

PUBLIC HEARING HIDDEN HOLLOW SUBDIVISION
BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Council Chambers - Brecksville City Hall
August 20, 2020 Page 1

Present: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer, Kirk Roman, Dominic Sciria
Absent: Ron Payto
Others: Eric Hall, Gerald Wise and approximately 18 guests

Mayor Hruby and Mr. Sciria attended the public hearing via conference call. Mr. Roman opened the public hearing at 7:00 P.M. by reading the following legal notice published in the August 6, 2020 issue of the *Sun Star Courier*.

The Brecksville Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing at 7:00 P.M. on Thursday, August 20, 2020 in the Ralph W. Biggs Council Chambers of Brecksville City Hall, 9069 Brecksville Road, Brecksville, Ohio, to hear the proposal for a new 14 lot major subdivision at 5324 Miller Road, Permanent Parcels 604-14-002, 604-14-006, 604-14-010 and 604-14-014.

Present on behalf of the proposed Hidden Hollow subdivision were: William Bailey, W. J. Bailey Homes, Kimberly Kerber, MacKay Engineering & Surveying Company and Aaron Evenchik, Legal Counsel for Bailey Homes. Ms. Kerber gave a detailed and lengthy presentation illustrating how the proposed Hidden Hollow subdivision conformed per the dictates of the City's Planning and Zoning Code, as well as the intent and objectives of the Master Plan for Brecksville.

The builder's original plan included 17 sublots in the R-30 single family, 30,000 min. sq. ft. per lot district, which was reduced to 14 sublots to address the Planning Commission's issue with density. Ms. Kerber indicated their storm water management plan onsite would address the flooding experienced by neighboring residents by diverting the water runoff coming from the West via swales, storm sewers and the retention basin on the property. She assured the Commission, and public present, that storm water management, for the site, would be designed in conjunction with the City Engineer to meet the City's requirements.

Sublot boundaries have been changed slightly from those presented to the Planning Commission on July 9, 2020. Sublots 1, 2 and 8 have been adjusted to improve their functionality by providing more space in the rear yards from the preservation area boundary. As an example, she noted that S/L 8 now had approximately 40 ft. from the rear of the house to the preservation area boundary. All sublots would have adequate backyard space for decks and/or patios. The footprint for houses was reduced to 70' x 50'. Ms. Kerber indicated that a draft Home Owners Association (HOA) document was submitted to the City.

Ms. Kerber described the usage of the properties bounding the site which limited development of the proposed site to a single cul-de-sac street. She remarked that two variances, often approved in the past by the City, were requested. The builder was requesting variances to 1) exceed the Code maximum cul-de-sac street of 800 ft. to permit 1,281 ft, and 2) to permit deviation from rectangular lots for sublots 9, 10 and 14 to permit non-rectangular lots due to their location on the cul-de-sac. Ms. Kerber cited a number of subdivisions in Brecksville with cul-de-sac streets exceeding 800 ft., along with non-conforming cul-de-sac lots.

The wetlands and rough topography of the site would be maintained. Their development plan would contain water drainage to the property on the site, thus improving the flooding problems of adjacent properties. Grading on the site would be limited and trees preserved wherever possible. The stream flowing through the site would be maintained. The proposed development has received a Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination by the Army Corps of Engineers, which would be followed by a required Wetlands Permit. The geotechnical analysis of the soil on the site resulted in no soil issues that would affect the installation of sanitary sewers and utilities. Ms. Kerber mentioned an Ownership Certificate submitted to the City indicating Mr. Bailey's right to bring an application for development before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Kerber reviewed each of the specific submitted sheets of the proposed development plan drawings for the benefit of the Commission and the public present. She cited City Code requirements, together with the developer's dated submission documents, that would satisfy those requirements. Ms. Kerber maintained that

Hidden Hollow would be an attractive, harmonious development featuring high end, high quality, expensive homes in conformance with the City Zoning Codes and the objectives of the Master Plan for the City.

The public hearing was opened to the public for their comments.

