

Mr. Dutton stated that an 8 ft. solid wood fence was indicated along the eastern property line to provide screening. He added that a landscaped strip was located between the right-of-way and the parking area. Mr. Dutton stated that Staff suggested additional screening in this area, which could include landscaping, slats in the chain link fencing, or other methods.

Mr. Dutton stated that Staff recommended approval of application P24-06 with the condition that additional screening shall be added between the access drive and the north property line near the Branch Road right-of-way.

Present for the case was Norman Saeger of Saeger Architectural Services, 4956 Eshelman Avenue NE in Louisville. Mr. Saeger stated that the application was for a small trucking business that was trying to get started and needed a place to park their trailers. He noted that Phase I was what was being reviewed by the Commission. Mr. Saeger stated that Phase II would be a two-bay service center and the paving of all the gravel parking lots.

Mr. Gold inquired into the apron width. Mr. Saeger stated that the driveway would be widened, but the curb cut would remain unchanged.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve the application P24-06, as submitted.

Mr. Case seconded the motion.

Mr. Gold amended his motion to include the condition that additional screening shall be added between the access drive and the north property line near the Branch Road right-of-way.

Ms. Russell seconded the amended motion.

Vote:

Gold Y Grice Y

Russell Y Case Y

Approved 4-0

2. P24-07 Tom O'Connell 247 South Elmwood Avenue Infill Home

Mr. Dutton stated that the subject site was composed of 0.19 acres located on the west side of South Elmwood Avenue. Mr. Dutton stated that the existing vacant site had previously contained a 1 ½ story single-family home and a detached garage.

Mr. Dutton stated that the site plan indicated a front setback of 20 ft., which was consistent with code requirements and structures in the area. He added that the site plan included increased side setbacks of 21 ft. and 10 ft., which exceeded the minimum side setback of 5 ft. He added that the applicant had submitted a proposal to construct a single-story 1,216 sq. ft. single-family slab home on the property. Mr. Dutton noted that the home included, 3 bedrooms and one bathroom, a front-loaded two car garage, a small covered front porch, horizontal siding, and a gabled asphalt shingle roof.

Mr. Dutton stated that, on the west side of South Elmwood Avenue, existing structures were two-story single-family homes. He noted that most had larger front porches and rear detached garages. He stated that properties on the east side of South Elmwood were commercial uses which were one and two story.

Mr. Dutton noted that Section 1113.07 required new homes in an existing neighborhood to comply with standards for compatibility, building placement and mass, and aesthetics. He added that he, as the Planning Director, had found that the proposal was not compatible with existing adjacent residential homes. Mr. Dutton stated that Section 1113.07 stated that noncompatible homes shall be taken to the Planning Commission for review.

Mr. Dutton noted that the application was similar to an application for a new home at 425 West Friendship Street, which had been approved by the Commission. He added that the Planning and Zoning Code did not provide any additional information regarding the review process or additional criteria to evaluate the request.

Present for the case was Tom O'Connell, Executive Director for Habitat for Humanity, 233 Lafayette Road. Mr. O'Connell stated that Habitat for Humanity was committed to the vision of seeing a world where everyone had a decent place to live. Mr. O'Connell stated that, with the city's support, Habitat had dedicated 16 homes in the city. He noted that there was a need for more affordable housing. Mr. O'Connell stated that families in their home ownership program needed to meet three qualifications:

1. Prospective Habitat homeowners must demonstrate a need for safe, affordable housing.
2. A willingness to partner with Habitat, either with sweat equity or volunteer hours.
3. Homeowners must be able and willing to pay an affordable mortgage.

Mr. O'Connell stated that Habitat had purchased the property in June of 2023, and had been committed to a person that had been in their program since November of 2022.

Ms. Russell stated that she thought the home was fine in the Elmwood location.

Mr. Grice opened the application for public comment. Tammy Kirby, 246 West Friendship Street, stated that she supported Habitat for Humanity. However, she added that she had issues with the aesthetics and architecture of the proposed house. Ms. Kirby stated that the property was in an historic area with older homes, and asked if the applicant could incorporate more architectural detail.

