



**Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes  
Thursday, October 7, 2021  
6:00 p.m.**

Board President, Jennifer Frazier, called to order the regularly scheduled meeting of the Architectural Review Board for the City of Twinsburg at 6:04 p.m.

**Roll Call – All Members**

Present: Jennifer Frazier, David Marcovitz, John Midlik, Don Spice and Viraj Sharma

Absent:

Others in attendance: Maureen Stauffer, Council Rep., Jason Pastorius, Building Department

**Excuse Absent Members**

**Motion:** All Present

**Approval of Minutes: September 21, 2021**

**Motion: Table until next meeting**

Jennifer Frazier moved and Viraj Sharma seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

**Public Participation**

- Mary Stencil, resident at 2679 East Aurora Road voiced her concern about Case# 21-08-64 (9036 Church Street). Mary had the following concerns:
  1. The addition is too big. She felt that the homeowners were trying to squeeze too large of an addition onto a lot too small to accommodate it.
  2. The addition is too close to her home and sidewalk.
  3. The addition encroaches on her privacy and quality of living. Mary stated that she enjoys looking out her windows and that the size of the addition will even block her view even from her second story window. She also felt it would block her view while sitting on her front porch.
  4. The homeowners are trying to put in a turnaround drive in the back and every car using it will flash their headlights into her home. Mary felt this option was used because there was not enough room to complete it the right way.

5. Mary was concerned that by adding more pavement around the storm sewer easement which sits about 12' away from her home would create flooding issues that would spill over to her property.
  6. Mary raised a concern about the decrease in her property value due to the massive structure blocking her view. Mary stated that her house is a small Century Home that receives its value from its close proximity to the square, visibility and curb appeal. Mary stated she lived in the home for 18 years and has worked hard to improve her property for her own enjoyment, livelihood and the community. How does allowing an addition for their business justify reducing her property value.
  7. Mary raised a concern about where one draws the line regarding the right of a homeowner to improve their property verses how said improvement infringes on the neighbors around it. She further stated that although the addition may meet the zoning laws put in place, doesn't this addition violate the very intention of what the zoning laws were meant to protect.
  8. Mary challenged the idea of the proposed project being a residential addition/in-law suite when no one lives at the property now or ever. She felt that the property is only being used as a rental property and was concerned about the strangers coming and going just a few steps away from her back porch.
  9. Mary requested that they restrict the property to residential use only if they want the addition so that it would protect the property once sold from being used as a rental type unit.
  10. Mary felt that the board should not approve the addition the way it is being presented. She felt there had to be a better way to protect her rights, give the homeowners they extra space they want and also provide the city with chance to determine how that property will be used in the future. She suggested that the solution was in re-designing a building that fits better in the allotted space they have.
- Two Letter were submitted regarding case #21-08-64. The first letter was written by Mary Stencil on August 10, 2021 and Stuart Dunn on September 21, 2021. The letters were read silently by each board member. Jennifer Frazier paraphrased the concerns raised by Stuart Dunn.
    1. Mr. Dunn felt that it was unusual for such a large addition to be constructed on an historical home in an historic section of Twinsburg even though he knew many of the protections and requirements for historical properties has been lifted.
      - Mrs. Gotch confirmed that the home has not been declared an historical property as to date.
    2. Second concern raised by Mr. Dunn was the use of the property.
      - Jennifer Frazier posed the question of what City entity is responsible for governing the use of commercial versus short term rental versus residential.
      - Mrs. Gotch replied that the property has evolved from just a Tea House primarily due to the pandemic. It is now Greenbridge Tea House and Airbnb and that it receives significant interest from natural park enthusiast to travelers who are interested in the Tea House. Mrs. Gotch further stated that the occupants are vetted prior to stay and the renters are short term occupants.
      - Jennifer Frazier stated she didn't believe the location was inappropriate for B&B usage especially because the property is located in a mix use district. Jennifer Frazier was unsure about the actual zoning of the Church Street property.

