MS. BROER:  It's 5:30.  I'll call the meeting to order.  We've got Donna and Brad and myself and the Mayor, so we're good.

Does anybody have any changes to the minutes as they were distributed?

MAYOR LICASTRO:  I make a motion to approve as offered.

MS. BLOOM-SCHWARTZ:  I second.

MS. BROER:  All in favor?

Ayes:  4.  Nays:  0.

MS. BROER:  We're going to go to our old business, which is the amendment to the Hamlet Court preliminary development plan and then we'll move to the final development plan for sublot 3.  Is there somebody who would like to -- the amendment for planning, come on up here.

MR. LICCIARDI:  My name is Steve Licciardi.  I'm the president of the Hamlet Court Condominium Association.  Full disclosure, I'm also an investor of the project that's caused us to be here this evening.  We're just seeking an amendment to our declaration and that requires approval by you all.  Do you have questions?  Do you want me to go into further detail?

MS. HOPKINS:  Okay.  So the amendment that was mentioned does include the declaration or the covenants for the condominium, but it also includes the revisions to the dwelling unit types.  So the plan that's shown on page 5 of my memo, it identifies the four -- the rearrangement, you can say, of the four unbuilt dwelling units.  So it's the same number of dwelling units, it's just a different arrangement.  And because of the different arrangement, that's what triggered the review of this revised plan as well as the additional documentation that you received on the landscaping plans.

MS. BROER:  If you can describe what you're looking for, that would be helpful.

MR. LICCIARDI:  Sure.  So the original concept of the property was to have 14 units.  And the builder never finished the last four.  And the declaration allows for several extensions with a limited number of years and we passed that.  And so now homeowners would like to see the development completed.  And, therefore, we had to review or renew our amendment so that we can add four additional homes to the association and the community.

MS. BROER:  Just for my clarification, because I'm not sure of the rules around this, does the amendment also cover the changes in the property lines, the lots?

MR. LICCIARDI:  No.

MAYOR LICASTRO:  Different topic.

MS. BROER:  Okay.  So do we have any -- do you have anything to weigh in on the amendment?

MR. MATTY:  Kris will, Mayor.

MS. HOPKINS:  Okay.  So the amendment that was mentioned does include the declaration or the covenants for the condominium, but it also includes the revisions to the dwelling unit types.  So the plan that's shown on page 5 of my memo, it identifies the four -- the rearrangement, you can say, of the four unbuilt dwelling units.  So it's the same number of dwelling units, it's just a different arrangement.

MS. BROER:  We'll start with you.

MS. HOPKINS:  Mr. Matty, do you want to comment?

MR. MATTY:  I do want to comment.

MS. BROER:  We'll start with you.
has shown the houses, unit 3, which is the only
one numbered, but then the future -- the ones
that are on the south side of Hamlet Court, those
three are less than 40 feet apart. The smallest
distance is between the two on the south side
that are closest to Lakeshore Boulevard, there's
only 33 feet and some inches between the two.
The important thing to point out is that
both -- wherever they have shown less than 40
feet, it does comply with the planned residential
development regulations that are spelled out in
the zoning code. So that minimum is 25 feet. So
from a code standpoint, the modification, the
change is acceptable. The other change, though,
does relate to the minimum front setback from
Lakeshore Boulevard and both on the original
plan, which is shown figure 3 on page 6, it's a
75-foot setback from Lakeshore Boulevard
right-of-way. And that is also consistent with
what the code requires, a minimum of 75 feet.
The change that they are proposing is
that the 75 feet be measured from the center line
of the street, which moves the building, the one
house within 50 feet of the right-of-way.

MR. HALPERN: So the theory when we were
laying this out with the site engineer was --
exactly what was brought up was by conforming to
the builder for these four units working with
Kingdom Home Builders, LLC. So I'm going to be
better of a situation.

MS. HOPKINS: Correct.

MR. HALPERN: H-A-L-P-E-R-N, from
Halpern from Kingdom Home Builders.

MS. BROER: Okay.

MS. HOPKINS: That's correct.

MS. BROER: Now it's currently what
you're proposing is measuring it from the middle
of the street.