Mr. John Swansinger, Buckingham, Doolittle & Burroughs, LLC, Legal Counsel for Citizens for Sensibility, a group of property owners in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project, had some questions:

- Maintenance of the approximately 30 ft. sanitary sewer easement on subplot 8, which ran through property in the designated preservation area. Ms. Kerber said the sewer easement was not part of the preservation area so there would be no issue if repairs were required within the easement.
- An area along subplot 6 designated as a ditch on the subdivision plans was actually labeled a stream on the wetlands map.
- A triangular area on subplot 8, which Ms. Kerber indicated was part of their permitted ½ acre wetlands fill.
- An area between sublots 13 & 14 that would be a swale draining into existing wetlands and then into an inlet between sublots 11 & 12.
- Would there be soil erosion problems on swales? Ms. Kerber didn't think erosion could be predicted.
- How did the developer determine water flow off the property would be improved? Runoff calculations were done and submitted to the City Engineer.
- Hazardous materials on the site? Mr. Bailey explained that no consideration was given to testing for hazardous materials as Mr. Cindric had a residential plumbing business and only stored supplies for that business in his shop on the property.

Mr. Swansinger recalled a comment to the Commission at their February 20, 2020 meeting by Jane Goodman from South Euclid. She spoke about the importance of the proposed development site for collecting water from the Furnace Run Watershed, along with the site's unsuitability for construction. Mr. Evenchik cited the many comments and videos from adjacent residents relating to flooding of their properties from the site that the developer planned to reduce substantially with stormwater management on the site.

Ms. Laura Teca, 10233 Barr Road, had several concerns. She asked why the residents of Barr Road had to suffer the disruption and expense of a sanitary sewer line when it appeared there was a closer possibility to hook up at Highland to an already existing sewer line. Ms. Teca commented that the small bog at the rear of their property turned into a raging river during heavy rains. She wondered if the capacity of the planned retention basin was sufficient to hold heavy rain events and what would happen if the pond overflowed. Ms. Kerber responded that Barr Road was their only option as the City would not grant them an easement over City property to hook in at Snowville Road. She noted the retention basin would be designed according to City Code specifications to accommodate a 300 year storm.

Ms. Pat Toll, 10240 Barr Road and a 43 year Brecksville resident, said Barr Road residents were told over the years that a sanitary sewer would be too expensive to install. Now, for a development that in no way benefits them, they would be expected to assume an expensive assessment for sewers. Mr. Bailey said he offered the City \$25,000 for the rights to an easement over City property to tie into the sewer line on Snowville Road, but was never told why they would not consider it.

Ms. Almut Zvosec (formerly Teuffel), 10115 Barr Road, wanted to discuss density, wetlands preservation and stormwater management. She questioned qualitatively whether the appearance of the development would be consistent with the general surrounding neighborhood due to the small size of the lots. Ms. Zvosec noted that the lots in her vicinity ranged from 1.24 – 3.71 acres. Eight of the proposed subdivision lots were over an acre, but significantly restricted in buildable area by preservation areas. Six of the sublots were under an acre.

Ms. Zvosec knew responsibility for the wetlands monitoring would be turned over to the development HOA after the builder finished construction. She wondered how the monitoring would work, how violations would be determined and addressed, and if there would be penalties for violations. Mr. Evenchik said that at the time the Army Corps issues a permit, a copy of the wetlands map would be sent to the EPA. In the case of an incursion into the preservation area the EPA would be sent out to issue a notice of violation and penalties could be levied. Ms. Zvosec questioned how a property owner would know the boundaries of the preservation area on their land. Mr. Evenchik mentioned again the wetlands map generated by the Army Corps. The wetlands area would also appear on the deed for the subplot. Builders, during the development period, would often erect temporary fencing to define wetlands areas. Ms. Zvosec was also concerned about the long term effect of erosion from water flooding into her pond, only to overflow her pond and continue its course. She felt the definition of a 100 year storm probably fit rain events that routinely occurred once or twice a year in that area.

Mr. Kenneth Stefanov, 5300 Miller Road, said he and his wife were not against development of the property, however they felt a fourteen lot subdivision represented bad development of the land. Their issues with the development included: density, storm water management, wetlands preservation, environmental concerns, and a perceived insensitivity of the builder to residents' concerns. The Stefanov's asked that the Planning Commission consider denying the proposed development plan.

