



CITY of MEDINA
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
May 9, 2024

Meeting Date: May 9, 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. Gold made a motion to approve the minutes from April 11, 2024 as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Rose.

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.

Applications

1. P24-12 Eben Selby 455 Lafayette Road TC-OV

Mr. Dutton stated that the case was before the Commission because the property was located in the Transitional Corridor Overlay District. Mr. Dutton stated that the existing building contained two dwelling units, one on the first floor and one on the second. He added that the applicant was proposing the construction of:

- A 743 sq. ft. (22 ft. x 33.75 ft.) detached three-car garage on the north side of the building, accessed by a new concrete driveway
- A first and second story addition on the northeast side of the building
- A first story deck on the north and east sides of the building

Mr. Dutton stated that the existing home was located 12 ft. from the Orchard Lane right-of-way, which was a nonconforming condition. He added that the proposed addition did not increase the footprint of the structure and the proposed deck was set back 12 ft. from the right-of-way. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed garage met the applicable Zoning Code standards for detached accessory structures.

Mr. Dutton added that the porch was proposed to be removed and replaced with a two-story addition in the same footprint, with the first floor of the addition having double doors opening

to the proposed deck and the second story with windows facing Orchard Lane. He stated that the applicant was also proposing dark gray vinyl siding on the entire home and the detached garage.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P24-12, as submitted.

Present for the case was Eben Selby, 455 Lafayette Road. Mr. Selby stated that he worked for a general contractor and would be doing most of the work himself. He added that an engineer would assess the building after demo of the porch. Mr. Selby stated that he was trying to make the house more usable and create a larger kitchen for the upstairs apartment.

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

Ms. Russell made a motion to approve application P24-12 as submitted.

Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Vote:

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. P24-13 Brian Grambort 881 Lafayette Road CZC/SPA

Mr. Dutton stated that, in June of 2022, City Council approved a rezoning of the property from I-1 to C-3. He added that prior to City Council's action, the Planning Commission had recommended approval of the rezoning in March of 2022. Mr. Dutton stated that, though not required with the rezoning request, a conceptual plan was included by the applicant indicating a multi-family residential building designed for individuals at risk of homelessness with 11 units.

Mr. Dutton stated that the current Site Plan and Conditional Zoning Certificate applications proposed the construction of an 8,799 sq. ft building located in the center of the lot with a single access drive, parking on the east side of the site, and a storm water basin in the northwest corner. He added that the applicant was proposing 11 multi-family residential units. He noted that the building would have an on site staff person, and would include a meeting room, counseling space, and an administrative office.

Mr. Dutton stated that all applicable development standards had been met, including setback, height, and lot coverage. He noted that parking for the site was required at two spaces per unit, with an additional space for every five units, for a total of 24 parking spaces. Mr. Dutton stated that the site plan showed 11 parking spaces with an additional 13 land banked spaces. He added that land banked spaces were not initially constructed, but would be required if city staff determined they were needed. Mr. Dutton stated that screening had been provided, particularly to the north adjacent to the Juvenile Detention Center. He noted that landscaping was also provided in front of the building, screening the parking lot, and within the parking lot.

Mr. Dutton stated that there were two variances required for the project. He noted that one would be the minimum lot size for each unit. He noted that for multi-family residential, the 5,400 sq. ft. of lot area was required per unit, while 3,524 sq. ft. of lot area per unit was proposed. He added that, put differently, 7.2 units were permitted on the site, while 11 units were proposed.

Mr. Dutton stated that the other variance was for the minimum floor area for a one bedroom unit, which was required to be 700 sq. ft. He noted that the applicant was proposing 569 sq. ft. units.

Mr. Dutton noted that the building exterior contained a variety of colors materials, and roof lines. He added that materials included lap siding, shake siding, brick veneer, and stone veneer.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of Site Plan and Conditional Zoning Certificate application P24-13 with the following conditions:

1. Land banked parking spaces shall be installed by the property owner if determined to be necessary by the City of Medina and shall meet the landscaping requirements of Section 1145.09(b).
2. The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1137.10 regarding the maximum lot size per dwelling unit and dwelling unit size or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Present for the case was Brian Grambort of Hiti, DiFrancesco and Siebold, 1939 West 125th Street, Suite 300 in Cleveland, and Skip Sipos, Executive Director of the Medina Metropolitan Housing Authority, 120 West Washington Street.

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

Mr. Dutton noted that an email from a nearby property owner detailing some concerns as to property values had been forwarded to the Commission.

Mr. Rose inquired if a couple or a parent and child could live in the units. Mr. Sipos stated that the building was designed to contain one bedroom units. He added that there was no restriction as to the number of people that could live in a unit, so a couple or parent and child could live there. Mr. Rose asked what would be done for someone with two children. Mr. Sipos stated that they would work with the person to find more suitable housing, but there was nothing to prohibit them from staying at the facility. He added that the average occupancy for this type of property was 1.2 people per unit.

There was a discussion as to number of people living in a unit. Ms. Russell stated that she had no issues with more than one person, as this facility was to help them avoid homelessness. Mr. Rose asked if there was a time limit on how long someone could live in a unit. Mr. Sipos stated that there was no time limit. He added that case management services would be provided on site to help the residents address the reasons they came to live in the apartments so that they could eventually move to better accommodations.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve application P24-13 with the following conditions:

1. Land banked parking spaces shall be installed by the property owner if determined to be necessary by the City of Medina and shall meet the landscaping requirements of Section 1145.09(b).

- The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1137.10 regarding the maximum lot size per dwelling unit and dwelling unit size or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Case seconded the 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>		

3. P24-14 Louis and Julie Schubert 248 South Harmony Street TC-OV

Mr. Dutton stated that the existing site included a two story 1,982 sq. ft. single-family home built in 1923 and a 2,423 sq. ft. detached garage. He added that the location of an in-law suite in the detached garage was approved by the Planning Commission in 2021. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was currently requesting the following additions to the single-family home:

- North Side – 590 sq. ft. addition for a master suite
- East Side – 598 sq. ft. addition for a living room, mud room, and laundry
- South/East/West Sides – 728 sq. ft. covered porch wrapping around the home

Mr. Dutton stated that the property was located on a corner lot, which effectively had two front yards adjacent to South Harmony Street and East Smith Road. He noted the required setback from each right-of-way was 40 ft., per Section 1123.05. He added that the existing principal structure was located 41.15 ft. from the South Harmony Street right-of-way and 110 ft. from the East Smith Road right-of-way. Mr. Dutton stated that the two proposed additions met the required setbacks from the rights-of-way. He added that the covered porch was located 34.71 ft. from the South Harmony Street right-of-way. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had filed a variance to Section 1123.05 to allow the covered porch to project into the required front setback.

Mr. Dutton noted that there was also a TCOV standard that stated the building width should not exceed 50 ft. However, he added that this standard was a “should” instead of a “shall”, so the Planning Commission had leeway in determining whether the regulation was applicable for the project. He noted that the fronts of the building were 70 ft. facing South Harmony Street and 79 ft. facing East Smith Road.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P24-14, as submitted with the condition that the project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1123.05 regarding front yard setbacks or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Present for the case were Jeb Schubert, 248 South Harmony Street and Jim Yezbak of Old World Custom Homes, 7056 Mears Gate Drive NW in Canton. Mr. Yezbak stated that he had been contracted to design and build the additions. He noted that the intent was to add the comforts

of a ground floor master, hearth room, and laundry room while maintaining the aesthetics of the home.

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

Mr. Rose made a motion to approve the extension to application P24-14 with the condition that the project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Section 1123.05 regarding front yard setbacks or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Gold seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

4. P24-15 Cosmin Bota 124 North Court Street CZC

Mr. Dutton noted that adjacent properties contained commercial uses to the north and south, and parking to the rear. Mr. Dutton stated that the Grind Coffee Bar occupied the western part of the building and was requesting to designate two outdoor dining areas near the entrance:

- A 20 ft. x 20 ft. section located on existing accessible parking spaces with 4 tables and seating for 8 to 10 guests. The accessible spaces would be shifted to the south and planters would separate parking from the seating area.
- A 10 ft. x 20 ft. section located in an existing flower bed adjacent to the building with 4 tables and seating for 8 to 10 guests. The bed would be replaced with pavers and pebbles.

He added that the patio areas would be open during business hours, which were currently Monday through Friday 7 am to 7 pm, Saturdays 8 am to 8 pm, and Sundays 7 am to 10 am. Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P24-15, as submitted.

Present for the case was Cosmin Bota, 124 North Court Street. Mr. Bota stated that they just wanted to give their customers the option to sit outdoors and enjoy their coffee or a crepe.

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

Ms. Russell made a motion to approve the extension to application P24-15 as submitted.