Mr. Gold stated that he understood Ms. Kirby's concern. He noted that Habitat was trying to keep the properties affordable for members of their program. He noted that there were commercial properties across the street and additions to neighboring houses that had distracted from their original architecture. Mr. Gold stated that he also thought the proposed house was better than the one that had previously been located on the property.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve application H24-07, as submitted.

Ms. Russell seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

3. P24-08 Joel Copley 820 Lafayette Road SPA

Mr. Dutton stated that the subject site consisted of 1.48 acres located south and west of the intersection of Lafayette Road and Ryan Road. Mr. Dutton stated that the existing site had a combination of concrete and pavement parking and drives. He added that proposed parking and drives would have a smaller footprint and stone areas to the east, and partially to the west, of the building would be replaced with concrete.

Mr. Dutton stated that the existing 18,900 sq. ft. building had been utilized for office and warehouse uses with parking on the west side of the building and parking and loading on the east side of the building. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed site plan incorporated a significant amount of additional landscaping on the north, east, and west sides of the building. Mr. Dutton stated that additional landscaping was suggest along Ryan Road, on the north side of the access drive, which may include additional trees, shrubs, or other landscaping material. He added that the applicant had proposed significant renovations to the building and site. He noted that the building was proposed to be utilized for offices, warehousing, and kitchens for demonstrations, testing, and studios.

Mr. Dutton stated that Staff recommended approval of application P24-08 with the condition that additional landscaping shall be provided between the eastern parking lot and Ryan Road.

Present for the case was Joel Copley of Janotta & Herner, 309 Monroe Street in Monroeville, and Jordan Sandridge of Sandridge Crafted Foods, 133 Commerce Drive. Mr. Copley stated that they were proposing a comprehensive facelift for the building, with significant architectural improvements to the façade of the building. Mr. Sandridge stated that they were looking to expand Sandridge’s headquarters in the city. He noted that the goal of the building was to create a space where their customers could meet with their marketing and culinary teams.

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

Mr. Gold asked if they would be utilizing the loading dock in their new operations. Mr. Sandridge stated that they would. Mr. Gold asked was size of truck would be coming to the site. Mr. Sandridge stated that the trucks would be 53 ft. Mr. Gold stated that a semi truck and trailer could not get in and out of the site from Ryan Road with a 30 ft. wide curb cut. He added that the curb cut would need to be at least 75 ft. wide. Mr. Copley stated that the trucks were being driven by Sandridge staff and that they were trying to be aesthetically pleasing on Ryan Road.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve application H24-08 with the condition that the apron width on Ryan Road shall be increased to 75 ft.

Mr. Case seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

4. P24-09 Ian Jones 257 South Court Street & 226 South Elmwood Avenue CZC&SPA

Mr. Dutton stated that the site was consisted of two properties located between South Court Street and South Elmwood Avenue. He added that the surrounding properties included C-2, P-F, and R-3 zoning. He noted that the eastern 0.96 acre property had received conditional approval from the Historic Preservation Board, Planning Commission, and Board of Zoning Appeals for the development of a hotel. Mr. Dutton stated that the current application did not alter or affect previous approvals concerning the hotel.

Mr. Dutton noted that the current application proposed the construction of a 5,800 sq. ft. event center to the rear of the hotel, the demolition of the NAPA building on the west side of the site, and the construction of a parking lot. Mr. Dutton stated that an event center was a conditional use and a parking lot was a permitted use in the C-2 zoning district.

Mr. Dutton noted that the Board of Zoning Appeals had met on March 12th to consider a variance to the building size, and had tabled the application so that they could receive more information.

Mr. Dutton stated that the site included the reconfiguration of two full existing access drives to South Elmwood Avenue, a full access drive to the city parking lot to the south, and a one-way egress drive to a county parking lot to the north. He noted that Section 1145.10(c) of the code stated that parking spaces shall not be located along entry drives within 20 ft. of the right-of-way. Mr. Dutton stated that parking spaces on the west side of the site were located 10 ft. from the right-of-way. He added that the Board of Zoning Appeals had also approved a variance to Section 1145.10(c) at their March 12th meeting.