MR. HALPERN: So the theory when we were
laying this out with the site engineer was --
exactly what was brought up was by conforming to
the builder for these four units working with
Kingdom Home Builders, LLC. So I'm going to be
better of a situation.

MS. HOPKINS: No.

MR. MATTY: We can deal with it here.

I'd like to hear the reason why though.

MS. BROER: Okay.

MS. HOPKINS: So one observation is that
if the distance, the separation between those
three houses is made even less, closer to the 25
feet, then you're going to have less of an
encroachment in the 75-foot setback.

MAYOR LICASTRO: So having it be closer
to the Boulevard makes more distance between the
proposed four new lots?

MR. HALPERN: That's correct.

MS. BROER: So if you want to respond to
Mr. Matty's question about why you've changed
where we measure it from.

Mr. LICCIARDI: Well, this is our
builder.
MR. HALPERN: I think we can, yes. I would be willing to -- I'm sure the objection from these folks would be that to recoup their financial investment, four is what they purchased and four is what they'd like to build.

MR. MATTY: What if you only build three houses? What if you only build three rather than four? If you build three, you'd have enough room between the houses and Lake Shore.

MR. HALPERN: Apparently, and obviously how the Planning Commission has authority to rule on this as opposed to going to BZA.

MR. LICCIARDI: And it was the original design of the community.

MR. HALPERN: And there were 13 that were allowed initially or approved initially.

MAYOR LICASTRO: So Mr. Matty, describe how the Planning Commission has authority to rule on this as opposed to going to BZA.

MAYOR HALPERN: Planning a development, but I mean, I think Planning Commission has got to take into consideration the normal rules that we follow. And, you know, I'm not in favor of bending rules here because you'll have to bend them somewhere else. From my desk, it looks like you're trying to fit too much on too small of a parcel.

MAYOR LICASTRO: So that concern being expressed, if push came to shove, can you meet the 75-foot setback from the right-of-way?

MR. HALPERN: I think we can, yes. I think we can. And I would be willing to -- I'm sorry.

MS. BROER: Would that include shifting future two-story slightly closer to unit 3?

MR. HALPERN: I think it might be -- the more appropriate way would be to take that particular plan and modify the plan enough to move it around and move it away from the setback.

MS. BROER: I would agree that while Bratenahl tends to have a bunch of runoff, it's nicer if we can actually measure things the way they're supposed to be measured consistently.

MR. HALPERN: Right.

MAYOR LICESTRO: So again if I may.

MS. BROER: Yes.

MAYOR LICESTRO: So Ms. Hopkins, you made reference to inter-building distances. I think this gentleman also made reference to that.

So at what point in time does that become problematic? How on close is too close.

MS. HOPKINS: The code requires 25 feet.

Minimum of 25 feet.

MR. HALPERN: Yes, we could kind of push those two together to pick up some of the space there.

MAYOR LICESTRO: So you can stay 75 feet off the right-of-way and still have a 25 foot
MS. BROER: So is it relatively similar?

MR. HALPERN: I'm assuming it would be, especially since we're separating buildings, usually creates a little more open space.

Certainly between properties and so on.

MS. HOPKINS: There is one --

MR. HALPERN: I don't know that that calculation was done for this, but I'm certain we can apply that to the drawings and submit that.

MAYOR LICASTRO: May I?

MS. BROER: Sure.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Right. So the more you can tow the line with setbacks, inter-building distances and open space, the easier the path is for you. So if you could move it 75 feet off the right-of-way, maintain a 25-foot inter-building distance and not diminish the amount of common ground or open space, it's obviously a much easier path for you. So are those doable?

MR. HALPERN: I think those are doable, sure. I would be willing to commit to that, sure.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Because I don't want to speak for the other commissioners, but it's likely the approval motion would be contingent upon those parameters being met.

MAYOR LICASTRO: So let's talk about the final plan. You'll have to go before the final commission. We'll keep you there.

Is that where we need to have all the conformities to it or will we need to -- does this require a public hearing with the Planning Commission. And the original procedures. And the original procedures do require a public hearing with the Planning Commission.

