



CITY of MEDINA

Planning Commission

Regular Meeting Minutes

May 8, 2025

Meeting Date: May 8, 2025

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 April 10, 2025, as submitted.

The motion was seconded by Ms. Russell.

Vote:

Gold Y Grice Y

Rose Y Russell Y

Thompson Y

Approved 5-0

The Court Reporter swore in all attendees.

Applications

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

Mr. Dutton stated that the application was being brought before the Commission for revisions to the project. He noted that the previously approved garage and driveway were not being altered. He added that the applicant had proposed modifications to the previous approval, including:

- Change of the use of the building from two dwelling units to a single dwelling unit.
- On the east elevation, an increase in the size of the addition, removal of a dormer, removal of first and second story windows, and modifications to the deck.
- On the north elevation, the removal of a second story deck and door.

Mr. Dutton presented the Commission with revised building elevations that had been submitted by the applicant. He stated that staff recommended approval of application P24-12, with the condition that a feature or features shall be incorporated on the east side of the addition's second floor such as a window, alternative material, design element, or similar item.

Present for the case was Eben Selby, 455 Lafayette Road. Mr. Selby stated that he wanted to tie the new roof into the existing one, but had discovered extensive roof and soffit deterioration, which led to a near-total rebuild of the second story. He added that he was considering installing board and batten siding on the east side of the second story, but he was also open to installing a window.

Mr. Grice asked if anyone from the public had comments. There were no comments from the public.

Ms. Russell made a motion to approve application P24-12 as submitted with the condition that a feature or features be incorporated on the east side of the addition's second floor such as a window, alternative material, design element, or similar item.

Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

Vote:

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

2. P25-07 Matt Schmahl North Side of East Washington Street COM

Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant was proposing a zoning map amendment to change the zoning of the properties from R-1 (Low Density Residential) to R-4 (Multi-Family Residential). Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had submitted a potential plan, which was not required, to construct 50 to 61 attached single-family dwellings with a single access point off of East Washington Street with an approximately 1,000 ft. long drive and a "T" turnaround. He noted that the current proposal before the Planning Commission was for the rezoning, and the applicant would have to return to the Planning Commission for Site Plan review if the rezoning was approved.

Mr. Dutton stated that the R-1 zoning district allowed single-family detached homes as a permitted use and R-4 allowed single family attached, single-family detached, and two-family dwellings were permitted uses. Additionally, he noted that the R-4 district allowed multi-family dwellings as a conditional use.

Mr. Dutton stated that the R-4 district allowed a maximum lot depth of five times the lot width and required a twenty-five percent minimum useable open space. Mr. Dutton stated that if the properties were rezoned to R-4, three of the lots would be nonconforming in regards to maximum lot depth. He added that if the subject properties were zoned R-4, a variance to the Maximum Lot Depth requirement would be needed to combine the properties for the proposed development.

Mr. Dutton stated that the maximum density in the R-4 zoning district was 1 unit per 5,400 sq. ft. and the 5.8 acre site would be permitted 47 units. He reiterated that the submitted text and concept plan indicated between 50 and 61 units, respectively. Mr. Dutton stated that, in

general, the land on the north side of East Washington Street was predominantly single-family residential on medium to large lots. He noted that the only exception was the Glenshire Hollows development off of Foote Road, which included single-family detached, two-family, and three-family attached condominiums. He added that their density was 11,326 sq. ft. per unit, which was considerably lower than the R-4 zoning district maximum. He stated that the Glenshire Development was approved in 1998 as a Planned Unit Development, which was no longer an active zoning overlay district.

Mr. Dutton stated that the City Engineer had identified concerns regarding traffic impacts on State Route 18, a traffic impact study requirement prior to Site Plan approval, the length of the cul-de-sac, and water age. Additionally, he noted that the Assistant Fire Chief had identified concerns regarding sufficient area for emergency vehicle turnaround and only a single ingress/egress point for the development.

Mr. Dutton added that the City's Comprehensive Plan indicated that the future land use of the properties in question was "Suburban Residential", which was the lowest density residential on the land use plan and was characterized by "a clustering of single-family homes with moderate quantities of conservation/open space areas".

Mr. Dutton stated that staff did not recommend approval of application P25-07 as the proposed R-4 zoning was not compatible with area zoning, density, and land uses, did not comply with the Comprehensive Plan, and raised concerns from the Engineering and Fire Departments.

Present for the case was Matt Schmahl of Gables Management Group, 3200 West Market Street, Suite 104 in Akron, and Nate Gehring of Ryan Homes, 6770 West Snowville Road in Brecksville. Mr. Schmahl stated that the potential plan was the first draft and the engineer had put as much development on a property as possible. He noted that the plan would probably change several times prior to final approval. Mr. Schmahl stated that he estimated around 40 to 47 townhomes would be proposed for the site. He noted that they would like to lower the density of the site plan, put in parking and a walking trail, and line up the entrance with the stoplight at the hospital.

Mr. Gehring noted that there was a need for affordable housing and that the proposed townhomes would probably be selling in the mid to upper three hundred thousands.

Mr. Grice asked if anyone from the public had any comment. There were comments from the public.

Mr. Rose stated that he felt the developer was attempting to get as much on the property as possible, which would reduce their costs. He noted that the city would have to provide services, and it would be difficult for a garbage truck or fire truck to access the site.