Mr. Dutton stated that a parking analysis had been required for the initial hotel development. He added that an updated analysis had been requested by the City Engineer, but had not been received at that time. Mr. Dutton stated that the City Engineer had also requested language be added to the sanitary sewer easement and a storm water management plan. Furthermore, he added that the Engineer questioned the necessity of the northern egress drive. Mr. Dutton stated that offsite improvements and a traffic management plan may be necessary if the access drive remained.

Mr. Dutton noted that the Fire Department comments had included the movement of a fire hydrant location and the installation of an emergency pedestrian egress gate in the northern fence. Mr. Dutton stated that while plans showed the fence as chain link, the applicant had indicated that it would be replaced with a more aesthetically pleasing fence.

Mr. Dutton added that a dumpster had been recently relocated to the south side of the site. He noted that dumpsters generally needed to be located 5' from the property line, though the Planning Commission could allow a reduced setback in the C-2 district.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had also submitted a lighting plan. He noted that parking lot lights were limited to 10 ft. in height in the C-2 district, unless a taller height was authorized by Planning Commission. He added that the applicant had requested a parking lot light height of 15 ft., which was shorter than commonly found in commercial areas.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of the Site Plan and Conditional Zoning Certificate application P24-09 with the following conditions:

1. The demolition of two buildings and the construction of a hotel at 253 and 257 South Court Street conditionally approved by application P22-19 shall remain unchanged and any further amendment shall be subject to Site Plan and/or Conditional Zoning Certificate approval by the Planning Commission.
2. Plans shall incorporate changes requested by the Fire Department including the relocation of a fire hydrant to the west, the relocation of the dumpster to the west, and the installation of an emergency egress gate in the fence along the north property line.
3. An update of the previously submitted Parking Supply and Demand Analysis, a storm water management plan, and a stormwater operations and management agreement shall be submitted and approved by the City Engineer.
4. The access point to the north shall be eliminated or the drive within the "Proposed 12' Egress Easement" shall be improved and a traffic management/pavement parking plan shall be submitted as required by the City Engineer.
5. The size and species of all landscape materials shall be indicated on the landscaping plan, additional landscaping shall be provided along South Elmwood Avenue in the required 10 ft. parking setback, and two street trees shall be indicated along South Elmwood Avenue.
6. A trash enclosure detail shall be provided in compliance with Section 1155.05(a) and a lighting plan shall be provided in compliance with Section 1145.09(c).
7. The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Sections 1135.06 regarding building footprint and 1145.10(c) regarding parking setbacks on an entry drive or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Present for the case was Jason Stevenson, 6800 River Forest Drive, Ian Jones, of Mann Parsons Gray Architects, 3660 Embassy Parkway in Fairlawn, and Joe Moffa of Riley Hotel Group, 387 Medina Road.

Ms. Russell inquired as to condition #4 of Staff's recommendations. Mr. Stevenson stated that the easement could be removed, thus removing the need for a plan and improvements. There was a discussion as to the northern the access point.

Mr. Gold asked about the property owner responsibility requirements included in the sanitary sewer easement. Mr. Dutton stated that the easement would be part of a larger project to move the storm sewer from underneath the hotel's location. Mr. Stevenson acknowledged that there would need to be language in the easement placing reconstructing responsibility on the property owner for areas disturbed by sewer repairs, if needed.

Mr. Stevenson stated that a parking analysis was done for the hotel which had stated that there was adequate parking for the initially indicated 99 rooms and 47 parking spaces. He added that the hotel had 78 rooms and the site had 61 parking spaces and he felt that they would not need an updated analysis. Mr. Dutton stated that the updated parking analysis condition was based a requirement from the City Engineer.

Mr. Jones stated that light poles were 15 ft. in height because they could not meet the average minimum ratios required by the Zoning Code in their photometric studies at 10 ft. in height.

Mr. Grice opened the public hearing.

