

SEWICKELY BOROUGH ZONING HEARING BOARD

January 4, 2022

Sewickley Borough Building

MEETING MINUTES

1. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Eichenlaub at 7:00 PM.

The meeting was called to order by the Chair, roll call was taken with the members introduced to the members of the public in attendance.

2. Members & Staff Attending:

Jim Eichenlaub, chairman
Clark Webb, member
Daniel Borecki, member
Randy McCray, Harshman CE Group, LLC, Sewickley Code Enforcement
Donna McMullen, hearing stenographer

3. Chairman Eichenlaub determined a quorum of the members were present.

4. Affirmation of proper advertising and notice of regular scheduled meeting.

Code Enforcement Officer affirmed the date, time and location of the meeting had been properly posted and advertised.

5. Board reorganization.

The Board took action to elect officers for 2022 and appoint the Board's solicitor.

Jim Eichenlaub, Chairman
Clark Webb, Vice Chairman
Dan Borecki, Secretary
DJ Nichols, Solicitor

6. Minutes of Previous Meeting.

The minutes of the October 5, 2021 meeting were approved.

7. Decision of Cases

None

8. New Case(s)

Case # 22-01
Request for Variance
Brian and Carol Duggan – Owner / Applicant
Property located 219 Centennial Avenue
Block & Lot # 508-J- 243
Zoning District: R-1

The Owner/Applicant requested the Board grant a variance to construct an addition to the residence located at 219 Centennial Avenue, Lot and Block # 508-J-243, property located in the R-1 zoning district. Said variance request is to seek relief from the requirements contained in Chapter 330 Article IV, Section 406- Table 3. The property in question is a corner lot situated at Centennial Avenue and Grimes Streets with the principal residence facing Centennial Avenue.

Applicants were represented by Carol Duggan (owner) and their agent Denny Thomas Jr., project architect. Applicants seek to construct an addition to the principal residence to consist of a kitchen, garage and second floor bedroom above the garage. The garage would access off Grimes Street where a concrete parking pad presently exists. The lot is below the minimum lot area required for a residential lot in the R1 zoning district.

Representative's testimony and statement in the variance application believes the request to reduce the side yard setback is in harmony with the neighborhood, pointing out that the residences and garages along Grimes Street are closer to the street than what is requested.

Several residents appeared before the Board to testify in favor and in opposition to the variance request.

Susan Kaminski of 311 Beaver Street testified she owns a property at 306 Sprott Way and had not opposition to the project and variance request. Blair Chan testified on behalf of her parents, Greg and Alexandra Burgreen of 611 Grimes Street, which is located adjacent to the property in question. Ms. Chan questioned the applicants regarding storm water runoff coming off the roof of the proposed structure and its impact on the adjacent property. Applicants testified a three-foot vegetative strip is planned between the new addition and the property line, replacing the existing concrete. Martin and Bridgett Bates of 620 Grove Street testified their property is a "through lot" that with the garage location and access off Grimes Street. The Bates' testified in opposition to the variance request stating the proposed set-back should be further back to improve the line of site and that the variance for hardships, which they believe does not exist. The Bates' suggested the addition could be redesigned to allow for a greater set back or as a detached garage rather than as an addition to the residence. Anne Williams of 614 Grimes Street testified her residence is located across the street from the proposed addition. She stated the proposed set-back was similar to the residences and garages located along Grimes Street and did not object to the variance request. Following testimony, the hearing and record was closed for deliberation by the Board, announcing the Board would render its oral and written decision at its meeting in February.

9. Unfinished Business

None

10. New Business

None

11. Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM.