



**CITY of MEDINA**  
**Planning Commission**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**June 13, 2024**

---

Meeting Date: June 13, 2024

Meeting Time: 6:00 PM

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

Absent: Nathan Case

**Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the minutes from May 9, 2024 as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Thompson.

Vote:

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

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

**Applications**

1. P23-01 Jay Bruckner 5854 West Smith Road SPA/CZC Extension

Mr. Dutton stated that in June of 2023, the Planning Commission had issued Site Plan and Conditional Zoning Certificate approval for a tractor-trailer parking and storage area at 5854 West Smith Road. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had requested the extension of the Site Plan approval for one additional year from the initial approval. He added that, if the extension request was approved, construction must commence by June 8, 2025 and be completed by June 8, 2026. Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of the request.

Present for the case was Jay Bruckner, 2575 Medina Road, and Alexandru Stan, 3607 Windsong Drive.

Mr. Rose inquired as to the reason for the extension. Mr. Stan stated they had not been able to find a contractor to do the work for them last year. He added that they were looking to start in September of 2024.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the extension of P23-01.

Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Vote:

Grice            Y        Rose            Y

Russell        Y        Thompson     Y

Gold            Y

Approved      5-0

---

2.    P24-16                      David Myers                      028-19C-17-041                      CZC&SPA

Mr. Dutton stated that the application had been reviewed at the May 9, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting and the applicant had requested to table the application. He added that the required public hearing had been held at the May meeting. Mr. Dutton stated that the original submittal had included two cul-de-sacs. He noted that items that were requested to be addressed by the applicant, including:

- Incorporating useable open space areas.
- Documentation shall be provided indicating how access will be obtained from the eastern cul-de-sac, through 1155 Industrial Parkway, to Industrial Parkway.
- Improvements to Lafayette Road at the entrance/exit to the Brookdale Mobile Home Park.
- Driveways on each lot and the drive connecting the cul-de-sacs shall be asphalt or concrete.
- Additional screening shall be provided to the east and west of the site.

Mr. Dutton stated that the revised plans addressed a number of the issues. He noted that the connector between the two cul-de-sacs was asphalt and the driveways for the individual homes were a hard surface. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had also provided documentation for the emergency access easement connecting the mobile home park to Industrial Parkway to the east.

Mr. Dutton added that the turn lanes on Lafayette Road had been discussed with the City Engineer and would be required, as recommended by the Traffic Analysis. He noted that the turn lanes would not be required if the speed limit on Lafayette Road were decreased, but changing the speed limit would be a separate process through ODOT, and might not be successful.

Mr. Dutton stated that an updated landscaping plan included additional screening to the east and recreational areas. He noted that while the additional trees filled in some of the gaps to the east, staff suggested additional screening around the eastern cul-de-sac and on adjacent properties to the west, with the property owners' permission.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of P24-16 with the following conditions:

1. Improvements to Lafayette Road at the entrance/exit to the Brookdale Mobile Home Park shall be installed as required by the City Engineer.
2. 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 as required by the Planning Director.

Present for the case were Jim Hauch, 217 East Main Street in Kent, and David Myers of Thorson Barker Engineering, 3030 West Streetsboro Road in Richfield. Mr. Myers stated that he accepted the conditions stated. He added that, after discussion with ODOT and the City Engineer, he agreed that the widening of Lafayette Road for turning lanes was necessary.

Mr. Myers stated that he was willing to add more screening around the cul-de-sac. Mr. Hauch stated that he had spoken with the Lafayette Township Trustee. He noted that trees could not be planted on top of the sanitary sewer easement located on the western side of the property, but that he was willing to plant trees on any of the neighboring properties that would be affected by the expansion.

Mr. Grice stated that the public hearing was held at the previous meeting. He stated that members of the public who had not spoken at the May meeting could address the Commission.

Curtis Perkins, 5604 Lafayette Road, stated that he lived directly across from the Brookdale Mobile Home Park and had concerns with the turning lanes. He added that he was in favor of dropping the speed limit on Lafayette Road, as he felt the turn lanes would affect neighboring driveways.

Doris Nelson, 5807 Deerview Lane, inquired as to the screening of the properties in Lafayette Township. Mr. Hauch stated that he would pay for the screening, but that it must be on the neighboring properties, as they could not plant in the sewer easement.

Mr. Gold asked about the previous stipulation recommended by staff for sidewalks. Mr. Hauch stated that they could add sidewalks, but that it was a lower traffic area and he would prefer not to include them. Mr. Dutton stated that, after talking with the City Engineer, the stipulation had been removed, as few private roads in the City had sidewalks.

Mr. Grice inquired as to the process for lowering the speed limit. Mr. Dutton stated that he had not been through the process but that he assumed it would take months for the state to review. Additionally, he noted that there would be a cost involved and the results might not be as desired. Mr. Myers stated that he thought it would probably be more in the range of one to two years to get the results. Mr. Hauch stated that he could try to get it lowered, but that he understood that it was not likely to succeed.

Mr. Gold stated that he had dealt with a situation on Route 18 where the speed limit was different for eastbound and westbound traffic. He added that, per ODOT regulations, you could not have a two-lane highway with differing speeds. He noted that the Traffic Survey was around a \$15,000 expense and that the ODOT review took a long time.

Mr. Rose asked if the extra runoff from the hard surfaces in the driveways and connector would go into the detention basin. Mr. Myer stated that it would.

