



CITY of MEDINA
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
November 14, 2024

Meeting Date: November 14, 2024

Meeting Time: 6:00 PM

Present: Nathan Case, Bruce Gold, Rick Grice, Paul Rose, Monica Russell, Andrew Dutton (Community Development Director), and Sarah Tome (Administrative Assistant)

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Rose stated that there had been a correction made to the minutes from October 10, 2024 in regards to his voting on the final case. Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the minutes from October 10, 2024, as corrected, and October 22, 2024, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Case.

Vote:

Case Y Gold Y

Grice Y Rose Y

Russell A

Approved 4-0 with Ms. Russell abstaining

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

Airport Commission Appointment

Mr. Grice stated that Mr. Gold had resigned from the Airport Commission and the Planning Commission would have to appoint a new member to the commission.

Mr. Gold made a motion to nominate Rick Grice as the Planning Commission's appointment to the Airport Commission.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rose.

Vote:

Case Y Gold Y

Grice Y Rose Y

Russell Y

Approved 5-0

Applications

1. P24-25 Tony Cerny 620 East Smith Road SPA

Mr. Dutton stated that the 620 Corporation Park on the south side of East Smith Road encompassed three parcels and included several industrial, commercial, and storage uses. He added that the western and northern parts of the site included multi-tenant buildings, the central part of the site contained a large industrial building with multiple units, and the southern part of the site incorporated nearly 300 self-storage units.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing 39 new self-storage units between the central large building and the existing self-storage units. He noted that the proposed building would include 30,000 sq. ft. of storage space with an upper level accessible to the north and a lower level accessible to the south. Mr. Dutton stated that the project met all applicable development standards except for the northern setback. He added that the applicant had indicated that a 35 ft. wide area would be transferred from the adjacent property containing large industrial buildings in order to meet setback requirements.

Mr. Dutton noted that the new self-storage units were accessible via gravel drives to the north and south. He added that gravel was a permitted drive surface as the site was in the rear area of an industrial property. Mr. Dutton stated that, due to the use's infrequent access, self-storage warehousing did not require any off-street parking spaces. He continued that the drive width between the buildings provided an adequate area for the loading and unloading of items.

Mr. Dutton stated that, though the industrial property abutted residential zoning districts on multiple sides, the proposed building would not be visible from adjacent properties due to existing vegetation, grade changes, and the railroad. He added that the City Engineer had commented that though a formal Stormwater Management Analysis was not anticipated, the city would require drainage and grading improvements.

Mr. Dutton stated that architectural plans indicated a typical self-storage warehouse design predominantly incorporating vertical metal siding and a low-pitched roof. He noted that the building integrated larger overhead doors on the north side of the building and smaller overhead doors on the south side of the building. He added that a compliant light fixture had been provided. Mr. Dutton stated that plans would also need to indicate the location and height of proposed lighting, however, the building was internal to the site, and lighting issues were not anticipated.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P24-25 for Site Plan approval as submitted with the following conditions:

1. The subject property shall be expanded to the north to comply with setback requirements.
2. The location and height of new lighting shall be submitted in compliance with Section 1145.09(c).

Present for the case was Tony Cerny of Architectural Design Studios, 620 East Smith Road.

Ms. Russell asked if the applicant was okay with the recommendations made by City Staff. Mr. Cerny stated that he had no issues and had already begun working on moving the property line.

Mr. Grice opened the application to the public for comment. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Gold asked if the applicant needed to submit a lighting plan. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant would need to submit a plan showing the location of the lighting. He added that a photometric plan would not be required.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve P24-25, as submitted.

Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Gold	<u>Y</u>	Grice	<u>Y</u>
Rose	<u>Y</u>	Russell	<u>Y</u>
Case	<u>Y</u>		
Approved	<u>5-0</u>		

2. P24-26 John Potter 322 West Smith Road TC-OV

Mr. Dutton stated that the case was before the Planning Commission because the property was located in the Transitional Corridor Overlay District. He stated that the site had previously contained a single-family home, which was demolished in 2018. He added that the property was currently vacant and backed up to Champion Creek. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing a new two-family residential building with the following general characteristics:

- 1,635 sq. ft. units, each with an attached one car garage
- A two story structure with a pitched roof with black asphalt shingles
- A front porch for each unit with a black metal roof
- A 130 ft. setback from the right-of-way
- A front elevation with vinyl board and batten siding

Mr. Dutton stated that Section 1135.03 of the Zoning Code indicated permitted uses in the C-2 zoning district, which were predominantly commercial. He noted that the proposed two-family residential use was not a permitted use in the C-2 zoning district. He added that the applicant had filed a variance to Section 1135.03 to allow the proposed use.

Mr. Dutton stated that, as the property was zoned C-2, Section 1135.06 of the Code included standards for principal buildings which were typically applied to commercial development. He noted that the proposed site plan did not meet the required 50 ft. rear setback and proposed parking in the front yard, which was not permitted. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had filed a variance to Sections 1135.06 and 1135.08(a) to allow a reduced rear yard setback and parking in the front yard, respectively. He added that, though a 25 ft. riparian setback was

shown on the submitted plan, the setback was a recommendation by the City's Engineering Department and was not a formal requirement.