MR. MATTY: 1164.10 and 1164.13 are the two sections. So this is a preliminary. So you must make these adjustments, come back at the next Planning Commission with the adjustments made. At the public hearing, you can present to the commission as part of the public hearing how you've made -- how you've met the three conditions that the Mayor put on the approval motion. And then the public can chime in and then if you get approval, that will go to Council.

MAYOR LICASTRO: And FYI, we combined the November and December meetings to a December 7th date, because obviously Thanksgiving and Christmas conflict. So what was described, we can do approval of the commissioner and chair at the December 7th meeting. Is that clear?

MR. HALPERN: Understood. So I have one question. As we have submitted sublot 3, the individual site plans, the next sort of site that's in question, so call it problematic site, so we'll still obviously need to submit -- if this is all approved and we have final approval, we'll still need to submit a site plan for that.

Is that where we need to have all the conformities to it or will we need to -- does everything need to conform in our next presentation to you?

MAYOR LICASTRO: All the properties will need to conform.

MR. HALPERN: Understood.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Starting with sublot 3,
which we're about to discuss, but given as a caveat here, we'll give you a guide going forward: 75 feet, 25 feet between the building distance and the common ground.

Mr. Halpern: So we'll sort of -- we'll be presenting like we have today. We'll be presenting to keep all those specifications as sort of our caveat. And as we submit sublot 2, as long as that house conforms to those requirements, then we should be okay.

Mayor Licastro: Yeah. Think of it more as a mandate than a caveat to be blunt.

Ms. Broer: So I guess my technical question is that the -- what they are presenting around sublot 3, is that dependent on the changes that are going through for the PRD?

Mr. Matty: Sounds like it to me.

Mayor Licastro: I would agree. Let's see what they're about to present. I think we're done with that.

Mr. Halpern: We do conform on that particular lot, yes.

Ms. Broer: Okay. So we'll move to the final development plan for sublot 3.

Mr. Halpern: Okay. So we are now presenting for sublot 3, the site plan for approval of that. You have drawings in front of you. I believe that we do conform to the 25-foot spacing between buildings. We are certainly further away than the 75 feet from Lakeshore Boulevard. We've submitted landscape plans for that, I believe, so I think we are in conformance.

Ms. Broer: So my question is does this sublot 3 conform to the original PRD?

Mayor Licastro: They were all attached homes. These are single-family.

Ms. Hopkins: No, most of them are, but unit 3 on page 6, it's in about the same spot.

It's a different configuration in terms of its more -- it's a wider unit that faces the street. The revise is a narrower unit that --

Ms. Broer: But is the building unit, the building envelope the same?

Ms. Hopkins: No, the building envelope is not the same.

Ms. Broer: Okay.

Mr. Halpern: To be clear, actually what we have done is taken a property that's however

Mr. Halpern: So historically or typically any time that we build a home and a foundation, we try to stay anywhere between 25 and 30 feet all the way around it, because we have to get equipment in and lay the bulldozer.

There's a lot of trees along that lot. Are they going to all be removed?

Mr. Halpern: So historically or typically any time that we build a home and a foundation, we try to stay anywhere between 25 and 30 feet all the way around it, because we have to get equipment in and lay the bulldozer.

Ms. Broer: If it wasn't, there might be more today, little bit more marketable.

Mr. Halpern: Okay.

Ms. Broer: If it wasn't, there might be a little bit more marketable.

Mr. Halpern: Okay.

Ms. Broer: Go ahead.

Mr. Halpern: So I'm not sure if there's anything else I can answer for you. If there's questions, I'll be happy to answer them.

Ms. Bloom-Schwartz: I have a question.

There's a lot of trees along that lot. Are they going to all be removed?

Mr. Halpern: So historically or typically any time that we build a home and a foundation, we try to stay anywhere between 25 and 30 feet all the way around it, because we have to get equipment in and lay the bulldozer.

Ms. Broer: I'd like to turn it over to Kris to present your thoughts.