There was a further discussion on Lafayette Road, including the requirements for U.S. Routes.

Ms. Russell made a motion to approve application P24-16 with the following conditions:

1. Improvements to Lafayette Road at the entrance/exit to the Brookdale Mobile Home Park shall be installed as required by the City Engineer.
2. 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 as required by the Planning Director.

Mr. Gold seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

3. P24-11 City of Medina Zoning Code Amendments COM

Mr. Dutton stated that the Zoning Amendment process had begun with a discussion on fence heights for corner lots. He added that proposed amendments addressed a variety of topics. Mr. Dutton stated that the first section dealt with review processes. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed revisions required the Planning Director to forward completed applications to the Commission and Board within 30 days and gave the Commission and Board 45 days from the initial meeting to make their decision. He added that the revisions provided a more consistent review process and helped clarify when a Site Plan must go to the Planning Commission for review and when it could be administratively approved by the Planning Director.

Mr. Dutton stated that the standards for fencing had been modified per the following:

- “Areas” had been replaced with “Districts”. Areas was not a defined term and was unclear in locations with a mix of uses.
- Exception<sup>4</sup> had been revised to allow fences in the front yard with a side street lot line (corner lots) to be up to 6 ft. in height within 15 ft. of the right-of-way with Planning Commission approval.
- Fences in the O-C or P-F districts may have a height of 8 ft. in the front yard with a side street lot line and barbed wire.
- Lots with double frontage, which have public rights-of-way to the front and rear of the lot, have two front yards, by definition. There were numerous such lots in the city,

particularly backing up to Reagan Parkway. Exception <sup>5</sup> allowed a 6 ft. fence adjacent to the yard located opposite the building's front facade.

Mr. Dutton stated that amendments were proposed to setbacks. He noted that, due to several recently granted variances and to allow existing homeowners to expand their homes in a reasonable manner, an amendment was being proposed to allow open roofed porches to extend 5 ft. into the front setback and 10 ft. into the rear setback.

Additionally, Mr. Dutton stated that existing parking lot lighting regulations were extensive and included requirements for light levels, minimums, and maximums. He added that the current requirements were difficult to comply with and had been simplified. Mr. Dutton stated that lighting heights were also increased to a more practical height of 15 ft. in residential districts and 20 ft. in all other districts. He noted that clarification had been provided indicating that a photometric plan was needed when a site was adjacent to a residential zoning district or use.

Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed amendments removed "Fitness Facility" from the "Personal or Professional Service" definition, defined it separately, allowed it as a permitted use in the C-3 Zoning District, and as a conditional use in the C-1, C-2, and I-1 districts.

Mr. Dutton stated that the last two proposed amendments were somewhat similar. He noted that the first involved food trucks. Mr. Dutton stated that, while there had not been any issues with food trucks, staff had been receiving inquiries regarding applicable regulations. He added that other cities regulated food trucks in a variety of ways ranging from general regulations to formal registration programs. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed amendments defined food trucks and allowed them in commercial areas. He noted that the amendments did not permit them in the right-of-way of streets or on sidewalks unless in conjunction with a street closure permit. Additionally, he added that food trucks could not be located in a public park without approval from the Mayor. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed amendments also limited food trucks in residential districts to a specific number of days, and the resident must pay for the food.

Mr. Dutton stated that the last of the revisions involved short term rentals. He noted that, similar to food trucks, the city did not have any current regulations regarding short term rentals. He added that the use did not fit well into existing use definitions and could be classified as a residential dwelling unit, hotel, motel, or bed and breakfast.

Mr. Dutton stated that short term rentals currently existed in the city within and around the Historic District. He continued that though there had not been complaints regarding short term rentals, he noted that staff received regular inquiries regarding applicable regulations.

Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed amendments allowed short term rentals as a permitted use in C-2 and M-U districts and as a conditional use in the R-3 district. Additionally, he noted that short term rentals were only allowed within 4,000 ft. of the Uptown Park. Mr. Dutton stated that he wanted to discuss an amendment with the Board requiring short term rentals to be "unhosted sharing", which meant that the home had permanent residents that vacated for guests rather than a dedication "vacation rental" with no permanent residents.

Ms. Russell stated that she appreciated the effort made by staff for the amendments, but stated that she was not in favor about the regulations for food trucks and short term rentals. She added that she understood the desire to be proactive, but that she wasn't sure they needed to regulate food trucks and rentals. Mr. Dutton stated that staff received inquiries regarding food trucks and short term rentals, but that there were not clear regulations.

Mr. Gold stated that he knew of a situation where a food truck was in a residential area one day a week every week during the summer. He added that the truck was there for a couple hours in the evening and that neighbors put out chairs and purchased food. Mr. Gold stated that he did not feel that this was a hindrance. He added that he felt that limiting it to one day in a residential district was too restrictive.

Mr. Grice stated that he had an issue with allowing roofed areas in the front yard. He noted that he was okay with the proposed amendment for roofed porches in rear yards. Mr. Grice stated that he understood Mr. Dutton's position on food trucks and the need for regulations.

Mr. Rose stated that he understood that one food truck in a residential area was not a problem, but he wondered where it stopped. Mr. Rose also agreed with Mr. Grice on the proposed amendments to roofed porches.

After further discussion on food trucks and short term rentals, this application was tabled to allow staff to take into account the Commission's statements and make changes to the proposed amendments.

### **Adjournment**

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sarah Tome

---

Rick Grice, Chairman