Mr. Dutton stated there was not a uniform architectural style to surrounding houses, but that the proposed two-family home incorporated a similar scale, front setback, and materials as area homes and was generally consistent with surrounding established patterns. He noted that Section 1135.13(c)(1) limited the use of vinyl siding to 15% for building elevations facing the right-of-way. He added that the proposed duplex was clad in vinyl siding, with vinyl board and batten siding on the elevation facing West Smith Road. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had filed a variance to Section 1135.13(c)(1).

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P24-26 as submitted with the condition that the project shall receive variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals to Section 1135.03 regarding use, Section 1135.06 regarding the rear yard setback, Section 1135.08(a) to allow parking in the front yard, and Section 1135.13(c)(1) regarding the use of vinyl facing the right of way.

Present for the case were David Wascak, 196 Marko Lane, Brooklyn Heights, and David Leach of the Cornice Company, 3200 West Market Street, Suite 6, Fairlawn.

Mr. Grice opened the application to the public for comment.

Gregory Happ, 331 E Washington Street, stated that he was in attendance representing the owners of the property at 328 West Smith Road. Mr. Happ stated that his clients objected to the applicant's request to place a duplex on the property. He noted that his clients felt the proposal created a very congested area and limited access to the rear of adjacent properties.

Mr. Happ stated that there was a drainage pipe on his clients' property that ran to the creek to the rear of the properties. He continued that his clients felt it would be impossible for the city to perform maintenance on the pipe with a duplex next door. He reiterated that his clients felt that the proposed structure was too big for the lot. Mr. Happ stated that, though there were other duplexes on the block of West Smith Road, they were on larger lots. He noted that there had been a single-family home on the site for 100 years and the lot should remain single-family residential. Mr. Happ stated that, as the proposed duplex would be on a slab foundation, the applicant would have to address additional water runoff on the neighboring properties.

Mr. Rose asked Mr. Happ why the adjacent property owner believed water would go into his basement. Mr. Happ stated that there were issues with water in the past and that his clients felt having a building placed 5 ft. away from the property line would lead to further issues.

Ms. Russell inquired into the drainage pipe referenced by Mr. Happ. Mr. Happ stated that there was a catch basin near the street. He added that his client had given the city permission to run a pipe on their property that connected the catch basin to the creek behind the properties. Ms. Russell stated that she would be surprised if anyone would be allowed to access the subject site for maintenance, as the pipe was located on the neighboring property. Mr. Dutton stated that, according to the City Engineer's GIS, there was not a pipe leading to the creek. There was further discussion regarding the drainage pipe.

Carrie Kalina, 4773 Forest Grove Dr, in Brunswick Hills, stated that she was told that the pipe ran from the creek to the catch basin. She added that she had been told that the city would come back after the construction on West Smith Road and clean out the pipe. Mr. Grice clarified that the pipe was located on Ms. Kalina's property at 328 West Smith Road. Ms. Kalina stated that it was.

Mr. Grice noted that the City's Engineering Department would review the proposed plan for drainage. Mr. Dutton stated that the Engineering Department reviewed any new structure in the city. Mr. Gold inquired as to how the new duplex would put more water onto the neighboring property. Mr. Happ stated that his clients felt the duplex's gutters would not handle all of the water from the roof. He reiterated that they objected to the applicant trying to put a duplex on what had been a single-family residential lot. Mr. Gold stated that there were many duplexes in the city that were located on smaller lots. Mr. Case noted that the footprint of the structure was only 44 ft. x 46 ft. Mr. Gold stated that the gutters would take care of the water from the roof. Mr. Case stated that, if anything, the addition of the duplex would lessen the amount of water on neighboring properties due to the gutters draining into the storm sewer and the property being graded towards the creek and the street. Mr. Rose noted that the city had also put in a new storm sewer when they had replaced West Smith Road.

Mr. Case asked if the applicant would be willing to add shake siding to the gables and shutters on the front windows. He noted that he felt this would give the duplex a more historic look, as board and batten siding did not usually extend into the gable. Mr. Leach stated they would be add shake siding and shutters.

Ms. Russell made a motion to approve application P24-26 as submitted with the condition that the project shall receive variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals to Section 1135.03 regarding use, Section 1135.06 regarding the rear yard setback, Section 1135.08(a) to allow parking in the front yard, and Section 1135.13(c)(1) regarding the use of vinyl facing the right of way. Mr. Case amended the motion to include the following additional conditions:

1. Shutters shall be installed beside the windows on the front building elevation.
2. Shake siding shall be installed in gabled areas on the front building elevation.

Mr. Gold seconded the amended motion.

