

Mrs. Sabetta asked if the replacement chain link fence will be black? Ms. Harris stated that it will be black and will be on the 2 sides that are hers which will be the south and east sides.

Mr. Jamieson, Director of Building, explained that the fence must be at least 15- feet back from the sidewalk or completely located in the rear yard, not coming out past the house. Depending on the distance of the fence to the sidewalk, Ms. Harris may need another variance.

After further discussion on the location of the fence and what variances will be required, Mr. Kramer suggested that the board table the case for Ms. Harris to set up a meeting with Mr. Jamieson and her contractor to determine exactly what variances will be required.

As there were no other questions or comments, Mr. Kramer declared the public portion closed.

**BZA 1194 Marjaan & Jessica Jaamey
5949 Mayflower Avenue
Requests an 8-foot variance to the rear yard setback to build an addition.**

The applicant requests a variance from 1159.08; *Rear Yards*
In a U-1 District, every building erected shall have a rear yard. **The least dimension of the rear yard shall be twenty percent of the depth of the lot**, but such least dimension need not be more than forty feet.

The following adjacent property owners were notified:

861-27-011	1592 Lander Road	April Management Ltd
861-27-026	5945 Mayflower Avenue	Yelena Kopisarova
861-27-028	5953 Mayflower Avenue	Santina Amoroso

Present for the meeting was Marjaan & Jessica Jaamey, 5949 Mayflower Avenue.

Mr. Jaamey explained that they would like to have an addition built on to the back of the house that will serve as a master bedroom suite. He understands the rear yard setback requirement is 27 feet. With the proposed addition, he will only have a 19-foot setback. To build anything smaller would not be worth it and there is no more yard area to put in the addition.

There was discussion on the existing sunroom, which led to discussion as to what the Architectural Board of Review approval entails. Mr. Kramer explained that the Board of Zoning Appeals is a different board and does not look at the aesthetics as ABR does; the role of the BZA is to hear appeals and grant or deny variances from the ordinances.

Mrs. Jaamey stated that when they purchased the home in 2016, they assumed the POS violations and fixed them. There were numerous violations on the sunroom, and all were corrected, but no inspector ever said anything about there not being a permit for the existing sunroom. The sunroom is on the back of the garage and it is not quite to the back of the house. The addition would be in line with the back of the house. Mr. Kramer explained that as an inspector conducts a POS inspection, he/she does not go back to research permit history.

Mr. Jamieson stated that the Jaamey's will need a variance for the rear yard setback and will then have to go back to ABR with their new plans.

Mr. & Mrs. Jaamey stated that the addition will be a master bedroom suite including a bathroom which they need for their expanding family. They currently have 3 bedrooms and 2 ½ baths. The addition will add value to the home.

Mrs. Sabetta asked Mr. Metyk how small the yard will be with the addition according to site plan provided. Mr. Metyk replied that the lot will be 19 feet deep per the site plan. If they tried to comply with the zoning code, the Jaamey's would only be able to do an 8-foot addition. Mr. Metyk stated that the 16-foot addition is not asking for a lot and it is the right size for this lot in his opinion. He added that an 8-foot addition is not feasible. There is a shed in the back yard that is not shown on the site plan. With the addition, the yard space will be 19 x 50.

Mr. Jaamey stated that the addition does not go all the way across yard, therefore only a portion of the yard will be 19 feet. He reiterated that the addition would increase the value of the home.

As there were no other questions or comments, Mr. Kramer declared the public portion closed. He added that the Board's decision requires action by Council and will be presented to Council in resolution form at the next scheduled meeting, Monday, February 22, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. Applicant can attend the meeting or send comments in writing to be presented to Council.

BZA 1195 Uhrman Building Company LLC
William Barnett
5915 Landerbrook Drive
Requests a variance to have a monument sign that is 5'6" in height.

The applicant requests a variance from 1191.12; *Signs for U-7 Headquarters or Executive Offices Park Districts*

In addition to any sign that may be permitted by Section [1191.01\(a\)](#), one free-standing wall sign per parcel, having a height of not more than five feet above normal grade and a width of not more than twelve feet, may be erected in a U-7 Headquarters or Executive Offices Park District, with the total sign area not to exceed thirty square feet on each face, provided that planting is placed around such free-standing wall sign.