Mr. Gold seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

Mr. Dutton stated that adjacent properties included the mobile home park, industrial, undeveloped land, and single family residential located outside of the city. Mr. Dutton noted that City Council had approved a rezoning of the southern property from I-1 to R-3 in February of 2023. He added that, prior to City Council's action, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the rezoning in November of 2022. Mr. Dutton stated that, though not required with the rezoning request, a conceptual plan was included by the applicant indicating 61 lots for manufactured homes. Mr. Dutton stated that the current Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan application included 55 manufactured homes on two cul-de-sacs accessed from the existing mobile home park. He added that the project included the expansion of an existing pond for storm water management.

Mr. Dutton stated that the project met general development standards, including lot size, density, and setback requirements. He noted that the proposed cul-de-sacs of 480 ft. and 1,173 ft. in length. Mr. Dutton stated that this exceeded the maximum 600 ft. length and a connection was provided between the cul-de-sacs. He added that this connection was shown as stone, but that the Engineering and Fire Departments required it to be a hard surface. Mr. Dutton stated that the Engineering and Fire Departments were also requiring a secondary access to the site from Industrial Drive. He noted that details regarding the connection would need to be submitted.

Mr. Dutton stated that sidewalks were not shown within the proposed development, but should be incorporated as shown in the concept plans and existing in the Brookdale Mobile Home Park. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed lots provided parking in the driveways, which could accommodate the required two spaces. He noted that the driveways would need to be of a hard surface, which would need to be detailed in the plans. He added that the units were more than the required 20 ft. apart.

Mr. Dutton stated the City Engineer had required a traffic analysis to evaluate the access point on Lafayette Road. He stated that the results recommended installing a westbound left-hand turn lane. Mr. Dutton added that the Engineering Department had indicated that the improvement should be constructed at the cost of the developer.

Mr. Dutton stated that the landscaping plan showed screening to the east as required to buffer the Industrial District. However, he noted that there were gaps in the landscaping that would need to be filled in. He added that the western side of the site was adjacent to single family homes. Mr. Dutton stated that there was existing landscaping both on site and on neighboring properties, but that additional screening should be provided to fill in gaps on the north end. Mr. Dutton stated that open space was required in mobile home developments.

He noted that there was a sufficient amount of open and undeveloped areas; however, the zoning code stated that open space should include usable areas such as paths, playgrounds, and pavilions, which were not present.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended application P24-16 be tabled by the Planning Commission in order for the applicant to address items regarding the use of open space, drive surfaces, emergency access to Industrial Drive, and screening. He added that if the Planning Commission decided to approve the application, staff recommended the following conditions:

1. Open space areas shall incorporate walking paths, playgrounds, courts, pavilions, or similar items that are usable for residents.
2. Documentation shall be provided indicating how access will be obtained from the eastern cul-de-sac, through 1155 Industrial Drive, to Industrial Drive.
3. Improvements to Lafayette Road at the entrance/exit to the Brookdale Mobile Home Park shall be installed as required by the City Engineer.
4. Driveways on each lot and the drive connecting the cul-de-sacs shall be asphalt or concrete.
5. Year round screening shall be provided from all industrial properties to the east of the Brookdale Mobile Home expansion and residential properties to the west of the Brookdale Mobile Home expansion with insufficient screening.

Present for the case was Jim Hauch, 217 East Main Street in Kent, and David Myers of Thorson Barker Engineering, 3030 West Streetsboro Road in Richfield.

Mr. Hauch stated that he had no issues with asphalt for the driveways and connecting drive. He noted that they were not opposed to adding a left turn lane, but that the required length was onerous due to the cost.

Mr. Hauch stated that he wanted spacing for landscaping on par with a residential development. He added that the playground was moved to the front of the mobile home park and he did not believe another was needed. He added walking trails could potentially be provided. Mr. Hauch stated that sidewalks would lead to the homes, but there was no use for sidewalks along the roads.

Mr. Grice opened the public hearing.

Doris Nelson, 5807 Deerview Lane, stated that she had concerns about the project. She stated that the property flooded her lot and she wanted to know what would be done to offset it. Mrs. Nelson noted that she had concerns about screening on the western side of the property. She stated that she had deciduous trees on her property that were in decline and that she wanted the applicant to provide screening in that area.

Mr. Hauch stated that pines were proposed, but that it would take several years for them to achieve full growth and screening. Ms. Nelson stated that she enjoyed her privacy and wanted screening.

There was a discussion as to storm water runoff. Mr. Myers stated that water from the proposed expansion would be funneled into the expanded pond. Ms. Nelson stated that a tremendous amount of water was directed to her property from the property in question. She stated that she and her neighbors had issues with people trespassing on their properties.

Mr. Hauch stated that there was an easement for the access drive on Industrial Road which would be provided to the city.

John Emery, 5901 Deerview Lane, stated that he was there representing both himself and his daughter, who lived next door. He stated that both of their properties were set back from Deerview Lane and that they both had flooding issues. Mr. Emery presented the Commission with ten questions he had regarding the proposed expansion. The questions included such items as whether or not the existing residents knew about the expansion, where would additional parking be located, and storm water issues.

Mr. Emery stated that they had trespassers on their property from the mobile home park. Mr. Hauch stated that he thought signage and landscaping would help show where the property line was, but that if Mr. Emery had people trespassing on his property, he should notify the police. He added that each of the new homes would have two parking spaces, so they would be adding parking.

There was a discussion as to parking towards the rear of the current mobile home park. Mr. Emery asked why neighbors were not informed of the change in zoning for the property. Mr. Dutton stated the change in zoning went through City Council and that notice had been placed in the newspaper, as was required.

There was a discussion as to the pond on the property. Mr. Emery stated he thought that there should be documentation from the city stating that flood water would not be an issue. Mr. Dutton stated that the City Engineer would have to review and approve the applicant's stormwater management plan. Mr. Emery asked for a copy of the plan. Mr. Dutton stated that the plan had not been submitted yet.

Mr. Emery asked if the proposed expansion would be new mobile homes. Mr. Hauch stated that the homes would be new.

Mr. Emery asked who managed the property. Mr. Hauch stated that there was on site management.

Justin Peroli, 5637 Birchwood Drive in Chippewa Lake, stated that he was a Lafayette Township Trustee and wanted to express the concerns of Lafayette Township as a whole. He stated that he had had a chance to speak with many residents who expressed the same concerns as those who had spoken at the meeting. He noted that there were concerns with trespassing on neighboring properties. Mr. Peroli stated that Section 1125.03(8) of the Zoning Code stated that such developments should be located adjacent to nonresidential uses. He noted that while the proposed expansion was located to industrial uses in the city, there was residential properties on the township side. Mr. Peroli asked the Commission to keep the residents of Lafayette Township in mind when they made their decision. There was a discussion as to how the expansion would disturb neighboring properties.

Mr. Grice closed the public hearing.

Ms. Russell noted that the applicant had stated that he did not want to put a lot of evergreens close together. She stated that she felt the concern was that there were large gaps between the stands of trees in the landscaping plan. There was a discussion as to landscaping.

Mr. Gold stated that he understood the concerns of the residents having a property that backed up to a park. He noted that the expansion would put a residential border at their property,

which would likely lead to less trespassing. Mr. Gold stated that trespassing was a police matter and had nothing to do with what the developer was proposing for the property.

Mr. Gold asked the residents if they had spoken to the County or City Engineers about the water issues. Ms. Nelson stated that she had not. Mr. Gold stated that the Engineers should be able to help the residents with the water and that he felt the development of the property should lessen the issues, as it would require additional storm water management. He asked the residents how long there had been problems with water. Ms. Nelson stated that she had lived there for 45 years and that there had been issues for a long time. Mr. Gold stated that the developer would be providing a storm water management plan that would need to be approved by the City Engineer.

There was a further discussion as to storm water management, green space, and the improvements to Lafayette Road.

After this discussion, the applicant requested to table the application to a future meeting.

6. P22-19 James Gerspacher 253-257 South Court Street CZC/SPA Revision

Mr. Dutton stated that, in November of 2022, the Planning Commission had conditionally approved a Site Plan and a Conditional Zoning Certificate for a hotel with a rear parking area. He added that the Planning Commission had extended the conditional approval on October 12, 2023. Mr. Dutton stated that, at the March 14, 2024 meeting of the Planning Commission, the Commission approved a separate application, P24-09, for the construction of an event center and a parking lot to the rear of the hotel. Mr. Dutton stated that the previous approval had included a hotel with a rooftop lounge located on the east side of the site, a one-way drop off lane adjacent to South Court Street, and a rear parking lot. He noted that the revised site plan incorporated a first floor restaurant, hotel rooms, and a partial fifth story with a rooftop lounge. He added that this project incorporated everything that had been approved with the event center application.