Lance Traves, 239 South Court Street, stated that he supported the revised site plan submitted by the applicant. He added that the project did not have an adverse effect on his property. Mr. Traves stated that he had submitted comments to the Commission in regards to the adverse effects of a site plan submitted by an adjacent property owner. He added that the adjacent property owner did not represent all of the property owners to the north and that he supported the applicant's site plan.

James Amodio of Brown, Amodio & Chandler, 109 West Liberty Street, stated that his client, MRR Properties LLC, the owner of 241 South Court Street, had concerns about the proposed site plan, which would eliminate a cut through between the two properties. He added that he had submitted another potential site plan from their architect, Tony Cerny. Brendan Rose of MRR Properties, LLC, 4015 Medina Road, stated that he had concerns with the applicant's site plan, which cut off the access to the south that they had enjoyed for the last two decades.

Ms. Russell asked if there was an easement in place or right of crossing. Mr. Amodio stated that there was not. Ms. Russell asked if there was an easement allowing MRR Properties to access Elmwood Avenue through the properties to the north. Mr. Amodio stated that there was. There was a discussion as to access to Elmwood from 241 South Court Street. Ms. Russell stated that she had an issue with requiring the property owner to allow adjacent property owners to cross their property limits when there was already an existing easement to the north.

Anthony Cerny of Architectural Design Studio, 620 East Smith Road, stated that he thought the issue came down to whether or not adjacent property owners, who had made use of the access to a property for as long as he remembered, had a right to continue using that access. He added that he had been asked to provide a site plan proposal that would still allow access to the hotel property from the north.

Kimberly Marshall stated that she felt access to the site was a separate issue. She added that the project was important to the City of Medina. She stated that the project was wanted by companies located in the city. She noted that there was currently no hotel in the city, and that the project would be good for Medina from an economic perspective, and that she supported the hotel and event center proposal.

Ms. Russell made a motion to approve application H24-09 with the following conditions indicated in the Staff Report:

1. The demolition of two buildings and the construction of a hotel at 253 and 257 South Court Street conditionally approved by application P22-19 shall remain unchanged and any further amendment shall be subject to Site Plan and/or Conditional Zoning Certificate approval by the Planning Commission.
2. Plans shall incorporate changes requested by the Fire Department including the relocation of a fire hydrant to the west, the relocation of the dumpster to the west, and the installation of an emergency egress gate in the fence along the north property line.
3. An update of the previously submitted Parking Supply and Demand Analysis, a storm water management plan, and a stormwater operations and management agreement shall be submitted and approved by the City Engineer.
4. The access point to the north shall be eliminated or the drive within the "Proposed 12' Egress Easement" shall be improved and a traffic management/pavement parking plan shall be submitted as required by the City Engineer.
5. The size and species of all landscape materials shall be indicated on the landscaping plan, additional landscaping shall be provided along South Elmwood Avenue in the required 10 ft. parking setback, and two street trees shall be indicated along South Elmwood Avenue.
6. A trash enclosure detail shall be provided in compliance with Section 1155.05(a) and a lighting plan shall be provided in compliance with Section 1145.09(c).
7. The project shall comply with Planning and Zoning Code Sections 1135.06 regarding building footprint and 1145.10(c) regarding parking setbacks on an entry drive or a variance shall be approved by the Board of Zoning Appeals.

Mr. Gold seconded the motion.

Vote:

Case Y Gold Y

Grice Y Russell Y

Approved 4-0

Mr. Dutton stated that this case was a revision of the Site Plan for the ACME project, which had been most recently reviewed in January 2024. Mr. Dutton stated that the proposed application revised the previously approved Final Site Plan by shifting the site 30 ft. to the west. He noted that the shift resulted in the following changes to the Final Site Plan:

- The eastern north/south access drive has been straightened to provide better access to future outlots and development to the north.
- The access drive to Wooster Pike/Route 3 is noted as a future drive, per ODOT approval.
- A landscaped island has been removed from the northernmost parking row.
- The three access drives on High Point Drive have been shifted west.
- The buffer yard on the west side of the site has been reduced from 105 ft. to the required 75 ft.