Ms. Hopkins: So a couple of things. I just noted some corrections that need to be made to the house, the plat. There are a couple of places under the condominium notes at the top at the center, it refers to unit 14, which I think is what you started out calling it and then your maintaining it now as unit 3, which is consistent with the current plan, so that's a typo. And then under the intent, there's a reference to a three-story home that's on the left side of the page.

Mr. Halpern: I saw that in your notes.

Ms. Hopkins: Those were minor things.

Mr. Halpern: Soblot 14 versus sublot 3 was our engineer from the original plat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>apparently this was subplot 14 at the time, so</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>they had it noted as 14, but for purposes of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>marketing and for our purposes, we would call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>them 1, 2, 3, and 4, seemed to be easier. At one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>point, I guess, the engineer says that we need to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>submit it as 14 and then kind of came back and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>then said no, you can do it this way, but I'll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>have those changed, no problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MS. HOPKINS: Okay. And the only other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>item on my memo is the comments about the trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>as well, and the preservation of the landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>is a critical component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>MR. HALPERN: Understood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MAYOR LICASTRO: So under two items A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>through D you summarized those?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MS. HOPKINS: Yes. B and C are decided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>by requirements that they comply with, pointing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>those out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MAYOR LICASTRO: And there's no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>inter-building distance because it's the first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>MS. HOPKINS: And the spacing from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>existing dwelling unit is compliant with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>40-foot setback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>MS. BROER: Any other questions from the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22</th>
<th>commission? Questions from the audience?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MAYOR LICASTRO: So we can approve this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>on its own without the amendment to the plan as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>discussed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MS. BROER: This would be --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MAYOR LICASTRO: Mr. Matty?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MR. MATTY: No, I think I'd wait until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>the amendment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MS. BROER: I think we can approve it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>contingent upon approval of the amendments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MR. MATTY: Exactly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MR. HALPERN: We're seeking so we can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>continue to develop this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>MAYOR LICASTRO: We're making sure we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>cross every T and dot every I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>MR. HALPERN: I understand. We've been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>kind of in limbo because you have to get one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>before the other. So as long as we keep it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>moving forward, we're okay with that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MS. BROER: Could I have a motion to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>approve this contingent on the approval of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>overall PRD amendments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MS. BLOOM-SCHWARTZ: So move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>MR. TURNER: I'll second that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>MS. BROER: All in favor?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 26 | Molnar Reporting Services, LLC  (440) 340-6161 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>Ayes: 4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MS. BROER: Opposed? Abstentions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Thank you very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MAYOR LICASTRO: So we need a minute to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>do some reconfiguration, so bear with us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Whereupon, Ms. Bloom-Schwartz left the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MS. BROER: Thank you for your patience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>We're going to move to the new addition at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Shoreby Club. Come on up. You can state your</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>name for the record.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MR. TATAROWICZ: I'm Shawn Tatarowicz.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>T-A-T-A-R-O-W-I-C-Z. I'm the general manager of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>the Shoreby Club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MR. MYERS: And Joe Myers, M-Y-E-R-S,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>the architect for the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>MR. TATAROWICZ: One comment before Joe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>gets started, this project was never referred to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>as an event center. It's not an event center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>It's a space for members where we have banquets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>there, absolutely, not as many as -- probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>less than we had before, but this is for members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>first of all. It's not an event center. It's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>just an amenity to the club to give members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>different dining options and different spaces for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24</th>
<th>activities for members and more member events.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MS. BROER: Okay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MAYOR LICASTRO: Thank you for that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>clarification. So why don't you give us an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>overview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MR. MYERS: So at the Shoreby Club now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>out next to the mansion, there is a grill area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>with a plaza that is actually the roof of an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>extension to the grill area that connects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>underground to the main mansion. There's been a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>tent there for years that's kind of evolved into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>kind of a year-round place for the outdoor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>dining, taking advantage of the view of the lake,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>so forth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>What they would like to do is replace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>that tent with an actual building that would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>more comfortable for the members of the Shoreby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>to take part in. So the new building would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>built on that same plaza, kind of in the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>place that the tent would be, you know, if this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>is the rounded parking that you see at the end of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>the lot, all the drives parking and everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>would remain the same and the building would be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>constructed where the tent is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>We had some pictures just to give you an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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From the rear, which this is saying that the grill is connected to the mansion from underground and comes over to a building that is already there. There's a plaza at this point. Now everything below it is existing. The new building they're proposing is above it, so they have the view from the lake looking back.

