



# CITY of MEDINA

## Planning Commission

### February 10, 2022

Meeting Date: February 10, 2022

Meeting Time: 6:30 PM

Present: Bruce Gold, Rick Grice, Paul Rose, Bob Thompson, Andrew Dutton (Community Development Director), Sarah Tome (Administrative Assistant)

## **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the minutes from January 13, 2022 as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rose.

**Vote:**

## Gold Y

Grice Y

Rose Y

Russell                  Abstain

Approved 3-0 with Ms. Russell abstaining

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

## **Old Business**

There was no old business to be discussed.

## New Business

1. P22-03 Midwest Sign Company 400 N. State Rd. CSP

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting a conditional sign permit for an electronic message center sign. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing a 5 ft. 1 in. tall freestanding sign near North State Street, which included a 23 sq. ft. internally illuminated aluminum sign and a 15 sq. ft. electronic message center (EMC) sign. He noted that the EMC portion of the sign required Conditional Sign Permit review by the Planning Commission. Mr. Dutton stated that Section 1147.07(j) of the zoning code required an EMC sign to meet illumination requirements and a maximum display change of once every 30 seconds.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant would use auto dimming in the illumination and would not change the displayed image more than once every thirty seconds.

Present for the case was Ron Velega, 400 N. State Rd. Mr. Valega stated that he was filling in for the applicant and would do his best to answer any questions of the Commission. There were no questions from the Commission.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve to approve the application as submitted.

Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Vote:

Gold            Y

Grice            Y

Rose            Y

Russell        Y

Approved      4-0

2.      P22-04            Kevin McNulty            Foundry St. Parcel #028-19A-16-044            SPA

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting Site Plan approval for self-storage warehousing. Mr. Dutton stated that the existing industrially zoned property had a shallow and wide configuration. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing the construction of 96 self-storage units and two small offices. He noted the site was split by a swale between a northern section with 42 units, an office, a dumpster enclosure, and snow storage areas and a southern section with 54 units, which are generally smaller, and an office.

Mr. Dutton noted that each section incorporated a separate entrance, emergency entrance, stormwater basin, and fencing. He stated that the applicant had submitted a variance application to the Board of Zoning Appeals to allow buildings within the front setback and for fencing to exceed the maximum height in the front yard.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P22-04 Site Plan as submitted, with the condition that the project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1141.05 regarding the front yard setback and Section 1155.01(c)(1) regarding fence height in the front yard, or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Present for the case was Kevin McNulty, 1620 Stony Hill Rd., Hinkley, Ohio. Mr. McNulty stated that the site in question was an almost unbuildable parcel. He stated that the site would be beautifully developed and would be great contribution to the city.

Mr. Rose inquired into how long the applicant had owned the property and how much he proposed to charge for storage unit rent.

Mr. McNulty stated that he had owned the property for three years. Mr. McNulty stated that rent for the units would be competitive, with numbers around the following levels:

- 10' x 20' unit - \$169/mo.
- 10' x 30' unit - \$220/mo.
- 18' x 30' unit - \$450/mo.
- 20' x 50' and 20' x 60' units around \$700/mo.

Mr. Rose asked if there was any chance of someone making a home out of a storage unit. Mr. McNulty responded that there was no chance of that happening. He stated that he owned another, similar facility and had never had this become an issue.

Mr. Russell made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1141.05 regarding the front yard building setback and Section 1155.01(c)(1) regarding fence height in the front yard, or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals

Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Vote:

Gold	<u>Y</u>
Grice	<u>Y</u>
Rose	<u>Y</u>
Russell	<u>Y</u>
Approved	4-0

---

2. P22-05 & P22-06 Jennifer Thur 717 N. Court St. CJC

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was requesting Site Plan and Conditional Use approval for a daycare center. Mr. Dutton noted that the applicant currently runs daycare facilities in the adjoining properties to the north and south of the site in question. He stated that the existing site included former converted office building, a detached garage, and a two-way access point off of North Court Street. Mr. Dutton continued that the applicant proposed to remove the existing detached garage, construct a rear addition, and connect the rear driveway to the property to the south.

Mr. Dutton noted that the Zoning Code required a 25 ft. setback when adjacent to a residential district. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had submitted an application for a variance with the Board of Zoning Appeals as proposed parking was within the setback. Mr. Dutton stated that the Engineering Department had requested that upon purchasing the property, the applicant either combine both parcels into one common parcel or prepare and submit a cross-access easement for the two properties to the City.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P22-06 as submitted, with the following conditions:

- The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1133.05 regarding the landscape setback from a residential district or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals; and
- The applicant shall either combine both parcels into one common parcel or prepare and submit a cross-access easement for the two properties to the City.
- In the event staff observes vehicles frequently backing up onto North Court Street during drop off or pick up, the applicant shall work with the staff to address the issue.

Present for the case was Jennifer Thur, 707 N. Court St. Ms. Thur stated that she was excited for the project and that the proposed facility would be an excellent addition to the two daycare centers she currently owned.

Ms. Russell asked if the applicant was looking to consolidate the lots. Ms. Thur responded that she would be willing to do this if it was deemed necessary.

Mr. Rose congratulated the applicant on how far her endeavor has come.

Mr. Grice opened the public hearing. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Mr. Rose made a motion to approve applications P22-05 and P22-06 with the following conditions:

- The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1133.05 regarding the landscape setback from a residential district or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
- The applicant shall either combine both parcels into one common parcel or prepare and submit a cross-access easement for the two properties to the City.
- In the event staff observes vehicles frequently backing up onto North Court Street during drop off or pick up, the applicant shall work with the staff to address the issue.

Ms. Russell seconded the motion.

Vote:

Gold           Y

Grice          Y

Rose           Y

Russell       Y

Approved      4-0

**Adjournment**

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sarah Tome

---

Rick Grice, Chairman