



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

27700 Hilliard Blvd.
Westlake, OH 44145

Phone 440.871.3300
Fax 440.617.4324

**WESTLAKE PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
MAY 18, 2020**

Present: Chairman Brad Lamb, Lauren Falcone, Duane Van Dyke, Lynda Appel
Absent: Phil DiCarlo
Also Present: Planning Director Jim Bedell, Law Director Michael Maloney, Assistant Planning Director William Krause, Clerk of Commissions Nicolette Sackman

The meeting was a virtual meeting in accordance with the Ohio Revised Code 121.22 emergency order due to COVID-19 and Westlake Ordinance 2020-54 which permits public bodies to conduct public meetings virtually. The meeting was live streamed for public viewing. The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Brad Lamb.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to approve the minutes of May 4, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Falcone, Appel, Van Dyke

Nays: None, motion carried

BUSINESS

Ordinance 2019-76 rezoning south side of Center Ridge Rd west of Crocker Rd., PP#217-26-012 & 007, from R-1F-80 District to R-MF-24 District, ref. 5/17/19, rep. P. Vincent, Ward 6 – tabled 6/3/19, 7/1/19, 8/5/19, 9/9/19, 10/7/19, 11/11/19, 12/2/19, 2/3/2020, 3/2/20 tabled to 5/11/20 meeting; 90-day extension of time (expires 5/31/2020) – applicant requests to be tabled to 6/1

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo noting the applicant requests to be tabled to June 1st and an extension of time is needed.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to recommend a 90-day extension of time (8/29/20) for Ordinance 2019-76.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table Ordinance 2019-76 to the June 1, 2020 meeting.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel
Nays: None, motion carried

**Lovesac Storefront and Sign Plan, 165 Main Street,
PP#211-25-004, rep. J. Kruse, Ward 5**

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo. This tenant is occupying space formerly occupied by Clark's shoes. The proposed storefront projects 2' into the storefront expansion zone (like Clark's shoes did) which is permitted by Section 10.2 of the Crocker Park Design Guidelines. The storefront consists primarily of brown wood-look tile planking. A 2" wide teal powder coated metal band frames the overall storefront and a 2" wide black metal band outlines the recessed entrance and matches the black metal which frames the large storefront windows. A simple teal awning with no lettering or graphics extends nearly the width of the storefront, which is a bright color and can be considered signage. Staff supports it being considered a trim color as the awning adds to the visual vitality of the storefront and streetscape and is similar to colors on the palette. He reviewed the signage package – electronic message center in the window, wall signs, canopy, blade sign, poster display, and colors.

Dustin Cruse, applicant, was present. Discussion ensued regarding the proposal. The commission did not have issues with the proposal and counting the awning color as a trim color.

Storefront

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed storefront projects 2' into the storefront expansion zone (like Clark's shoes did) which is permitted by Section 10.2 of the Crocker Park Design Guidelines.
2. The awning color is similar to colors shown in the Crocker Park Design Guidelines color palette.
3. The storefront materials conform to the Crocker Park Design Guidelines.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to recommend approval of the Lovesac storefront, considering the awning color as part of the storefront rather than the signage.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel
Nays: None, motion carried

Sign Plan

Findings of Fact:

1. Proposed 54.25 sq. ft. total sign area complies with the Crocker Park Sign Criteria.
2. The "back wall digital video screen" is permitted under Crocker Sign Criteria Section 10.1 which permits "digital graphic panels" in storefronts.
3. This sign is considered a window sign because it is visible and legible from outside of the tenant space through the windows.
4. The 17.22 sq. ft. digital window sign will require a waiver from the criteria because Section 11.1 of the Crocker Park Sign Criteria limits window signs to 10 sq. ft. per structural bay. This storefront has two structural bays so is permitted 20 sq. ft. of sign area. The waiver will be to allow all 17.22 sq. ft. in one structural bay.

5. The 21 sq. ft. “storefront graphic frame” is a poster display case which is permitted as a secondary sign under Section 11.1 of the Crocker Park Sign Criteria.