MR. TURNER: So in other words, there's no expansion of the footprint?

MR. MYERS: There's a little bit of an expansion. It's a little bit forward of the ten, but basically in the same location.

MR. TATAROWICZ: I can show it better right here as far as the expansion goes. So this is currently where the tent ends. We're up here. The tent ends right here. So the expansion would be a deck onto the pool deck you saw in that picture. A little more expansion would be also back here. This is where the tent currently ends. This is just like garden and trees right there, that would be the bar area and the men's and women's restroom in that area, so it would be a little bit wider this way, but not much though.

MAYOR LICASTRO: And you note the addition of restrooms, as well, correct.

MR. TATAROWICZ: Yes. And the heating and air-conditioning will be included as well.

Right now we don't have that. This is the front. terms of process. This comes here and then goes to Architectural Review?

MS. BROER: So just one question in terms of process. This comes here and then goes to Architectural Review?

MS. HOPKINS: In the same, yeah.

MAYOR LICASTRO: And Council.

MS. BROER: And Council. But does it have to go to Architectural Review?

MAYOR LICASTRO: Absolutely.


MS. HOPKINS: First let me clarify, in my memo, I did say in the first paragraph that it's a new accessory building or referred to by the applicant as a conservatory event center, primarily because it shows up on all the drawings down here as a conservatory event center.

So for whatever clarification, I mean, I think you can still have an accessory building that is for events that are related to the membership, which is what the whole Shoreby Club is. So I think that that's just for the record that it can be considered a place you hold events for.

The second item as commenting on the proposal. The first item is -- first I'd like to point out that the Village did receive a number of letters of approval from not only all of the HOAs within the Newport PRD, but also from the Colony Homeowners Association, which is immediately to the east. So in terms of the neighborhood, there were letters of approval.

The second item as commenting on the proposal. The first item is -- first I'd like to point out that the Village did receive a number of letters of approval from not only all of the HOAs within the Newport PRD, but also from the Colony Homeowners Association, which is immediately to the east. So in terms of the neighborhood, there were letters of approval.

The second item as commenting on the proposal. The first item is -- first I'd like to point out that the Village did receive a number of letters of approval from not only all of the HOAs within the Newport PRD, but also from the Colony Homeowners Association, which is immediately to the east. So in terms of the neighborhood, there were letters of approval.
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or 18 feet four inches. So it’s three feet four inches higher than an accessory building, accessory structure, but, again, that is an interpretation I think the Planning Commission can make whether that 15 foot applies to this specific building.

Item number three is talking about how in the zoning regulations it talks about these conditionally accessory uses to be internal to the project and not have an adverse impact on the Village or compromise the health, safety, welfare, et cetera. That’s related to number four in terms of the parking plan and concerns that have been voiced in the past about overflow parking. That’s not. That’s being accommodated outside of the PRD. So one of the recommendations I’m making is that there be a parking plan submitted showing the anticipated cars can be accommodated on the site.

Number five, there is a condition in the zoning code right now that talks about the special permit is to be renewed on an annual basis, which I’m not sure that’s been followed, but with this -- the building -- a structure that now is really a permanent structure that’s going to be able to be used year-round, whereas previously it was a seasonal tent, that my recommendation -- again, this is for the Planning Commission’s consideration is that there be a summary of events and its attendance for the Shoreby Club.

First of all, we establish a baseline so that we have some information from the last two years and that there be an annual review going forward, so that’s a recommendation.

And then number six is just underscoring that this is an amendment to the PRD that goes through Planning Commission and Council.

MS. BROER: So just to clarify, the requirement for submitting an annual list of events would be so that we were sure that it was integral to the membership and not a sort of generally available, that’s the thinking behind that?

MS. HOPKINS: Correct.

