

**PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
Monday January 27, 2020
City Hall, 7:00 pm
DRAFT**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Michael Wright at 7: 00 p.m.

PRESENT: Kimberly Watts, David Schwartz, Jill Plamper, Richard Polan, Jeff Jenks, Michael Wright, and Jill Ingber.
Staff: Hank Berry

ABSENT: Blake Moore

Approval of Agenda

Motion by Watts and seconded by Plamper to approve the agenda as presented and amended.

Yeas: Watts, Schwartz, Plamper, Polan, Jenks, Wright, Kohn, Ingber
Nays: None
Absent: Moore

Motion passed.

Approval of Minutes from November 25, 2019

Watts noted a typo on page 1, third line from the bottom, the word “the” should be changed to “they”.

Motion by Jenks and seconded by Ingber to approve the minutes of November 25, 2019 as amended.

Yeas: Watts, Schwartz, Plamper, Polan, Jenks, Wright, Ingber
Nays: None
Abstained: Kohn
Absent: Moore

Motion passed.

Matter of Site Plan Review for a Proposed Addition to the Herkowitz residence at 13336 Winchester

Randy and Stacy Herkowitz are requesting site plan approval for the construction of an addition to the rear of the home for a bathroom. The bathroom will sit on top of the existing single story bump out. The zoning is R-1D and the property contains one platted lot (40’x130’), 5,200 sq. ft.

Hank Berry noted this is a small addition of a second floor bathroom over an existing space. It is not changing the footprint, is under the maximum house size with no character bonuses and meets

all the bulk regulations. The elevations include the use as vinyl siding but does lack fenestration on one wall. It also lacks details on window sizes and materials that should be clarified but the windows could be scaled out and the wall with no fenestration could be a topic of discussion for Planning Commission.

Public Participation:

None

Commissioner Comments:

Plamper: Sought and received clarification on wall without windows being the bathtub location.

Schwartz: Noted he is fine with the lack of fenestration on that wall but feels the they should know the window sizes prior to approval which are not noted on the plans.

Berry: Noted the owners do have the sizes but were not included on the plan. Based on the plans it appears they are 2'6" wide and 3'6" long double hung sliders. The left elevation window is also 2'6" wide and 3'6" long. He clarified with the contractor completing the project, Murray Built, that they are correctly representing the noted sizes and that they will comply with code to temper the windows.

Watts: The interior plans represents the windows in question are 24"x54" which is slightly smaller than previously discussed. Questioned if they gave any consideration to flipping the tub to other elevation due to the side it is noted on, having little fenestration. The change would be in effort to create balance.

Berry: Noted in response to Watts that the tub could be moved in relation to the location of the stack. It is possible to re-locate if they had to.

Motion by Kohn and seconded by Schwartz to approve the plan as drawn subject to the specification of the windows on the rear side, 2'6" x 3'6", and the addition of the window on either the wall it is shown, a similar size window, or on the opposite wall if they decide to flip the plan.

Yeas: Wright, Ingber, Jenks, Polan, Watts, Kohn, Plamper,
Schwartz
Nays: None
Absent: Moore

Motion passed.

Matter of Site Plan Review for a Proposed Addition to the Cushard residence at 13312 Vernon

Daniel Cushard is requesting site plan approval for the construction of an addition to the home. The zoning is R-1D and the property contains 1 platted lot (80'x128' IRR), 10,899.38 sq. ft. The proposed plan is to turn the one and a half garage into a two car garage with an addition being an extension to the garage towards the house, bringing the breezeway forward to enlarge storage

space.

Hank Berry noted the plan is taking the garage to right side creating a wall to add more storage. The house is already connected to the garage by a breezeway, so he is only adding to that. He added a transom window to break up the elevation. He is using a sixteen foot door that balances out the look of the garage. He is moving over one wall and a roof line to add more space. He further noted that although the plans may be sufficient for site plan approval, the plans are incomplete in order to obtain a building permit.

Public Comments:

Raymond Fraser - 13320 Vernon

Noted concern with additional run off onto his property with the addition to the garage.

Commissioner Comments:

Watts: Sought clarification on whether the roof line is changing. Berry noted that the roof line is just moving towards the inside of the property versus the outside and will not change.

Ingber: Noted the plan looks nice and appreciates the usage of brick. Sought clarification on exterior faucet area noted on the plan.

Cushard: Noted in response to Ingber it is a screen to hide the faucet.

Plamper: Questioned with removal of vinyl siding and the addition of Hardie Board, was any thought given to the addition of windows on the side of the garage facing the neighbor.