Motion: Based upon the findings of fact Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to approve the Lovesac sign plan as submitted 4/29/20 with a waiver to allow 17.22 sq. ft. of digital window signage in one window with a condition that the digital sign is operated so that it does not glare into the eyes of drivers and pedestrians.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

**Cost Plus World Market Storefront and Sign Plan, 307
Main St., PP#211-26-305, rep. M. DeCapite, Ward 5**

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo and the proposal. He noted while it is exciting to see this tenant space finally ready to be occupied it is disappointing that the southwest canted corner of the tenant space is not an entrance and that this southwest façade and south façade will be totally “blind” facades without any clear glazing in the windows. He reviewed the elevations and Design Guidelines.

He explained the windows shown on American Ave. are covered with an white film so there is no visibility into the tenant space, as is the canted window on the corner of Main Street and American Ave. The tenant has shown these areas to be back lit as requested by city staff. Both Main Street and American Ave., and the whole area of this traffic circle, need activation. The Design Guidelines calls out Main St. and American Ave. as specific streets where creating sustained vitality is essential and that tenants need to be able to uniquely display their merchandise to attract passing customers. He reviewed the floor plan which shows the interior space and merchandise displays along the interior of those elevations. The building was designed so the southwest canted façade would be an entrance into the tenant space. This tenant is not utilizing that façade and if not an entrance the southwest canted façade should be at least a display window. The design of the proposed doors and windows on Main Street are plain. The combined three proposed storefront facades have in total only 18% of clear glass and 12% backlit translucent white glass. Neither the southwest or south facades have any visual connection between the interior and exterior of the store.

Mr. Krause reviewed type of signage being proposed. A total of three primary and three secondary sign types are proposed which complies with the Crocker Park Sign Criteria for corner retail tenants. A total of 142.07 of primary signage and 173 sq. ft. of secondary signage are proposed for a grand total of 315.07 sq. ft. of proposed signage out of a total of 325 sq. ft. of signage permitted. No design details or color renderings for the proposed banner, blade or easel signs have been submitted or color renderings of the façade with these signs included. More design details and color renderings are needed for the proposed banner, blade and easel signs.

Ms. Marie DeCapite, MCG Architecture; Mr. Jonathan Drews, Stark Enterprises; Mr. Dave Cameron, CPWM (Tenant Representative); and Mr. Mark Schaefer, Federal Heath Sign Company; were present. Ms. DeCapite advised they did look at the corner feature but when reviewed the tenant floor space it was not possible to use that as an entrance. Mr. Drews felt as

proposed the proposal was able to proceed from their standpoint as things in that area have changed since the inception of the American Ave. and Main St. intersection. The majority of the traffic is from American Greetings employees.

Members of the commission discussed the proposal and agreed with Mr. Krause regarding the southwest canted corner of the tenant space, adding activation of the area, and would like to see the proposal revised. The materials were discussed and the metal panel should be revised or how it will look and fit into the look of the façade. The applicant stated it was to break up the look of the brick and provide an industrial feel. They can revise the façade to bring in other features as discussed. It was stressed this area serves as a gateway into Crocker Park and additional details should be provided. They reviewed the signage and how the flat vinyl sign will look 3D and what the blade sign and easel sign will look like. The plans should include how the signage will look from a street level view.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table Cost Plus World Market to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

**Buy Buy Baby Storefront and Sign Plan, 292 Main St.,
PP#211-24-303, rep. M. DeCapite, Ward 5**

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo. He explained the storefront has a traditional design. The storefront consists of brick in both running bond and soldier course patterns; decorative Fypon wood look trim; “dark sky” wall sconces, which details need to be submitted; and the concrete curb base will have a parged smooth finish painted to match the brick, which Mr. Krause questioned how it would hold up due to salt on the sidewalks in the winter. The tenant has a similar need as Cost Plus World Market to merchandise some of the inside of the exterior walls and has designed the windows with the illusion of connection between the interior and exterior of the store with the use of clear glazing in the windows with poster display cases set behind the glass. The canted corner of the tenant space and the Main Street façade next to H&M has clear glazing without poster display cases so pedestrians will be able to actually see into the store in these areas.

Mr. Krause reviewed the signage noting the poster display cases and large vertical banners which activate the street will require a large waiver from the sign criteria in terms of the amount of proposed secondary sign area. Primary signs A and B do not have any issues and comply with the master sign criteria. Primary sign C is problematic as it is vinyl film graphic letters heat applied directly to brick which has not been used before in Crocker Park and the master sign criteria discourages the use of plastic. He stated the applicant explained the vinyl film looks similar to thick paint applied to brick and *Homage* is a tenant in Crocker Park which was approved to have a sign painted directly on brick. He reviewed the poster display cases which must be changed a minimum of four times a year. Details and color renderings need to be submitted for the proposed poster display, banner, blade and easel signs.