Vote:

Grice	<u>Y</u>	Rose	<u>Y</u>
Russell	<u>Y</u>	Case	<u>Y</u>
Gold	<u>Y</u>		
Approved	<u>5-0</u>		

Mr. Dutton stated that the property included an existing 58,615 sq. ft. industrial and office building, which had most recently been occupied by Corrpro Waterworks. He added that the applicant, Sandridge, was planning to occupy the space and upgrade the building and site. Mr. Dutton stated that the footprint of the existing building would not change and plans indicated a reconstruction of the existing parking lot and drives. He added that new parking lot lighting was shown with a compliant light fixture, height, and photometric plan.

Additionally, he stated that landscaping had been shown on the east and west sides of the building's office area and the south side of the building's industrial area. Mr. Dutton stated that the initial changes to the building would be to the south side of the structure, which contained the office area. He stated that changes included new larger windows, white EIFS sections, horizontal metal siding sections, an awning, and wall sconces. He added that seating areas were also proposed on the east and west sides of the office area. Mr. Dutton stated that, in the future, northern sections of the building would incorporate the same design scheme.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P24-27 for Site Plan approval, as submitted.

Present for the case was Joel Copley with Janotta & Herner, 309 Monroe Street, Monroeville. Mr. Copley stated that the Planning Commission had reviewed a project for Sandridge at 820 Lafayette Road. He added that the current proposal was for the same use. Mr. Copley continued that Sandridge had acquired the property next door to their current facility, which would allow the company to benefit from a contiguous facility. Mr. Copley stated that the intended use of the front portion of the building was the culinary and marketing center. He noted that they were still working on the best use for the warehouse portion of the building.

Mr. Gold inquired as to whether Corrpro had acquired the property on Lafayette Road. Mr. Copley stated that Sandridge owned the building and Corrpro had become their tenant.

Mr. Grice opened the application to the public for comment. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Gold asked about the phases of the project. Mr. Copley stated that the need for a second phase would be determined once the use for the warehouse portion of the building was decided upon. Mr. Gold inquired if all of the exterior façade renovations would be done at one time. Mr. Copley stated that the intent was to renovate all of the street facing sides of the building at once.

Ms. Russell made a motion to approve application P24-27, as submitted.

Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Vote:

Rose Y Russell Y

Case Y Gold Y

Grice Y

Approved 5-0

4. P24-28 Tim Pelton 549 South Court Street TC-OV

Mr. Dutton stated that the Planning Commission had previously seen a similar application for a new home on the property. He noted that the two-story home originally on the site was built in 1890 and had experienced a fire in 2019, which led to it being demolished. Mr. Dutton stated that, in September of 2024, an application was made to construct a new home on the site. He added that, after discussion, the application was denied by the Planning Commission. Mr. Dutton stated that revised plans had been submitted to construct a home on the site with the following general characteristics, which had not changed from the original submittal:

- A one-story 2,328 sq. ft. structure with a second-story fixed front window
- An attached two-car garage and an attached drive-through third-car garage
- A pitched roof with multiple roof lines
- A 130 ft. setback from the right-of-way
- A front elevation with a mix of materials

Mr. Dutton stated that the site plan was revised by moving the third car garage on the north side of the home back 5 ft. He noted that revised plans differ from the original submission by providing two options for the front elevation incorporating alternate materials, window shutters, a smaller roof over the entryway, revised garage doors, and an optional awning above the two car garage.

Mr. Dutton stated that Staff did not recommend approval of application P24-28, as submitted. He noted that, though the proposed home was of high quality, revisions predominantly incorporated aesthetic exterior changes and Staff’s recommendation was based on the home’s inability to meet TC-OV Development Guidelines and Infill Development Standards. He added that elements of a more compatible home would include a similar setback as adjacent homes, a second story, a prominent front porch, and a fully detached or recessed garage to the rear of the home.

Present for the case was Tim Pelton of Landmark Homes, 125 North Broadway Street. Mr. Pelton stated that, based on their conversations with the Planning Commission in September, he had tried to give the home a more upright stance, as opposed to a ranch look. He noted that he had also changed the exterior materials so that the structure had less of a modern farmhouse look.

Mr. Gold stated that, given the placement of the sanitary sewer on the property, he could understand the proposed setback. Additionally, he noted that other properties within a ¼ mile of the property had similar setbacks. Mr. Gold stated that he thought the application was a reasonable attempt to make the house fit in better with the surrounding neighborhood.

Ms. Russell stated that she had no issues with the setback. She inquired as to the reason for a single-story home. Mr. Pelton stated that the property owner was looking to age in place. Mr. Case noted that the building had the height of a two story home.

Mr. Case stated that he liked both of the designs offered by the applicant. Mr. Rose stated that he preferred option 2. Mr. Rose stated that he appreciated the efforts made by the applicant in this updated design.

Mr. Rose made a motion to accept the application, as submitted.

Mr. Case seconded the motion.

Vote:

Russell Y Case Y

Gold Y Grice Y

Rose Y

Approved 5-0

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Rick Grice, Chairman