Cushard: Noted in response to Plamper that they had not considered windows so to maintain privacy. He further noted there are shrubs along the house to break up that lack of fenestration.

Plamper: Sought clarification on the current location of the downspouts and if installing new, where and how will the water be directed to in efforts to address the neighbor's drainage concerns.

Cushard: Noted there would be underground extensions or drainpipe that would be buried directing water to a popup or drywell coming out to the front of the house next to the driveway.

Polan: Sought clarification if an overhead door was being added in the rear of the addition as well as type of door. He also agrees that the side of the garage with no fenestration needs to be broken up. Suggested the addition of a transom window that would allow for him to maintain privacy.

Kohn: Noted he is not happy with the plans and does not feel they sufficiently call out the materials on the front side. He further sought clarification as to what the front material will be.

Cushard: Noted in response to Kohn, the front will be brick including the five foot wrap around and the other two sides being Hardie Board.

Jenks: Noted he would like to see a French drain installed in the front yard to assist with the drainage issues. He would also like to see some windows included on the side facing the neighbor.

Wright: Likes the design and thinks it looks great.

Motion by Plamper and seconded by Schwartz to table until plans are drawn that are appropriate with the scope of work and materials being easily identifiable.

Yeas: Wright, Ingber, Jenks, Schwartz, Polan, Plamper, Kohn, Watts,
Nays: None
Absent: Moore

Motion passed.

Matter of Site Plan Review for a proposed addition to the Samuelson residence at 10128 Hart.

Vanessa and Derrick Samuelson are requesting site plan approval for the construction of an addition to the family residence at 10128 Hart. The zoning is R-1E and the property contains 1 platted lot (40' x 125"), 4,996 sq. ft.

Derrick Samuelson explained that they moved to the neighborhood a few years ago and love the area. They need a bigger home are looking to add an addition to the home which is a bungalow. The second story is one bedroom and bath and with the addition, would add two bedrooms to the second floor, allowing their children to be on the same floor.

Andrew Danaher, architect, noted it is a straightforward addition. There is a three season room to the rear of the home that sits slab on grade that has foundations and the hope is to reuse the first floor coverage creating a small addition to the north west side of the rear portion of the house. This will allow them to extend living space and make the second floor work out. It will create a covered space to the rear of the yard. First floor footprint will remain the same, but the second floor will grow. They tried to keep the materials natural and windows sizes similar throughout. They called out the siding for the rear as a natural cedar siding. They will not be touching the front of the home.

Hank Berry clarified the plan is very well done adding as much fenestration where they could fit in. The back of the addition has a tremendous amount of fenestration also. The addition is brick on the first floor and cedar shake on the second which is an upgrade from materials seen on other projects. He also clarified that there is a discrepancy for lot coverage per the survey. He shows that he is 7.4 feet over so any decision made tonight should be subject to Zoning Board of Appeals variance or a determination that there is a mathematical error. If they approve this tonight upon the resolution of a variance, that they be allowed to proceed with the project.

Public Participation:

None

Commissioner Comments:

Watts: The design is nicely done.

Ingber: Happy with all the windows in the back as well as the number of windows being included.

Plamper: Noted personal preference as not in favor of the addition roof line coming out the back of the bungalow but feels the proposed plan is well done.

Polan: Asked for clarification on the demo elevations about the note pointing to key and tooth brick and how the brick meets the cedar elevation on that plane. Danaher clarified that this is the typical way to tool the joints consistently versus saw cutting the joint. It happens on the west side of the house as well as the north east corner.

Kohn: Questioned the practice of building over an open porch and whether there are ordinance or master plan issues with this type of build. Berry clarified it is not cantilevered and this type of build has been seen before.

Motion by Schwartz and seconded by Ingber to approve the proposed addition for 10128 Hart subject to resolution of the need of a variance or ZBA approval.

Yeas: Ingber, Jenks, Schwartz, Polan, Plamper, Kohn,
Watts,
Nays: None
Abstained: Wright
Absent: Moore

Motion Passed.

Matter of Site Plan Review for a Proposed Addition to the McKeough residence at 25515 Wareham.

Emily Mckeogh is requesting site plan approval for the construction of an addition to her residence. The zoning is R-1C and the property contains 1 platted lot (55'x 125' IRR), 6,592 sq. ft. Kris Guccione, designer representing Mrs. McKeough, noted that the proposed plan includes a small addition with an interior renovation. The addition is 450 square feet with a four foot brick wall, limestone sill, Hardie Board siding and five new windows to match the existing.