Ms. Marie DeCapite, MCG Architecture; Mr. Jonathan Drews, Stark Enterprises; Mr. Dave Cameron, CPWM (Tenant Representative); and Mr. Mark Schaefer, Federal Heath Sign Company; were present. Ms. DeCapite explained initially their plans did not include banners but they were under the amount of allowable secondary signage area and the landlord recommended to add banners to the proposal to mimic the banners across the street for Cost Plus World Market, which put them over the allowable area for secondary signage.

Members of the commission discussed the proposal and questioned if the windows where the interior is visible will have 3D display items within, which Ms. DeCapite stated the applicant would. The windows that do not provide visibility into the interior were reviewed along with those that are visible into the interior tenant space were discussed along with the elevations. The commission would like more visibility into the store and to see 3D displays in the display cases as well as posters by increasing the depth of the cases. There were concerns with the deterioration of the curb base that will have a parged smooth finish painted to match the brick and if another material could be used.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table Buy Buy Baby to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

**St. Paul Lutheran Church Development Plan (shed),
27993 Detroit Rd., PP#212-19-006, rep. D. Lynn, Ward 5**

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo and the proposal for a shed as part of their cemetery improvements. The shed will be 1,064 sq. ft. and used to store equipment for maintaining both the cemetery and church/school property on the northeast portion of the existing asphalt parking lot behind the existing school. The proposed shed will be sided in vinyl siding or cement board in a beige color to blend with the principal buildings on the site. He reviewed the gutters and downspouts, materials, landscape and screening. There is one exterior wall-pack proposed on the west side of the building fixture that is fully downcast and shielded. Staff requests the P3 option which shows 3,500 Kelvin and 3,000 Lumens.

Mr. Dave Lynn was present. Members of the commission discussed the proposal, screening, materials/color and lighting.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table the St. Paul Lutheran Church Development Plan to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

**Ascent Church Lot Split and minor rev to Development
Plan (to approve existing setbacks when new lot is created
due to lot split), 3600 Crocker Rd., PP#216-10-021, 0213 &
031, rep. P. Endrei, Ward 6**

Mr. Bedell explained the proposal to split the lot into two lots so the school is on its own parcel. The building has been vacant and the church has not been successful in finding another tenant since Einstein Academy left last spring. The church is selling the building and parcel to the Julie Billiart School. Parcel A (church) is 8.1815 acres and Parcel B (school) is 2.9626 acres. The parcel lines have been drawn to limit the number of modifications required. No new construction is proposed for either parcel. However, the existing development plan for the church includes the area of the proposed Parcel B. Therefore, a minor revision to the existing development plan is necessary to reflect the new lot lines and setbacks. It also shows driveway and parking easements.

Dr. Endrei (Ascent Church) and Ms. Davis (Julie Billiart School) were present. Discussion ensued that one southerly driveway entrance will remain on the church parcel and be used for both buildings. There will be parking easements that will stay with the property for shared parking between the uses. The lot split layout was discussed with Mr. Bedell noting as proposed it complies with lot coverage requirements.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table the Ascent Church Lot Split to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

Cuyahoga Community College Development Plan, 31001 Clemens Rd., PP#211-04-007, rep. S. Marcum, Ward 3

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo. The purpose of this request is to recommend approval of a revised landscaping plan for the area of the site to the north of the aforementioned building for a new “element/structure” that is proposed for an area that is outside of any utilities or trees to be preserved in the tree preservation plan. He noted the proposal is more of an architectural feature as it is an open-air outdoor structure for small group assembly. Trees will screen the majority of



the view of the structure. Structure has no doors and is a west-facing slat wall to provide only nominal shelter from westward wind and direct sun, as it is not intended to be a place of shelter from the elements, but a place to give occupants a chance to be closer to nature: the woodland and the wetlands on the site. The slat wall height is 10’-7” when viewing it from the back (from the west). When viewing it from the lawn that is to the east and at a lower grade, the top of the slat

wall is approximately 16’ above grade. There are no zoning restrictions on the height of the structure.