- Mrs. Gotch confirmed that it is a C-5 district (residential and commercial) and stated she believed it was smart of City Council to try to encourage the develop of productive use of the area and improvement of the properties.
  - Jennifer Frazier confirmed that the City is trying to encourage a “live, work and walkable environment” in the downtown area. Ms. Frazier reiterated that she did not believe the B&B usage was inappropriate for the Church Street given its location in a mix use district with commercial across the street and residential next door. Ms. Frazier confirmed that although she felt that way, the ARB board does not determine usage of a property but has the ability to determine the architectural design of property based on the zoning of said property.
  - Jennifer Frazier stated that the property could be classified as B&B, Duplex/2-rental unit or a mix use commercial live/work upstairs/downstairs building.
3. The third issue raised by Mr. Dunn was Chapter 771.04 of the Airbnb host requirements for a short term rental which would require the need for a heavily expanded garage.
- The board felt it could be an issue and will address during the hearing of the case.
  - The board further stated that they were not made aware by the owners that was why the two car garage was being erected. Mrs. Gotch stated that was not the reason and the two car garage made sense to accommodate the expanded living quarters above it.
4. The fourth issue raised by Mr. Dunn was the property being operated like a Motel with unknown occupants coming and going without any contact with the homeowners who do not reside there.
- Mrs. Gotch confirmed no one resides there, but the no contact is due to current Covid-19 restrictions.
- The board stated that the discussion of the letter was to place the concerns on record and that they expressed legitimate concerns. Mrs. Gotch responded that she felt they were expected concerns, but legitimate depends on what one would call the property. They have considered turning it into a motel, but no decision have been made thus far.
  - Mr. Midlik questioned the location of Mary’s home in relation to Church Street property. Mrs. Gotch stated it is on 82 and can be seen in the drawings submitted to ARB. The drawings do show the 12’ setback they are respecting in relation to the property line between the homes.
  - Jennifer Frazier wanted on record that City Engineer needs to look at the impervious pavement, water drainage and percentage of paved lot coverage. She also felt that whatever entity determines how an entity operates in the C5 should be consulted.

**Review:**

- **Case 21-08-64 9036 Church Street, Residential Addition-Steve Gotch, Homeowner**
  - Mr. Steve Gotch presented before the board the proposed changes to the residential addition. They include the following:
    - A more defined foundation gable instead of a cosmetic one.
    - The garage door now has Carriage House look. It will still lift up like a regular garage door, but will give the appearance of carriage house look on North side of the house which is not really seen from 82.
    - The size of the garage and above structural has been changed from 24’x24’ to 24’x22’. The upper deck is now 5.5 instead of 8 feet

- The addition has been pushed back to be in line with the current house footprint.
- Window was added on west side to not have a blank façade as requested by the board.
- Additional discussion regarding the proposed changes included the following:
  - There will be no connection because lower level which is primarily the garage and the upstairs addition.
  - The drawings are giving the impression of massive structure, but it is only 1400 square foot addition being proposed. The current home is 1475 square feet and if you do not count the garage the addition is only about 500 square feet and with portico it would be about 600 square feet.
  - The addition is technically a two story build, but at the street level due to the slope it is only a 1.5 story addition.
  - Windows do not align with existing house windows. They are about 3 feet higher.
  - Side door of garage leads to a door of the house that leads to the basement so that if in the future one wanted to connect the two houses via the interior they could.
  - Mrs. Gotch confirmed they have never lived there and that it has taken them a few years to get it renovated and open the Tea House. That with the conversion to Airbnb they have received 5 star ratings which is good business for the Twinsburg community.
- The board reviewed the new plans and determined that they structure no longer appeared to not hinder the view of the porch to square of neighbors home, was further from the sidewalk and not as massive in structure as previously presented.
- The board stated that the proposed changes also appeared to minimize the headlight issue. It was suggested that planting of shrubs would further assist with minimizing the headlight from cars turning around.
- The board stated that the mass is back to an appropriate size and location on the property and as courtesy to neighbor to plant some trees on the northwest side and deciduous trees in front, but not blocking the addition window to give character to that side of the house.
- The board noticed a retaining wall on the new plans to possibly facilitate the three point turn. Mrs. Gotch said it was drawn in, but may just be a sloped driveway. Mr. Gotch confirmed there was no regrading being done.