Berry noted the house is under the maximum house size not including any bonuses. The addition is a modest back yard addition that still respects the setbacks as well as the height. It meets all the bulk regulations with respect to window sizes and materials that should be clarified. He did receive a verbal notification from the neighbor at 25435 Wareham stating they have no issues with the proposed plan. He presented drawings for the Commission clarifying the proposed plan layout and materials.

Public Participation:

None

Commissioner Comments:

Ingber: Noted the plans look great.

Watts: Noted she does not see sizes of the proposed windows. She further noted the plan is well done. Guccione clarified the window dimensions are noted on the floor plan.

Kohn: Noted he likes the plan.

Jenks: Noted he thinks the plan is good.

Wright: Noted he also thinks the addition looks good.

Motion by Plamper and seconded by Jenks to approve the proposed addition for 25515 Wareham as presented.

Yeas:	Wright, Ingber, Jenks, Schwartz, Polan, Plamper, Kohn, Watts,
Nays:	None
Absent:	Moore

Motion passed.

Matter of Review for Planning Commission Approval for a Proposed Front Roof Solar Panel Installation to the Ahuvia Residence at 25338 Dundee.

The Ahuvia residents are seeking approval for the placement of solar panels on the front of their home. Mrs. Ahuvia addressed the Commission on why they are choosing solar power and why they need to place them on the front of the home. They are looking for a fully functioning system that utilizes a battery that stores the energy to be used at night. The specifics of the requests, in order to fully convert to solar power, panels will need to be installed on three of the four sides of the roof including the front side of the home which the west by south, the most important side in collecting solar power. Placing the panels on alternate locations such as the north side would cut efficiency by twenty five percent.

Hank Berry provided clarification on the request that the burden of proof will be on Mr. Ahuvia to show that without the front facing portions the system will be ineffective (not producing any significant or desired effect.) The Commission will have to decide at what point ineffective comes in as it is not defined in the code. Typically, that would not be “unable to use the maximum” but rather would the system function in a reasonable capacity without front placement. While this comes to the Commission by current code, there will be a code change coming to redirect this particular type of appeal to the ZBA. The ordinance was enacted to keep solar panels off the front of the houses as they are not common to Huntington Woods. At previous meetings and even for the previous code the public input was long the lines of “great as long as we don not have to look at it”. We do allow solar panels by right with this restriction. The street curb appeal was deemed to have outweighed the need for front placement by right. A resident does have a right to solar panels but the front facing panels by previous Commissions were not allowed. The Commission options are to pass it as there has been a solid demonstration of need, deny it as not having met the requirements which would also allow him to go to the ZBA to appeal or table it if

sufficient information is not produced.

Yellow Light, the installer of the panels contracted by the Ahuvia's, presented photos to the Commission to provide understanding of placement and how it will look from street view.

Public Participation:

Raymond Fraser - 13320 Vernon

He is in favor of solar power but questioned if anyone had looked into Tesla solar shingles as an alternative.

Mari Cooper - Noted she is in favor of allowing the panels on the front of the house.

Commissioner Comments:

Jenks: Noted he would like to see how effective this placement will be and allow them to try.

Kohn: He does not feel the Commission is the place to make this decision allowing the front placement. There are a set of regulations that the Commission should comply with that can not be ignored. In terms of evaluating the validity of this project, the Commission is stuck with current regulations prohibiting. He sought clarification from Yellow Light on the decrease in efficiency if not placed on the front side as well as the placement of trees affecting the efficiency.

Plamper: Sought and received clarification if they are trying to be totally self-sufficient with solar power, what is the life span of the system is and how often technology will advance. Also asked if they had considered placing panels on the garage roof. Yellow Light stated it is possible but is an additional cost but there is no plan for panel placement.

Schwartz: Asked if there is a desire to place the panels on the front of the house versus a need. Ahuvia noted the garage is not in good condition. He also questioned if higher wattage that could be used along with placement and how will it look. Yellow Light provided a detailed layout to the Commission on how it will look.

Watts: Does not feel a ten percent decrease in efficiency due to alternate placement is ineffective or impractical. Public input from previous hearing regarding solar placement was that of not wanting to look at panels on the front of the home.

General discussion continued amongst the Commission on how to proceed with request.

Motion by Wright and seconded by Polan to approve as presented based on the ineffectiveness of placing them on the non-street facing roof.

Yeas: Jenks, Polan, Wright

Nays: Kohn, Plamper, Schwartz, Watts

Absent: Ingber, Moore

Motion failed with a 3 to 4 vote.

Berry noted that the request can go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance or could install

the panels with a permit without any Commission approval less the front roof placement.

**Motion by Plamper seconded by Schwartz to adjourn.
All in favor the motion passed.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:51 p.m.

Heidi Barckholtz
Recorder

DRAFT