Mr. Marcum, architect, and Mr. Lang were present and answered questions. Discussion ensued the structure will be used as a gathering place. Parts may be visible from Clemens Road but the

trees will screen the majority of the structure. Members of the commission complimented the applicant on the design of the structure.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table the Cuyahoga Community College Development Plan to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

**The Learning Experience Development Plan, 25211
Center Ridge Rd., PP#215-26-005, rep. M. Zimmerman,
Ward 2 – tabled 3/2/20**

Mr. Bedell and Mr. Krause reviewed their staff memos. The proposal is for a single story 10,000 s.f. day care center on a 2.11 acre property. The site will include parking for 35, a rear playground, a dumpster enclosure, storm water retention and landscaping. The lighting plan is very good and has no issues. Since the last meeting the landscape plans were revised, the EFIS was removed, the 3D alphabet blocks were changed to 2D, and the awnings were changed to an earth tone. The total amount of signage proposed complies with what is permitted.

The commission discussed the revisions and the proposal. The front entrance has columns with 2D block features that look like children’s alphabet blocks. It was questioned if they could be removed. It was noted the facility in Dublin, Ohio does not have the blocks or signage on the building. The applicant was not able to answer questions about the Dublin facility as it was not a project they worked on. They will find out what is at that site but noted the design feature is part of the company’s branding. It was requested to see a color sample of the roof materials and stone. Mr. Zimmerman will see what he can get as due to COVID they have not been able to get materials. It was suggested that a photo of the materials could be supplied. It was recommended to screen the dumpster enclosure with as much landscape material as possible as well as the side of the playground that is against the shopping center. Brick material on the dumpster enclosure would be preferred over stone so that it matches more with the building rather than standing out. Up and down oriented decorative lighting on the building was suggested.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table the Learning Experience Development Plan to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

**The Villas at Westin Pointe Development Plan, 23059-
23159 Center Ridge Rd., PP#214-29-006 to 008, rep. D.
Siley, Ward 1 – tabled 3/2/20**

Correspondence received from:

1. A letter was received 4/15/20 from John Cristino, 23039 Center Ridge – concerns with proposal
2. A letter was received 5/9/2020 from Justin Orley, Orley Custom Homes, owner of multiple parcels on Fox Run – objects to rear yard modifications

3. A letter was received 3/30/20 from James Vine, 23285 Pheasant Lane – concerns with parking

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo and the revisions made since the March meeting. There will be 25 two story units and the landscaping on Center Ridge Road was enhanced. The entry sign and design was received, while it is a nice entry, it was suggested to make the sign on the pillar a little larger. The building elevations need more details as the rear elevations appears flat and somewhat plain in comparison to the front and side facades that have varied materials, wall plains and rooflines. It was noted that surrounding neighbors have concerns with drainage. He reviewed the elevations, landscape and parking.

Mr. Siley stated that there will be landscape on the mound adjacent to the neighbor's landscape. There is an existing fence at the northwest side of the property and mounding on Pebblebrook's side of the property, and if additional landscape is needed it can be adjusted. Mr. Bedell noted additional landscape and mounding is needed against the single family property. Mr. Siley submitted a photo of an example of the building design.

Members of the commission discussed the proposal and would like to see more buffering between the properties as multiple residents have expressed concerns with screening and parking. One resident suggested putting a wall in place to block parking, but if that were done, all the trees would have to be removed and they wished to keep as many trees as possible. Mr. Siley stated in addition to parking in driveways, the street will be wide enough to allow parking on one side of the street and comply with fire access requirements. Mr. Siley advised that he did talk to Mr. Cristino regarding his drainage concerns and yard drains will be provided to collect water and it will not go off site. The rear elevations should be revised to add additional details as the neighboring multifamily units are very nice and appealing from all sides. Some of those residents will face the rear of the proposed units so attention should be given to those elevations. The rear setback to the south adjacent to the single family property was discussed and as much of the existing woods should be retained to provide screening. Tree preservation on the site is desired and the commission would like to see as many trees as possible retained.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table the Villas at Westin Pointe Development Plan to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

**Corporate Circle Master Sign Criteria, Corporate Circle,
PP#211-26-067 & 068, 211-29-009, rep. R. Levitz, Ward 5**

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo for the updated sign criteria. The outstanding issues were the amount of secondary sign area for retail tenants and number of secondary sign types for office tenants. Mr. Levitz reviewed the updates and provided various renderings showing mocked up tenants showing .25 sf, .5 sf and .75 sf of secondary signage for retail tenants per linear foot of primary tenant frontage. Renderings showing the complete office building elevation with all the mock tenants to show what entire elevation would look like with awnings, the maximum amount of signage for each tenant and less signage. Mr. Krause reviewed the

findings of fact listed below and he felt .5 sf of secondary signage for retail tenants per linear foot of primary tenant frontage was a good compromise.