Such wall shall be constructed of either burnt clay brick, stone, or precast panels, and/or other suitable materials as approved by the Architectural Board of Review.

The following adjacent property owners were notified:

861-30-021	2028 Lander Road	Parker-Hannafin Corporation
861-30-029	5900 Landerbrook Drive	Shelbourne Cleveland East LLC
861-30-031	5885 Landerbrook Drive	P D C Office Park

Present was Bill Barnett, 5915 Landerbrook Drive, Suite 300, Vice President and General Counsel for the Uhrmann Building Company. 5915 Landerbrook Drive is the headquarters for State Industrial Products. With the building being totally renovated they intend to replace the old sign due to deterioration and legibility. They chose the materials and look of the new sign in keeping with the look of the property as the building is shiny steel. The base of the sign creates a 6" height variance required. They are requesting the variance so the base can keep the sign off the ground and allowance for snow accumulation but still be visible from the street.

Mr. Kramer asked how we consider this a monument sign? Mr. Jamieson stated that the sign ordinance allows for other type of monument signs other than the traditional burnt clay brick, stone, or precast panels as long as it is approved by the Architectural Board of Review.

Mr. Kramer addressed the need to have the lettering in the proposed size as opposed to making a bit smaller to accommodate the base and meet the 5-foot required height by ordinance. Mr. Barnett stated they want the tenant information large enough to not cause confusion to anyone accessing the businesses.

Mr. Dilulio asked if the foundation for the sign will be new or will they use existing and is the sign visible over the existing bushes. Mr. Barnett stated that the foundation will be new and if the sign is at ground level, you would not be able to see the lowest tenant with the bushes. Mr. Dilulio asked if other renderings were made from the sign company with smaller height of address and names to meet the zoning code. He is struggling with seeing a practical difficulty as there are other ways the sign could be made to meet code and not require a variance.

Mr. Barnett responded that they do not feel that the variance they are requesting will cause a big disruption; they are creating a better sign. They keep up with the property's landscaping, pond, etc. and feel they are a good neighbor. The proposed sign projects the image want to project. Mr. Kramer is also struggling to the see the practical difficulty in this situation.

Mr. Barnett emphasized that the base takes the sign off the ground which they need for visibility.

Mr. Dilulio stated that the sign company should have come up with a design that fits the requirements.

As there were no other questions or comments, Mr. Kramer declared the public portion closed. He added that the Board's decision requires action by Council and will be presented to Council in resolution form at the next scheduled meeting, Monday, February 22, 2021 at 7:00 p.m.

Case No. 1193 – Alexa Harris – 1783 Crestwood Road – fence

Mrs. Sabetta, seconded by Mr. Wagner, moved to table the applicant's request for the applicant to work with the Building Director and fence company on exact measurements so variance requirements are clear.

All in favor. Motion carried.

Case No. 1194 – Maarjan & Jessica Jaamey – 5949 Mayflower Avenue – rear yard setback.

Mr. Wagner, seconded by Mr. Dilulio, moved to grant the applicant's request.

Roll call on motion: AYES: Dilulio, Sabetta, Wagner, Metyk, Kramer
NAYES: None.
MOTION GRANTED

Said request is granted for the reason that the strict enforcement of the ordinance would impose, on the owner, a practical difficulty in the use of the property.

Case No. 1195 – Uhrman Building Company LLC – 5915 Landerbrook Drive – monument sign.

Mr. Wagner, seconded by Mr. Dilulio, moved to grant the applicant's request.

Roll call on motion: AYES: Metyk, Sabetta, Wagner
NAYES: Dilulio, Kramer
MOTION GRANTED

Said request is granted for the reason that the strict enforcement of the ordinance would impose, on the owner, a practical difficulty in the use of the property.

As there was no further business, Mr. Kramer adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

APPROVED:


Fredric Kramer
Chairperson

Respectfully submitted,


Monica Ferrante
Secretary