owners, Mr. Keener may want to send a notice home with the students.

A notice of the public hearing will be placed on the city's web site.

Mr. Miller asked about the acceptability of the Hardy Board for the modular unit. Mr. Persanyi stated that he would like to see something that would be closer to the look of the exterior of the existing building since he does not see the structure being removed within the next five or six years. Mr. Miller asked if the architect for the project would look at providing a brick masonry sample that would be responsive to the existing Normandy School. Mr. Dzienny added that there must be a solution to somehow breaking up the look of the planks of the Hardy Board and blending it in better.

Discussion followed regarding the time-line for approval. Mr. Stumph asked if approval could be granted by the Planning Commission contingent upon approval by the Architectural Board of Review on February 8. Mr. Majewski stated that by code, the Planning Commission is not permitted to approve conditionally. They must wait for review and action by the other Boards before they can pass approval.

The Architectural Board of Review will be asked if they will consider having a special meeting the week of January 23, possibly on Wednesday, January 25, 2012. The Planning Commission could then consider approval at their meeting on February 1, 2012. The secretary will contact the members of the Architectural Board of Review.

### **Council Update**

Mr. Clete Miller, who has begun serving his first term as Councilman of Ward 2 and has been assigned to be the representative of Council to the Planning Commission, advised that Council has been discussing the 2012 budget and they are getting closer to the adoption of a budget. There have been changes with the two new Council members and changes in the committee assignments of Council representatives. Mr. Miller will be the Planning Commission representative for at least two years. There also has been discussion about a new member of the Planning Commission being selected to fill a vacancy and hopefully that selection will be made within the near future.

Planning Commission Minutes

January 4, 2012

Mr. Miller advised that there are additional gas sleeving operations by the Columbia Gas Company that will occur from Dover Center Road to Columbia Road. A public meeting relative to this project will be held on Thursday, January 19, 2012 at Normandy School at 7 p.m.

Council held their organizational meeting on Tuesday, January 3 and more information will be presented at future meetings.

Mr. Majewski asked about discussion that was held by the Cahoon Memorial Park Trustees regarding demolition of the rental home at the northeast corner of Wolf Road and Columbia Road in Cahoon Memorial Park. Councilman Pohlkamp made a statement about the proposal for demolition possibly coming to the Planning Commission. Mr. Majewski stated that in looking through the ordinances he found a few things that said the demolition should come to the Planning Commission because it is a public building. The city charter states that a demolition of a public building should come to the Planning Commission. The Building Code also references the Historic District and the site of this home is specifically included in the Historic District. Alterations and demolition to the building coming to the Planning Commission is a point that should be clarified. Mr. Majewski referenced Section 1367.02 (b) of the Building Code.

Messrs. Krause and Majewski expressed congratulations to the new Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Planning Commission, Andy Dzienny and Abe Bruckman respectively.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion** by Majewski, second by Dzienny, to adjourn at 8:55 p.m. **Motion carried 5-0.**

---

Bela Persanyi, Chairman pro tem

---

Joan Kemper, Secretary