Mr. Dutton stated that there had been a number of variances with the original approval, which would need to be revised. He noted that one variance had been to the front setback, which was required to be zero and had been increased from 18 ft. to 21 ft. Mr. Dutton stated that the second variance was for the drop off lane in front of the building, which was technically parking, and thus not permitted in front of the building. He noted that the Planning Commission had the ability to approve two curb cuts, which they had done with the original application.

Mr. Dutton stated that off street parking was not required for this property, however, there were 9 spaces located on the property, with an additional 52 spaces provided on an adjacent property to the west. He noted that the applicant was also working with the city on the potential improvement of the 38 space public parking lot on the west side of South Elmwood Avenue, which could double its capacity. Mr. Dutton stated that a parking supply and demand analysis was previously submitted, but it would need to be revised for the proposed updates and to the event center. He noted that Council approval would be required for the proposed modifications to the Feckly lot and public use of a private sidewalk.

Mr. Dutton stated that a compliant lighting plan had been submitted with the event center application and remained unchanged. He noted that the lighting adjacent to South Court Street would need to be revised to match the existing street lights.

Mr. Dutton stated that the building footprint had been increased from the originally approved 12,784 sq. ft. to 16,013 sq. ft. He noted that the previously approved variance to the building footprint would need to be revised.

Mr. Dutton stated that Planning Commission could approve a maximum effective building height of 60 ft. He noted that the effective height of the revised building was 61 ft., which would require a new variance. Mr. Dutton stated that there would also need to be a revised variance for a front building face, as it was not broken up into sections of 50 ft. in width.

Mr. Dutton stated that all of the revised building elevations incorporated an abundance of windows and a fourth floor balcony. He noted that the building revisions had been approved by the Historic Preservation Board earlier in the evening.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended revised approval of Site Plan and Conditional Zoning Certificate application P22-19 with the following conditions:

1. The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Sections 1135.06 regarding building footprint, minimum front setback, and building height, 1135.08(a) regarding the location of parking in the front yard, and 1135.13(b)(4) regarding dividing the building face into storefronts or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. Two lights noted as "P5" located in the right-of-way shall be replaced with lights matching existing street lights along South Court Street
3. Use, improvements, or access to the public right-of-way or City Parking Lot #4 shall be authorized in a format determined by the City Law Director.
4. Additional information shall be submitted to the City Engineer including an update of the Parking Supply and Demand Analysis, the effects of increased parking demand on weekends, and the potential impacts of the drop-off lane on South Court Street. The submitted information shall be found to be acceptable by the City Engineer.

Mr. Dutton noted that the approval recommendation included the Commission's discretion to allow a second curb cut per Section 1135.08(b).

Present for the case was Jason Stevenson, 3991 North Jefferson Street, and Jana Call and Bobby Johnston of Mann Parsons Gray Architects, 3660 Embassy Parkway in Fairlawn. Mr. Stevenson stated that the parking study had been completed and that it indicated that there was adequate parking. He stated that he would submit a copy to the city. Mr. Stevenson noted that he was in talks with the city to acquire the rights to use the Elmwood parking lot and that it would be improved to increase its capacity.

Mr. Gold asked where the 61 ft. effective height was measured from. Mr. Dutton stated that it was to the roof of the rooftop lounge and did not include the parapet wall. There was a discussion as to the effective height of buildings.

Ms. Russell asked if the applicants had any concerns about the conditions indicated in the staff report. Mr. Stevenson stated that they were going before the BZA later that night in regards to

the variances, they would adhere to the street light requirements, the parking analysis had been addressed and would be submitted, and he would take note of the need for authorization from the Law Director in regards to the parking lot and right-of-way.

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

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the revision of Site Plan and Conditional Zoning Certificate application P22-19 with the following conditions:

1. The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Sections 1135.06 regarding building footprint, minimum front setback, and building height, 1135.08(a) regarding the location of parking in the front yard, and 1135.13(b)(4) regarding dividing the building face into storefronts or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. Two lights noted as "P5" located in the right-of-way shall be replaced with lights matching existing street lights along South Court Street
3. Use, improvements, or access to the public right-of-way or City Parking Lot #4 shall be authorized in a format determined by the City Law Director.
4. Additional information shall be submitted to the City Engineer including an update of the Parking Supply and Demand Analysis, the effects of increased parking demand on weekends, and the potential impacts of the drop-off lane on South Court Street. The submitted information shall be found to be acceptable by the City Engineer.

Mr. Case seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Rick Grice, Chairman