



CITY of MEDINA

Planning Commission

Regular Meeting Minutes

March 13, 2025

Meeting Date: March 13, 2025

Meeting Time: 6:30 PM

Present: Nathan Case, Bruce Gold, Rick Grice, Paul Rose, Monica Russell, Andrew Dutton (Community Development Director), and Sarah Tome (Administrative Assistant). As stated below, prior to the motion to approve the Final Decision and Conclusions of Fact for the February 2025 meeting, Mr. Rose recused himself from the Planning Commission and Jeremy Sack joined the Planning Commission.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the minutes from February 13, 2025 as submitted.

Mr. Case seconded the motion.

Vote:

Case	<u>Y</u>	Gold	<u>Y</u>
Grice	<u>Y</u>	Rose	<u>Abstain</u>
Russell	<u>Y</u>		
Approved	<u>4-0</u> with Mr. Rose abstaining		

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

Applications

1. P25-01 Katelyn Friedl 818 E Washington Street TC-OV

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing a new single-story 1,914 sq. ft. home with an attached two-car garage. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed home met the required setbacks. He noted that the setback from the right-of-way was 168 ft. and was in line with adjacent homes. He added that the home had a front porch with a metal roof and a front elevation primarily clad with board and batten siding and stone. Mr. Dutton stated that the section of East Washington Street contained a variety styles including single-story homes and split-level homes.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P25-01 as submitted.

Present for the case was Karen Friedl, 818 East Washington Street. Ms. Friedl stated that the pillars would not have the lateral braces shown on the submitted plans. She added that the house would be white, have a black roof, and would have red brick accents.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the application P25-01, 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.	P25-02	Steve Berry	999 Lafayette Road	CZC/SPA
----	--------	-------------	--------------------	---------

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing a convenience store in the center of the lot with a counterclockwise drive through. He noted that the proposal also included passenger vehicle fueling on the south side of the site and tractor-trailer fueling on the north side of the site. He added that the site plan met most of the required development standards, such as setbacks, building height, and lot coverage.

Mr. Dutton continued that the site plan included three access points with one located on Lafayette Road for passenger vehicles and two located on Lake Road for truck traffic. He noted that the widths of the drives were between 37 ft. and 67 ft. at the right-of-way and 43 ft. and 100 ft. at the curb. Mr. Dutton stated that Section 1153.04(d)(15)(B.) limited the width of an access drive to 30 ft. at the right-of-way and only permitted two access drives. He continued that Section 1145.10(e) limited the maximum commercial driveway width to 24 ft. at the right-of-way and 38 ft. at the curb. He noted that the application had submitted a variance application to the two code sections, which would be reviewed by the Board of Zoning Appeals later in the evening.

Mr. Dutton stated that the passenger vehicle parking located on the south side of the lot met the minimum number required. He noted that the code stated that parking, to the extent feasible, shall be located behind the front wall of the building. He added that the proposed plan incorporated parking in front of the building, which was a common configuration for a convenience store with a filling station.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had provided a revision to the sidewalks shown on the plan. He noted that the originally submitted plans showed sidewalks located on the subject property without a connection to the corner curb ramp. He added that the revised version showed the sidewalks in the public right-of-way, which was the typical location, and connected them to the curb ramp. Mr. Dutton continued that locating the sidewalk in the right-of-way on

Lake Road would place the sidewalk adjacent to the roadway. He stated that the City Engineering preferred the plan with the sidewalks located on the subject property and would execute an easement with the property owner for the sidewalk. Mr. Dutton added that a sidewalk would also need to connect the public sidewalk to the convenience store.

Mr. Dutton stated that the landscaping plan provided by the applicant included sufficient landscape buffering to the west side of the truck fueling area and the convenience store, where residential properties were located. He noted that the zoning code required a 10 ft. wide landscaping strip between the passenger parking area and the right-of-way. He stated that in the original plan, parking is shown at the 10 ft. setback, but with only a 5 ft. landscaping strip. Mr. Dutton stated that the Planning Commission would need to waive the 10 ft. requirement, which they were permitted to do.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had noted that storm water management would be located underground, which was generally acceptable to the City Engineer.