Discussion ensued regarding the amount of secondary sign types for office tenants. After lengthy discussion it was determined that .5 sf of secondary signage for retail tenants per linear foot of primary tenant frontage would be used. There was discussion that some of the commission did not like awnings and the suggested color pallet. Mr. Rubin stated that tenants want to be able to have a variety of signage and awnings and it is also not desirable for the awnings to all be one color. A color pallet was determined based on past suggestions that the colors for the awnings should be limited to a certain set of colors. After lengthy discussion it was determined that awnings will be permitted as sign types with the color to be approved by planning commission on a case by case basis

Findings of Fact:

1. Having retail signage facing Crocker Road will be a major difference between the Corporate Circle and Crocker Park sign criteria.
2. An important principal the criteria maintains is that the types of signage visible from outside of Corporate Circle are the same types of signage permitted for retail in the rest of the city. The criteria does not allow, for Primary Tenant Frontage visible from Crocker Road: Feature Signs, Projecting Banner Signs, Umbrella Graphics, Mobile Retail Carts, and signs incorporating animation or exposed neon, outline lighting and LED/LCD electronic media except as may be permissible by code or as approved by Planning Commission and Display Stands/Easels, except as permitted by Schedule 1223.04(g) of the Westlake sign code.
3. Another principal which the criteria maintains is that the signage on the back of the new office building closest to the abutting residential is kept minimal and non-illuminated.
4. Showcase Display Window signage for vacant storefronts visible from Crocker Road is not permitted to advertise products, goods and services by tenants within the PUD or by other businesses and entities outside of the PUD.
5. The proposed criteria will be revised so that Planning Commission will be reviewing the signage for each tenant that goes into Corporate Circle as they do for Crocker Park. The 13th paragraph of Section 1.1 shall be revised to state that tenants shall submit an application with proposed signs to the Planning Commission for review and approval. The 14th paragraph of Section 1.1 to be removed.
6. The criteria for the C1 and C2 office buildings remain the same except for an entitlement for four wall signs on the west elevation.
7. For any Construction Barricade Signs visible from Crocker Road the lettering and graphics and any artwork will be limited to 80 sq. ft.
8. The PUD development parcel is slightly over 15 acres with an office building behind a retail building and if it was still three separate development parcels (of five acres each) they would each be permitted one temporary sign of 32 sq. ft. each.
9. The applicant is requesting the same ratio for retail signage as that which is permitted within Crocker Park (that is, not visible from Crocker Road) which is 1.5 sq. ft. per linear foot of frontage for primary signage and .75 sq. ft. per linear foot of frontage for secondary signage, for a total of 2.25 sq. ft. of signage per linear foot. The applicant is open to considering a compromise of .5 sq. ft. per linear foot of frontage for secondary signage for

a total of 2.0 sq. ft. of signage per linear foot. He has stated he only anticipates about 33% of the retail tenants will request the maximum amount of signage but it needs to be available to attract the 33% of tenants who will want it.

10. Retail tenants in the rest of the city are limited to 1.5 sq. ft. of signage per linear foot of frontage in Shopping Center zoning districts.
11. The applicant has agreed to 1 sq. ft. of primary and .25 sq. ft. of secondary signage for office tenants per linear foot of primary tenant frontage and has agreed to a maximum of two types of secondary signage per office tenant with a revision to the criteria permitting up to a total of 2 sq. ft. of window signage to post store hours, etc. exempt from being counted, as permitted in the regular Westlake sign code under Section 1223.11(f) & (g).
12. The 9th paragraph in Section 1.1 shall be revised to state that Outdoor dining signage shall be included as part of the tenant sign approval process.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to approve the Corporate Circle Master Sign Criteria as revised with the following conditions:

1. Section 12.1 shall be revised to limit the total amount of permitted secondary signage for retail tenants to a maximum of .5 sq. ft. per linear foot of tenant frontage.
2. Section 12.2 shall be revised to limit the number of types of secondary signs permitted for an individual tenant to two, with two square feet of window sign area exempt from being counted toward the number of sign types and from tenant sign area.
3. Awnings are permitted as sign types with the color to be approved by planning commission on a case by case basis.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel, DiCarlo