MAYOR LICASTRO: May I comment on that point? It’s salient. So when Shoreby was originally approved, Newport was originally approved, there was -- obviously the renovation of the mansion was critical to the project.
of the existing building, you know, it's
1 connecting the mansion and the grill. It's
2 actually adding a second story to the grill
3 that's already there, so I guess I wasn't
4 thinking it was an accessory building. It is an
5 accessory use, the whole Club.
6 MS. BROER: But legalities aside, why
7 did you pick 18.5 feet instead of 15?
8 MR. MYERS: I used the same roof slope
9 as the mansion and the grill both had the same
10 pitch to the roof. So to be consistent with the
11 buildings on either side of it, I wanted to keep
12 the roof at the same roof slope so it didn't look
13 strange to have a real low sloping roof when the
14 two buildings either side were a steeper roof.
15
16 MR. TATAROWICZ: Just a side comment, I
17 got a lot of feedback from members about this and
18 they're all for it. The biggest one, they really
19 wanted the front to look more like the mansion.
20 So that's what we're working on to make it look
21 more like the mansion, so that's why we did that
22 front to look like it, because they really wanted
23 it to look like one main focal point.
24 MAYOR LICASTRO: Trust me, so will the
25 Architectural Review Board. They'll be really

adamant about keeping that same look.
2 Ms. Hopkins, the fact it's matching,
3 where the height would match the buildings, is
4 that a factor to consider?
5 MS. HOPKINS: I think that definitely
6 is. Again, I would point out that to me it's not
7 clear whether the maximum height that's spelled
8 out in the zoning code was intended to apply to
9 this event, this type of accessory -- what's it
called, the accessory private club and their
10 accessory buildings, because it's found within
11 the part of the code that addresses the houses in
12 a PRD. So I think it's within the Planning
13 Commission's purview to determine whether or not
14 it applies to this building.
15
16 MR. MYERS: The height is lower than the
17 mansion, a little bit higher than the grill, so
18 it sort of steps. So it's consistent with the
19 buildings around it.
20 MS. BROER: Other questions from the
21 commission?
22 MR. TURNER: Just out of curiosity, do
23 you happen to know how high the current tent is?
24 MR. MYERS: It's a little less than this
25 new building. I don't know the exact dimension
MS. HOPKINS: There is a picture of it on page 7 in my memo where it contrasts the proposed structure with the tent. It’s not a good one-to-one comparison because of the angle of the photograph, but it gives you a little bit of a sense of the difference.

MS. BROER: Questions from the audience?

MS. MEADE: Not really a question just a comment.

MS. BROER: Say your name for the record.

MS. MEADE: Pat Meade, Coit Road resident. When you were talking about parking, as a Coit Road resident, a lot of us were upset because we have the street sign from overflow. We would never get advanced notice and it created an issue, because they would park in front of driveways and made it inconvenient. So I appreciate hearing today that all parking will be maintained on site, so I really appreciate that.

Thank you.

MS. BROER: I would clarify, I would make sure that that clarifies for the record, which is --
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MS. MEADE: It says all in here.

MS. BROER: All. I’m not sure that you actually want to promise that all parking will forever be --

MR. TATAROWICZ: We have not.

MS. BROER: If you guys want to say that, that’s fine. I would not.

MAYOR LICASTRO: You’ve been great about it, Shawn. We appreciate that. Coit is a public street. People can park on Coit, but we want it to be your very last option.

MS. BROER: Right.

MR. TATAROWICZ: It’s not even an option to my staff.

MAYOR LICASTRO: Don’t paint yourself into a corner.

MS. BROER: Yeah, don’t paint yourself into a corner.

MS. MEADE: I’m just saying on number four it reads on site parking to accommodate all activities that may be held simultaneously at the Shoreby Club.

MS. BROER: Yeah, and I’m just making sure that they clarify that, you know, they have legal people who are coming to the Shoreby Club.
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have a legal right to park on Coit Road.

MAYOR LICASTRO: It's a public street.

MS. MEADE: Or Lakeshore Boulevard.

MS. BROER: Or Lakeshore Boulevard.