He noted that previous site plan had meant that the easternmost drives on highpoint had lined up with the access drive for the Brookdale Senior Living center to the south. he added that, with the 30 ft. shift in the proposed site plan, the eastern access drive only partially aligned with an access drive for the Brookdale Senior Living facility to the south., and the central and western access drive did not line up with access drives to the south. Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of revised application P24-04 with the stipulation that all conditions from the Planning Commission’s initial approval of the application on January 11, 2024 shall remain in effect.

Present for the case was Greg Ernst of AODK, 14394 Detroit Avenue in Lakewood, and Joe Albrecht of Albrecht Inc., 17 South Main Street in Akron. Mr. Albrecht thanked the Commission for their consideration of these important revisions to the project. He added that the 30 ft. shift of the site plan would benefit the overall plan.

Mr. Case made a motion to approve the revision to P24-03 as submitted.

Mr. Gold seconded the motion.

Vote:

Case Y Gold Y

Grice Y Russell Y

Approved 4-0

Discussion Item – Westview Village Expansion – Eden Lane

Mr. Dutton stated that the Westview Village development was originally approved in 2003 and revised in 2017, 2018, and 2020. He noted that the currently approved Site Plan incorporated 54 total attached single-family residential and two-family residential units which were predominantly two story. Mr. Dutton stated that the property was somewhat restricted in development due to the presence of a gas well in the central portion of the site and wetlands in

the northwest portion of the site. He stated that the applicant was proposing to submit a revised site plan to incorporate additional units in the development. Mr. Dutton stated that the subject R-4 zoning district allowed for 49 units on the property. He noted that the currently approved 54 unit development exceeded this amount, which may have been due to its approval with previous zoning code standards.

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing a substantial density increase, which appeared to be approximately double the number of permitted units. He noted that parking was shown under proposed buildings, which was uncommon in a suburban setting and was typically cost-prohibitive. Mr. Dutton noted that the proposal included multi-family residential apartment-style buildings, rather than the existing attached single-family rowhouse-style buildings. He added that the proposed buildings were similar in design to existing buildings on the west side of the site, but did not have side-by-side units, individual entrances, and were completely three-story buildings.

Mr. Dutton stated that Staff acknowledged the need for affordable workforce housing in the community, however, the need must be balanced with standards ensuring quality developments with reasonable scale, density, open space, and landscaping.

Present for the discussion was Raj Pawar, 4639 Sharon Copley Road. Mr. Pawar stated that the last time he had come before the Commission, it was for the units that were already built on the site. He added that this was an opportunity to bring more high-quality units to the property. Mr. Pawar stated that the gas well on the site had been plugged and the easement no longer existed, giving them the opportunity to put more units on the site. He added that he thought there was enough land for the proposed units and that there would be more amenities for the tenants.

Mr. Gold asked if the proposal would require Board of Zoning Appeals Approval. Mr. Dutton stated that it would and that the Planning Commission would also review the project. Mr. Gold inquired as to Planning's concerns with the project. Mr. Dutton stated that there were concerns with the density being much higher than permitted. He noted that he had not seen a variance that doubled the density.

Mr. Gold asked if the density could be reduced. Mr. Pawar stated that he thought the project was in line with other projects in the city.

Ms. Russell stated that she was not sure about having 94 units on the site, but was willing to consider more than 55. She acknowledged the need for affordable housing. Mr. Grice stated that he felt double the allowed density was too much, though he was also willing to consider more than 55. Ms. Russell stated that she was interested in seeing information on projects with similar acreage to density ratios in the area.

Other

Mr. Gold stated that he felt the Planning Commission needed to address the fence requirements in the Zoning Code. He noted that he believed the 15 ft. setback requirement for 6 ft. fences on properties with a side street lot line was excessive in many situations. Mr. Gold stated that this issue had been discussed in the past, but no action was taken. He added that this issue needed to be addressed and should be added to the agenda for discussion in the near future.

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Rick Grice, Chairman