Ms. Christina Ziegler, 10143 Barr Road, provided the Commission and residents present with a document entitled "Furnace Run Watershed Plan – Balancing Growth and Watershed Stewardship 2011." The document provided criteria for identifying "priority conservation areas" as they impact the Furnace Run Watershed. Impactful criteria included flooding, erosion, water quality and the tree canopy. Ms. Ziegler asked if the builder had a plan for tree removal and also tree replacement for the subdivision. Mr. Bailey commented that he did not have such a plan at this time.

Mr. Randy Zak, 5520 Miller Road, had provided Commission members, in advance of the meeting, with a letter to the City dated August 20, 2020 documenting his concerns with the proposed development. His primary concern was drainage of about a half-acre of development land adjacent to the northwest corner of his property. Ms. Kerber noted that currently two acres drain toward Mr. Zak's property, which would be reduced to a half acre after development. She described a mound that would channel water toward the street, as well as a catch basin in the southwest corner of their property to catch water. Mr. Zak thought the half-acre piece would turn into a dead zone of dead trees and downed branches. He asked about a utility plan so he could see if lighting from the development or from traffic in and out would impact his privacy. Originally, the small wetlands area near his home was to be filled and now it was not. He questioned whether the HOA documents would include any responsibility for the development to take care of the costs of flooding from the development onto adjacent properties. Mr. Zak's impression was that it was hard to evaluate the impact of the plan as the plan changed every time it came before the Commission. Mr. Evenchik commented that it didn't seem water flow, currently onto the Zak property, could get much worse. He maintained that their stormwater management plans for the subdivision would substantially reduce the current flow of water to his property.

Mr. Swansinger just received a copy of the draft HOA document a day ago and had only time to give it a cursory examination. Submission 14 days ahead of the public hearing would allow for a detailed review. Mr. Zak saw no reference in the draft HOA relating to monitoring of the preservation areas or maintenance of the swales. Mr. Evenchik said that typically lawn swales were taken care of by the property owner, or HOA. Mr. Zak began quoting from the HOA some stipulations associated with a PDA. Mr. Harwood advised that the subdivision was not a PDA. He said the City Law Director was currently reviewing the HOA draft, which would need some revision to fit the subdivision.

Mr. Howard Toll, 10240 Barr Road and a 45 year Brecksville resident, was always told there was no possibility of sanitary sewers along Barr Road because of the cost of drilling exceptionally deep through rock would be cost prohibitive. He mentioned that residents along one side of Barr, because of their lower lots, would also need pumping stations. He knew of a few neighbors who had just borne the cost of replacing their septic systems.

Ms. Debra Shankland, 8691 Fox Rest Drive, said that as a naturalist by training, she had an interest in the Furnace Run Watershed. Ms. Shankland was concerned that a rise in impervious surfaces would increase the amount of runoff. She noted that the characteristic of the water flow in that area was for instantaneous, raging flood waters that dissipate quickly. Adding more construction in the area would only serve to prevent any chance for the water runoff to trickle down. She saw no evidence in current construction for low impact development methods such as using cisterns and shared driveways. Ms. Shankland thought the large detention basin would turn into a goose pond collecting goose droppings and fertilizer runoff. She stressed that some of the green infrastructure strategies should be considered to address stormwater. Ms. Shankland noted that the water quality downstream would reflect the impact of development upstream. Mr. Evenchik responded that those issues would be addressed further into plan development. Ms. Zvosec's final comment was that just because they checked all the boxes didn't mean it was a good project.

Mr. Roman noted that this matter would be considered at the Work Session later in the evening. The Public Hearing closed at 8:25 p.m.

THE BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

KIRK ROMAN, CHAIRMAN
DOMINIC SCIRIA, VICE CHAIRMAN
ERIC LAHRMER, SECRETARY

Minutes recorded by Nancy Dimitris

REGULAR MEETING
BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Council Chambers - Brecksville City Hall
August 20, 2020 Page 1

Present: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer, Kirk Roman, Dominic Sciria
Absent: Ron Payto
Others: Eric Hall, Gerald Wise and approximately 18 guests

Mr. Roman opened the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission at 8:25 P.M. Mayor Hruby and Mr. Sciria attended the meeting via conference call.

APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 6, 2020 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES FOR A SOLAR SYSTEM ON PLANTATION DRIVE

It was moved by Mr. Roman and seconded by Mr. Harwood that the Planning Commission August 6, 2020 Public Hearing Minutes for a Solar System on Plantation Drive be approved.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer,
Kirk Roman, Dominic Sciria
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED

APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 6, 2020 PUBLIC HEARING MINUTES ON A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR VALOR ACRES

It was moved by Mr. Roman and seconded by Mr. Harwood that the Planning Commission August 6, 2020 Public Hearing Minutes on a Conditional Use Permit for Valor Acres be approved.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer,
Kirk Roman, Dominic Sciria
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED

APPROVAL OF THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 6, 2020

It was moved by Mr. Roman and seconded by Mr. Harwood that the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of August 6, 2020 be approved.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer,
Kirk Roman, Dominic Sciria
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED

APPROVAL OF THE WORK SESSION MEETING MINUTES OF AUGUST 6, 2020

It was moved by Mr. Roman and seconded by Mr. Harwood that the Planning Commission Work Session Meeting Minutes of August 6, 2020 be approved.

ROLL CALL: Ayes: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer,
Kirk Roman, Dominic Sciria
Nays: None
MOTION CARRIED

REPORT OF COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. Harwood reported that at their last meeting City Council passed a sign for Ahola Payroll Solutions, the DiGeronimo Solar System, the Valor Acres Conditional Use Permit and Independence Cement's Addition.

REPORT OF MAYOR HRUBY - No Report

REPORT OF CITY ENGINEER - No Report

The Regular Meeting recessed into the Work Session, and reopened to make a motion.

HIDDEN HOLLOW SUBDIVISION – WJ BAILEY HOMES – 5324 MILLER ROAD

It was moved by Mr. Roman and seconded by Mr. Harwood that the Planning Commission recommend to City Council **Preliminary** approval of a new major subdivision at 5324 Miller Road, Brecksville Ohio on PP #604-14-002, 604-14-006, 604-14-010, and 604-14-014, as described in the application dated March 9, 2020 and attached materials listed below subject to approval by the City Engineer, the City Law Director, City Council and also approval by the Board of Zoning Appeals of the following variances:

- Variance from Section 1117.04(e) requirement that cul-de-sac streets shall not exceed 800 feet in length to allow 1,281 feet.
- Variance from Section 1117.09 that lots shall be generally rectangular in form to allow a non-rectangular form for lots 9, 10 and 14.

Preliminary Plan	Mackay Engineering and Surveying	August 3, 2020
Preliminary Overall Layout A	Mackay Engineering and Surveying	August 3, 2020
Existing Drainage Area Map	Mackay Engineering and Surveying	August 3, 2020
Proposed Drainage Area Map	Mackay Engineering and Surveying	August 2, 2020
Sanitary Sewer Profile: H. Hollow	Mackay Engineering and Surveying	August 3, 2020
Sanitary Sewer Profile: Barr Road	Mackay Engineering and Surveying	January 6, 2020
Landscape Plan	Morton's Landscape Development Co.	August 7, 2020
Ownership Certificate	Joseph M. Cindric	December 20, 2019
Trip Generation Analysis	TMS Engineers, Inc.	November 18, 2019
Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination	Department of the Army	February 11, 2019
Geotechnical Exploration Report	Wertz Geotechnical Engineering Inc.	February 20, 2020
Option Agreement - Sewer Easement and Right of Way		Effective Date Redacted

ROLL CALL: Ayes: None
Nays: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer, Kirk Roman,
Dominic Sciria
MOTION FAILED

The Regular Meeting closed at 9:12 p.m.