Mr. Dutton stated that building elevations indicated a flat roof with varying roof lines, walls of predominantly two colors with recessed sections, and stone lower sections. Mr. Dutton stated that stucco, of which EIFS was a synthetic version, was permitted in bands of accent color or recessions. He added that the proposed structure incorporated these elements.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P25-02 for Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan approval as submitted with parking in the front yard and a 5 ft. parking setback, with the following conditions:

1. The project shall comply with Sections 1145.10(e) and 1153.04(d)(15)(B.) regarding the number and width of access points or receive variance approval from the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. The proposed public sidewalk shall connect with the existing curb ramp at the corner of Lafayette Road and Lake Road and a private sidewalk shall connect from the public sidewalk to the convenience store building per Section 1130.10.
3. Two trees shall be located adjacent to Lafayette Road in the area marked "LAWN" on the Landscaping Plan.
4. A light fixture detail shall be submitted in compliance with Section 1145.09(c)(6).

Present for the case was Stephen Berry of Architectural Design Inc., 374 Boardman-Poland Road, Suite 201 in Youngstown, representing Harpreet Singh Aujla and Davinder Paul Singh. Mr. Berry stated the plan aimed to segregate truck traffic from automobile traffic. He added that access points were located as far away from the intersection as possible to prevent stacking issues.

Mr. Grice opened the public hearing.

Majeed Makhoul of Berns, Ockner & Greenberger, 3201 Enterprise Parkway, Suite 220, in Beachwood, representing Minute Mart LLC, the property owner of 1010 Lafayette Road, stated that his client requested the Planning Commission to reject the application, or at a minimum

table it, as he felt approval would be premature. He noted that the applicant was asking for substantial variances and the Planning Commission should not grant approval without knowing if the variances would be granted. Mr. Makhoulf stated that the applicant bore the burden to prove his case beyond a reasonable doubt. He contended that the applicant had made no case for approval to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Makhoulf continued that the proposed project would have impacts on surrounding properties. He stated that the project would devalue his client's property, result in safety issues for their customers, and create significantly more traffic than the property's previous use. Mr. Makhoulf indicated that no information had been provided regarding the amount of traffic that would be generated by the project.

Mr. Gold noted that the Board of Zoning Appeals met right after the Planning Commission, and that approval from the Commission would be contingent on the Board's approval of the variances. He noted that Mr. Makhoulf had not presented a case as to how the traffic implications would affect the surrounding properties. Mr. Makhoulf indicated that the variances were substantial and the proposal would result in additional traffic.

William Deluca, Regional Manager for Minit Mart, 1010 Lafayette Road, presented the Commission with a picture of traffic on West Smith Road. Mr. Rose noted that West Smith was a different road which did not cross either Lake Road or Lafayette Road. Mr. Deluca also presented the Commission with pictures of traffic on Lafayette Road. He noted that he had been overseeing the Minit Mart for seven years and stated that the proposal would create more traffic. There was a discussion as to traffic.

Ms. Russell stated that she would not expect more traffic to be generated by the proposed project and there would likely be less traffic going to Mr. Deluca's business with the introduction of a similar business across the street. Mr. Makhoulf responded that the gravitational model would occur which contends that when similar uses are located next to one another, they generate more traffic to the area.

Mr. Dutton stated that Site Plan applications were always sent to the City Engineer for review prior to the Planning Commission meeting and the City Engineer did not request a traffic impact study or traffic analysis. Mr. Dutton added that the application was willing to meet the 10 ft. setback for the landscaping, but that the city would prefer a reduced amount of landscaping so the sidewalk would not be directly adjacent to the roadway.

Cammie Reust, 580 North Harmony Street, stated that she believed the proposed convenience store would generate more traffic in the area.

Troy Gerspacher, 5734 Trystin Tree Drive, was present representing the property's seller. He supported the approval of the application and stated that the project would be positive for industrial users in the surrounding area.

Mr. Gold inquired as to the staff's requirement for a lighting plan. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had submitted a compliant lighting plan and staff only needed a light fixture detail.

Mr. Case inquired as to the possibility of requiring a sign at the Lafayette Road entrance prohibiting truck access to the site from that road. After conferring with the business owners, Mr. Berry stated that they had no objection to including the sign.