**The Board is Noting:** Recommendation for planting evergreen on NW where there is blank wall and the driveway. Deciduous tree near the front not block window, but give privacy to neighbor next door. Review of proposal by city engineer for percentage of lot coverage and the amount of impervious pavement.

**Motion – Approved as Noted**

Viraj Sharma moved and John Midlik seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

- **Case 21-10-75 9044 Cross Street, Residential Addition- Architect (name provided inaudible)**
  - The Architect presented the proposed plan for the rear addition at 9044 Cross Street.
  - One small set of pictures and plans were provided.

- The board questioned if the entire interior of the house was being gutted. The Architect replied that not gutted per say but all the finishes are being replaced. The new addition will try to replicate the existing box structure.
- The Architect confirmed that the siding is greyish, vinyl and the trim color will be white.
- The board asked if the roof of existing house will be replaced. The Architect responded that due to budget constraints, they would not re-roof the house. It was fairly new and they would try to match as close as possible with a 2/12 pitch, shed roof on the addition. The board stated it is usually at least 3/12 and found the roof to be odd looking, but because of the location of the addition and the property it would be not a major concern.
- The board suggested a change in kitchen layout by placing the sink underneath the window. Since they were putting in new cabinets anyway it would be easier to re-arrange than change out the windows. Should they decide the change the windows they could come back to the board with plan changes.
- The board stated that based on the look of the property, they were excited about the addition being put on her, but had a concern regarding the really long shed roof and the lack of a window. The board felt the addition is completely appropriate, the location of the addition is great, adding the outdoor space alongside the deck facing the driveway is a good, and the board also liked the sliding glass door for the addition and existing home going out onto the deck with the windows on each side.
- The board notices there were flaws with the elevation design. The elevation plans did not match the plans submitted. Items missing included a chimney and windows, sliding glass doors drawn incorrectly on plans. The board drew them into the elevations, but requested a submission of new elevation drawings to reflect the correct details.

•  
**The Board is Noting:** Elevation be updated to match the intent of the plans and new drawings will be submitted.

**Motion – Approve as noted**

John Midlik moved and Viraj Sharma seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

- **Case 21-08-65 2019 Trailwood, Residential Addition-Robert & Gina Bell, Homeowners**
  - Mr. Bell submitted the proposal for the addition to the property at 2019 Trailwood which is located in the Meadowood Development. He stated this is their second trip to the ARB board.
  - The board noted that the kitchen remodel looked nice. The last time they case was heard they board was not sure about the shape of kitchen, what the roof would be, whether there was a bay window. The new plans submitted are now very clear.
  - Mr. Bell stated that it just cantilevers like the existing house, foundation underneath main body is a crawl space.
  - Mr. Bell confirmed that there are two double hung and one picture window over sink and that the gutters and downspouts have been addressed.
  - The board noted that the roof line made sense with the reduction of the height of the two windows on 2<sup>nd</sup> story next to the garage and made them wider. Mr. Bell stated they are still waiting to see what windows to add to give more natural light. Mr. Bell stated that the windows are Egress front and back and therefore not the only window and the each

- room will still have another full window. Full window that falls into the corner to the left elevation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> story of main body of house in the rear is okay.
- The board stated that if they decided another window on the left elevation of the rear that make it match the new window size or the one already there in the same room.
  - The board questioned the window shown on the elevation versus the plans that show a door. Mr. Bell confirmed that it was a door and that a man door would be off the back of the garage leading to the storage area with another door allowing entry into the mud room.
  - Mr. Bell stated that it is their intention to rebuild the deck and the hot tub will then exit right into the mud room.
  - Mr. Bell confirmed that he is completing the project himself.
  - The board noticed that the existing garage door of the swings the wrong way (backwards) and should be swapped around during the construction process.

**The Board is Noting:** Homeowner option- add one window or door on the left where garage extends and one window or door on the rear elevation with the minimum of one door.

**Motion – Approved as Noted**

David Marcovitz moved and Viraj Sharma seconded, upon roll call the motion passed unanimously.

**Adjournment:** As there was no further business before the Board, Jennifer Frazier moved and John Midlik seconded. The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

---

Jennifer Frazier, Chairman

---

Sonya Pennington, Administrative Assistance