THE BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

KIRK ROMAN, CHAIRMAN
DOMINIC SCIRIA, VICE CHAIRMAN
ERIC LAHRMER, SECRETARY

Minutes recorded by Nancy Dimitris

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION
BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Council Chambers - Brecksville City Hall
August 20, 2020 Page 1

Present: Michael Bandsuh, Michael Harwood, Mayor Hruby, Eric Lahrmer, Kirk Roman, Dominic Sciria
Absent: Ron Payto
Others: Eric Hall, Gerald Wise and approximately 18 guests

Mr. Roman opened the Work Session at 8:40 P.M.

HIDDEN HOLLOW SUBDIVISION – WJ BAILEY HOMES – 5324 MILLER ROAD

Present: William Bailey, W. J. Bailey Homes
Kimberly Kerber, MacKay Engineering & Surveying Company
Aaron Evenchik, Legal Counsel for Bailey Homes

Mr. Roman advised that, as the Hidden Hollow Subdivision had been discussed for an hour and a half earlier at a public hearing, the applicant would not be expected to repeat that lengthy presentation. Mr. Evenchik stated that their proposed subdivision met all development requirements of R-30 zoning. The applicant requested that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary subdivision plans as submitted. Mr. Evenchik asked at what point they should apply to the Board of Zoning Appeals for consideration of the two variances requested. Mr. Hall responded that the BZA appearance could be scheduled after preliminary plan approval. Mr. Roman asked each Planning Commission member for comments.

Mr. Lahrmer remarked that the applicant, during the numerous times the project has been considered, claimed that it met all City Code and zoning requirements. He challenged that assertion with the following Code Section excerpts:

- Section 1117.01(a) To provide for the planning of attractive and harmonious neighborhoods and to take advantage of topography and natural features.
- Sublots 1, 2 and 3 would have front yards facing backyards, not typical of construction in the City and impacting privacy.
- Section 1117.09 Design of Lots – Each lot shall be designed to form a functional site for the type of dwelling and the ancillary open space and the lot lines shall not be considered as merely a geometric shape enclosing the minimum requirements. The lots shall generally be rectangular, elongated or other shapes that restrict its use as a building site and utilization of yards shall be avoided.
- Section 1151.01(a) To regulate the bulk and location of buildings in relation to the land in order to obtain proper light, air, privacy and usable open spaces on each zoning lot appropriate for the district.
- Section 1151.24 Schedule of Yard Regulations for One Family Lots -Minimum rear yard of 70 feet.
- Sublot 8 for example has an effective rear yard of 40 foot before encroaching on the preservation easement.
- Section 1196.01 Design Review Guidelines - Intent
- (a) To strengthen, protect, enhance and improve the existing visual and aesthetic character of the city and to prevent the creation of perpetuation of nuisances or blight in the city.
 - (b) To integrate developments into the surrounding environment, as well as to ensure that each new development and redevelopment will be attractive.
 - (h) To ensure that these objectives are achieved through an impartial review process, which assures that each proposal complies with design guidelines.

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION
BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Council Chambers - Brecksville City Hall
August 20, 2020 Page 2

Mr. Lahrmer felt the density of the development was too tight. He thought they were using only quantitative measures with regard to the proposed plan with no regard for qualitative considerations.

Mr. Bandsuh said, while the developer addressed some of the Commission's concerns, density was not reduced enough. He felt stormwater management could reduce drainage off the site. Mr. Bandsuh was also concerned about the impact on the tree canopy. He also had to consider the proposed sewer easement through a preservation area to be disturbed about the highly invasive impact of this development in a sensitive area rich in natural resources.

Mr. Sciria asked if residents along Barr Road were being asked to pay for the new sanitary sewers. Mr. Evenchik responded that the developer would pay for the installation of the sewers, however anyone tapping into the new line would incur an assessment. Mr. Sciria commented on a note that the property was 85% wooded and he wondered if that was pre-development, or after development. Ms. Kerber responded that in its present condition it was 85% wooded. Mr. Sciria felt storm water management, on the site, was adequately addressed and could actually improve for residents adjacent to the property. He mentioned substantial tree clearing and grading in the entrance area. Yet he also remarked on preservation areas in the entrance that might often look unkempt with dead and deteriorating vegetation. Mr. Sciria noted that the constantly changing lot lines solve a problem in one lot only to create another in a different lot. As examples he mentioned:

- S/L 1 & 2 Smaller footprint due to preservation area.
- S/L3 Steep grade and future soil erosion
- S/L 1 A backyard in someone else's front yard.
- S/Ls 4, 5, 6 & 7 Yard drains close to homes a flooding hazard
- S/L 8 Only 20 ft. of level yard. A small % of buildable area – not functional
- S/L 1 & 12 Large preservation area on lots.
- Clearing along the side yard of home at 5300 Miller Road that will affect their privacy
- Privacy of existing homes to the east on Miller Road

Mr. Sciria acknowledged that the Commission granted the variances being requested a number of times in the past, but only when they did not adversely affect the development of the project. He said justification for a variance was usually based on a hardship that was not created by the applicant. Mr. Sciria speculated that a lesser density development might eliminate some of the negative impact issues being discussed. He pointed out that a consideration of a profit goal was not the responsibility of the Commission. Mr. Sciria felt there was a better plan that would fit in with the existing residential development in that area.

Mr. Harwood passed along Mr. Payto's comment that the proposed subdivision was too dense for the property involved. Mr. Payto was also aligned with Mr. Lahrmer relating to qualitative considerations vs quantitative concerns. Mr. Harwood felt the density was too great. In his opinion the proposed development of that property was not in keeping with current construction in that area. He pointed out the Commission's intense consideration for water and retention issues was focused to not creating a problem for residents and HOA's after the developer was gone.

Mayor Hruby explained that, at the time the City acquired the land from GEIS that Mr. Bailey would like to cross with an easement, part of the deal with GEIS was to preserve and not develop that parcel. The Mayor confirmed that if a sanitary sewer was installed along Barr Road, Barr Road residents would have to tap in and pay to reimburse the builder. Mr. Wise indicated there had been no submission requesting a sewer easement across City property to Snowville. Such a request would have to be reviewed and approved by City Council and, as the Mayor indicated, it was not a consideration.

Mayor Hruby felt there were areas in the Code, as stated by Mr. Lahrmer, where the proposed plan was not compliant with Code. Compliance to Code was not as exacting as a math equation. The Mayor's main concern for the proposed development was density. The developer has claimed to reduce density from an initial 17 lots to 14 lots. Mayor Hruby thought the 17 lot plan was an artificially high number that had no hope of working. At 14 homes the Mayor felt the plan still did not work.

MINUTES OF THE WORK SESSION
BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION
Council Chambers - Brecksville City Hall
August 20, 2020 Page 3

Mr. Wise reviewed in detail his August 10, 2020 letter to the City, attached and made part of the minutes, enumerating seven engineering revisions made to the plan to address comments from the Planning Commission, the developer, or at the City Engineer's direction.

Mr. Evenchik asked what would happen to their variance request to the Board of Zoning Appeals should the Planning Commission vote to not recommend the development to City Council for approval. He also wished to submit for the record a letter addressed to the Mayor and he quoted a sentence from that letter as follows:

It is well established under Ohio Law that when a plan meets the zoning code and all codified permitted uses the city's planning commission may not rely on subjective goals and aspirations of the city to deny a plan.

Mayor Hruby felt legal counsel, for the developer, had the incorrect impression that a failure to recommend the plan to City Council signaled an end to consideration by the Planning Commission. He commented that the developer was welcome to return to the Planning Commission for further consideration of a different development plan for that property. Mr. Evenchik acknowledged that they could return to the Planning Commission to re-evaluate the plan, or they could under Code Section 1115.05(C)(4) allow the plan to be considered by City Council to approve, approve with changes, or deny. Mr. Evenchik would need to consult with Mr. Bailey. The Work Session recessed into the Regular Meeting for a vote.

The Work Session closed at 9:12 p.m.

THE BRECKSVILLE PLANNING COMMISSION

KIRK ROMAN, CHAIRMAN
DOMINIC SCIRIA, VICE CHAIRMAN
ERIC LAHRMER, SECRETARY

Minutes recorded by Nancy Dimitris