Mr. Berry noted that the business across the street with the same use had parking in the front yard and appeared to have oversized curb cuts.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the application P25-02, as submitted, with the following conditions:

1. The approval of the requested variances by the Board of Zoning Appeals.
2. The proposed public sidewalk shall connect with the existing curb ramp at the corner of Lafayette Road and Lake Road.
3. Two trees shall be located adjacent to Lafayette Road in the area marked "LAWN" on the Landscaping Plan.
4. A light fixture detail shall be submitted in compliance with Section 1145.09.
5. Semi-trucks shall be prohibited from turning into the property at the Lafayette Road entrance.

Mr. Case seconded the motion.

Mr. Makhoulf stated that he was obligated to put on the record that his client intended to appeal to the Court of Common Pleas if the case was approved.

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. P24-16 David Myers 028-19C-17-041 & 028-19C-17-040 Revised CZC/SPA

Mr. Dutton stated that the project had previously been approved by the Planning Commission for 55 manufactured home lots. Mr. Dutton noted that, following the approval, the gas easement located on the subject site was found to be 75 ft. wide rather than 50 ft. wide. He added that the easement width resulted in a necessary reconfiguration of the site's layout.

Mr. Dutton stated that the current Conditional Zoning Certificate and Site Plan applications proposed two drives connecting at a single cul-de-sac for 54 manufactured home lots. He noted that the proposal met the required setbacks from adjacent property lines.

Mr. Dutton stated that there was industrial zoning to the east and residential uses to the west. He noted that the landscaping plan provided by the applicant provided partial screening to the east, though it was limited by the gas easement. He added that the recommendation was to

add more screening to the east and fill in the gaps in the screening for the residential homes to the west.

Mr. Dutton stated that Staff recommended approval of 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 that currently have insufficient screening as required by the Planning Director.

Present for the case was Jim Huach, 217 East Main Street in Kent. Mr. Hauch stated that the gas company had initially verbally indicated the easement width was 50 ft. He continued that after the project had gone out to bid, the gas company presented a document stating that the easement was actually 75 ft. wide. He noted that plans were reconfigured to accommodate for the larger easement.

Mr. Grice opened the public hearing.

Dori Nelson, 5807 Deerview Lane, stated that her biggest concern was screening. She noted that all of the trees to the rear of her lot were dying and she was concerned about sufficient screening. Mr. Hauch stated that they had been working with a Lafayette Township Trustee to contact property owners. He added that screening would be planted on neighboring properties as requested by the property owners. Mr. Huach noted that the subject property would be regraded, which should improve water runoff. There was a discussion as to the placement of the trees.

David Myers of Thorson Baker Engineering, 3030 West Streetsboro Road in Richfield, stated that there was a sanitary sewer easement adjacent to the western property line. He added that the original approval had been to install trees on neighboring properties, as the Medina County Sanitary Engineers would not allow trees to be planted within the easement.

John Emory, 5901 Deerview Lane, inquired if the size of the retention pond was still being increased. Mr. Myers stated that the retention pond size had not changed from the original proposal, which was an increase from its existing size. There was an additional discussion as to trees and drainage.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the application P24-16, as submitted 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 that currently have insufficient screening as required by the Planning Director.

Ms. Russell 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>4-0</u>		

Adoption of Final Decision and Conclusions of Fact

Mr. Dutton stated that there were two Final Decision and Conclusions of Fact documents regarding the Planning Commission's TCOV review for a two-family dwelling at 322 West Smith Road. He stated that the documents memorialized what was presented to the Commission at the meeting, testimony given, and the decision of the Planning Commission. Mr. Dutton noted that the first document was for the November 2024 meeting, when Mr. Rose was present, and the second document was for the February 2025 meeting, when Mr. Sack was present.

Having received the documents and reviewed them, Mr. Gold made a motion to accept the first Final Decision and Conclusions of Fact for the November 2024 meeting as submitted.

Mr. Rose 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>		

At this time, Mr. Rose recused himself from the Planning Commission and Mr. Sack joined the Planning Commission.

Mr. Gold made a motion to accept the second Final Decision and Conclusions of Fact for the February 2025 meeting as submitted.

Ms. Russell seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Rick Grice, Chairman