MAYOR LICASTRO: You can't really park on Lakeshore Boulevard. It's too narrow. Yeah, so it's a public street. The fact that it's close to your last if not zero option is preferred. I might also add that the height factor is something the ARB will look at closely as well. If we’re going to make a motion, we can make that contingent upon ARB’s review to make sure this fits.

MR. MATTY: Could I hear a little -- I was a little concerned about the manager's first comment that this will increase the activities available to the Club.

MR. TATAROWICZ: Member activities.

MR. MATTY: Member activities. Do you have a baseline of activities that you can present at the next meeting for what exists today?

MR. TATAROWICZ: We hold member events once a month. We might just do maybe member events like maybe twice a month. I want people to have a space to be used by members whether or not just members booking parties in a space. We talked a lot about when it rains at the Shoreby Club, we go from 300 tables on the pool deck to 13 tables in the grill. That's a problem. So this would send members now up to the secondary floor to be able to dine there as well instead of having so many people in the grill, spread everybody out a little bit more. It is mostly increasing activities for members to be able to go in different locations of the Club.

MR. MATTY: My concern is this is supposed to continue as an accessory use. So if the accessory use doesn’t continue, this cannot be a principal use of the Club. And I think it’s very important that at the time of the public hearing you come with a baseline that’s accurate, because that will not only be to your benefit to get approval here, but to get approval every year, which I will ask the secretary to put you on an agenda every year to come back and explain what's happened at the Club.

And if the architect could at the same time, I think it’s very important at the next meeting that you show your parking plan and you Molnar Reporting Services, LLC (440) 340-6161
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1 show how if you have a facility that can fit 202
2 people, where are you going to park those 202
3 people and your staff so that it can be
4 self-contained. If you can’t do that, then
5 you’re getting to the point of a principal use
6 with not enough land to accommodate that use and
7 that can’t be. Under the code, this has to
8 remain an accessory use, it can’t be a principal
9 use.

And your intent is well received, but we
10 need to see some numbers and we need to see the
11 parking spaces and where they’ll be. And if your
12 staff is X number, where they’re going to park.
13 And if the guests of whoever the member is, where
14 are they going to park, instead of on the grass a
15 or hillside or a street. I think that’s
16 important to get approval.

MAYOR LICASTRO: May I have a caveat?
17 It would be interesting to see how many events
18 you’ve had in the tent and how many member --
19 whatever you want to call them, you have in the
20 new building to see that the numbers jive, if
21 it’s comparable, that would be helpful.

MS. BROER: Motion?

MAYOR LICASTRO: So let’s figure out how
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1 to draft this motion. Okay. So a motion to
2 approve contingent upon Architectural Review
3 Board approval, contingent upon a public hearing
4 and Council approval as discussed.

MS. BROER: Works for me. Second?

MR. TURNER: I’ll second that.

MS. HOPKINS: Well --

MR. MATTY: How about back here?

MAYOR LICASTRO: Did I miss anything?

MS. HOPKINS: You mentioned the public
1 hearing. The public hearing is here with the
12 Planning Commission.

MR. MATTY: Yeah, so the Planning
14 Commission will have an approval at that time,
15 Mayor, and then Council will need to approve.

MAYOR LICASTRO: So this again is
17 preliminary like you heard before. The final
18 will come with a public hearing in Planning
19 Commission and then to Council. I thought I made

that clear, but thanks for the clarity. Do you
21 understand the motion?

MS. BROER: Yes. All in favor?

Ayes: 3.

MS. BROER: Opposed? Abstention? Thank

you.

Molnar Reporting Services, LLC          (440) 340-6161

CERTIFICATE

I, Nancy L. Molnar, do hereby certify that
as such Reporter I took down in Stenotypy all of
the proceedings had in the foregoing transcript;
that I have transcribed my said Stenotype notes
into typewritten form as appears in the foregoing
transcript; that said transcript is the complete
form of the proceedings had in said cause and
constitutes a true and correct transcript therein.

Nancy L. Molnar, Notary Public
within and for the State of Ohio

Molnar Reporting Services, LLC          (440) 340-6161