Mr. Gold expressed concern over access to the site for city services, noting that having only one ingress/egress made access difficult. He also noted the City Engineer's comment on water age on the site.

Mr. Schmahl stated that he believed any development with over fifty units required a secondary access point and the project would stay under that amount. He noted that he would

like to match the entrance to the stoplight at the hospital, which would also allow for parking. He added that he could envision having a cul-de-sac for easier turnarounds.

After further discussion, Mr. Dutton noted that the Commission was only evaluating the change of zoning for the site from R-1 to R-4 and that the developer would have to come back before the Planning Commission for Site Plan approval. He added that the project would have to meet the standards of the R-4 District, which allowed for a maximum of 47 units on the site. There was a discussion as to the Glenshire Hollows development. Mr. Dutton stated that the density of the PUD Overlay was far less than what was allowed in the R-4 district.

Mr. Rose asked what other uses would be allowed if they approved the R-4 zoning and inquired if the developer could come back before the Planning Commission if an apartment building was proposed. Mr. Dutton stated that multi-family residential was a conditional use in the R-4 district, so the applicant could apply for such a project.

The owner of the bulk of the property in question, Rick Greenburg, 997 East Washington Street, stated that he was interested in building something that Medina could be proud of. He noted he felt that high-end multi-family units were lacking in the city. He added that the site's location across from the Medina Hospital would be great for people of his generation, as well as the easy access to shopping downtown.

Mr. Gold made a motion to recommend approval of the application to City Council.

Ms. Russell seconded the motion.

Vote:

Rose	<u>Y</u>	Russell	<u>Y</u>
Thompson	<u>Y</u>	Gold	<u>N</u>
Grice	<u>N</u>		
Approved	<u>3-2</u>		

3.	P25-08	Andrew Kason	232 West Smith Road	COM
----	--------	--------------	---------------------	-----

Mr. Dutton stated that the property contained an existing 4,400 sq. ft. bar and restaurant with an interior concert venue and an 1,100 sq. ft. rear patio. He added that the existing site had a gravel parking lot capable of accommodating approximately 50 parking spaces.

Mr. Dutton continued that the applicant was proposing an outdoor concert venue in the eastern portion of the property's parking lot, enclosed by a rope fence, which staff had calculated at approximately 15,000 sq. ft. He noted that concerts were proposed every Friday from Memorial Day to Labor Day, between the hours of 6 pm and 10:30 pm, with an additional concert in August for the South Town Music Festival.

Mr. Dutton stated that a concert venue was considered "Commercial Entertainment", which was a permitted use in the subject C-2 zoning district. He noted that the use did not include specific standards and there was not a distinction between an indoor or outdoor Commercial Entertainment use. He added that in 2024, the applicant had received permission to conduct

special event outdoor concerts at the site on four dates, with the understanding that a formal application would need to be brought before the Planning Commission for additional events.

Mr. Dutton stated that the property was located within Parking District 1. He noted that, per Section 1145.04(d), properties in the District were exempt from minimum parking requirements. He added that the section also required that a proposed use in the District shall submit information indicating the intended location of parking. He added that, in general, $\frac{1}{4}$ of a mile was considered an acceptable walking distance to a destination. Mr. Dutton stated that the applicant had indicated that additional parking was available in City of Medina public lots #3, #4, #5, and the Castle Noel Lot. Additionally, he noted that the applicant had indicated he was working with the Habitat for Humanity Restore directly to the south of the site for an additional parking option. He added that, with the concert area, there would be approximately 15–20 spaces left on the site.

Mr. Dutton stated that the Police Department had indicated that there were no calls to Cin Dees during the four special event dates for the outdoor concerts in 2024. He added that the City Engineer had noted concerns related to customer parking and verification of a sufficient alcohol permit.

Mr. Dutton stated that staff recommended approval of application P25-08 as submitted, with the condition that the applicant should work with Habitat for Humanity to allow parking during Cin Dees outdoor commercial entertainment events.

Present for the case was Andrew Kason, the owner of Cin Dees, 232 West Smith Road. Mr. Kason stated that he had obtained permission to use the Habitat for Humanity parking lot after 5 pm. He noted that Cin Dees held three concerts in 2024 and had no complaints from the neighborhood. He added that he was trying to bring back the Rally in the Alley events from years past. Mr. Kason stated that they would like to hold an additional concert for Labor Day.

Mr. Grice asked if anyone from the public had any comment. There were no questions or comments from the public.

Ms. Russell stated that she did not see any problems with concerts on Fridays but she was concerned that a subsequent owner could hold concerts on other days. Mr. Dutton stated that the Commission was approving what had been submitted to them and concerts on additional nights would have to come back before the Commission for approval.

Mr. Gold made a motion to approve application P25-08 as submitted.

Mr. Rose seconded the motion.

Mrs. Russell asked if the motion should be amended to allow the applicant to hold a concert on Labor Day. There was a discussion as to the additional concert. Mr. Kason stated that they would not be holding the concert in 2025, and would consider it in 2026 if the events went well. He stated that he did not have a problem coming back in 2026 for approval of the additional concert.

Vote:

Russell	<u>Y</u>	Thompson	<u>Y</u>
---------	----------	----------	----------

Gold	<u>Y</u>	Grice	<u>Y</u>
------	----------	-------	----------

Rose	<u>Y</u>		
------	----------	--	--

Approved	<u>5-0</u>		
----------	------------	--	--

Adjournment

Having no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah Tome

Rick Grice, Chairman