Nays: None, motion carried

Westside Christian Academy Development Plan (modular classrooms), 23096 Center Ridge Rd., PP#214-27-008, rep. T. Dieterle, Ward 1

Correspondence was received:

1. Email received: 5/12/2020 from John and Loretta Cain, 2000 Hunters Point Lane

Mr. Krause reviewed his staff memo explaining the proposal is for two modular classroom trailers temporarily on the property as part of the school expansion. The westerly of the two modular classrooms to be placed immediately after approval and a second one when needed. The units will be visible to surrounding property owners. A complaint was received that trees and screen were removed and the buffer needs to be replaced and increased over what is there now. He reviewed the trees and the 60/80 buffer requirements are not being met. There will be no "courtyard" with just one modular unit initially and the lights will be visible to residents east of the property. If the existing lights on the modular buildings were installed before the current lighting ordinance was adopted they should be changed out to comply with the current city lighting regulations.

Mr. Dieterle explained that is was uncertain when the building addition will be constructed as they are currently fundraising so that is why they wish to install the temporary modular units

(trailers). They will address the missing trees and buffer as required. Trees had been removed as they were diseased.

Discussion ensued regarding how long the units would temporarily be in place and it was estimated 5-10 years. The commission felt 5-10 years wasn't temporary and 2-5 years at most would be temporary. Mr. Wittman from Westside Christian Academy advised the school is growing and they need additional space for students. They would like to have the units in place by August. The trees that had to be removed will be replaced to comply with buffering requirements. It was questioned if the units could be relocated, if all the existing parking was needed, and the site was reviewed. Mr. Dieterle explained they looked at several locations to place the units and the proposed location was the best based on proximity to the main building and it will not impact the construction of the addition once it commences. All of the existing parking is needed. The commission stressed the importance of replacing the trees now and consideration of relocating the mobile classroom units.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table the Westside Christian Academy Development Plan to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

Hallberg Townhouses Development Plan, 28258 Center Ridge Rd., PP#216-14-011, rep. L. Staib, Ward 4

Correspondence was received:

1. Email received: Sat 5/9/2020 4:21 PM from Rick & Laura Lyle, 28710 Weybridge Dr

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo, department comments, materials and the overall plan. The property has been zoned multifamily since 1940. The development will include two six-unit buildings that are two stories tall with no roof top decks with a contemporary design. He reviewed the site noting the west side of the south building shows a 25' setback which needs clarified due to a discrepancy on the plans. The entrance sign needs to be shifted 5' east and is slightly too tall. He advised additional buffering is needed along the south side of the drive adjacent to the single family zoned property and street trees have not been provided and are required. The lighting plan complies with code requirements and is well prepared. Additional details are need for the color of the rails.

Mr. Greller, owner, Mr. Fant and Mr. Staib architects were present. They will comply with the 25' setback for the west side of the south building and they will take care of the buffering along the drive.

Discussion ensued that the units will be priced in the \$500,000-\$600,000 price range, approximately 2,400-3,000 sf, and will include elevators in the units with second story master bedrooms. It is not anticipated there will be any issues with parking as four cars can fit at each unit between two garage spaces and two driveway spaces. The units in the south building may be able to fit four cars in the driveway pending the vehicle size. The main entrance drive complies

with fire radius requirements and parking on one side of the street. They plan to retain as many trees as possible. Building materials and windows were discussed.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to table the Hallberg Townhouses Development Plan to June 1, 2020.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

MISCELLANEOUS

19-05-28 Ord. 2019-39 Conditional Use Permit for an office use, Bradley Road, PP#211-02-011 & 012, rep. K. Midgley, Ward 3, ref. by council 4/4/19 – request an extension of time as expires 6/6/20

Mr. Bedell reviewed his staff memo noting an extension of time is requested.

Motion: Mrs. Falcone moved, seconded by Mr. Van Dyke to recommend that Council approve an extension of time for the Ordinance 2019-39 to 6/6/21.

ROLL CALL ON APPROVAL:

Yeas: Lamb, Van Dyke, Falcone, Appel

Nays: None, motion carried

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 11:55 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, June 1, 2020.

Chairman Brad Lamb

Nicolette Sackman, MMC
Clerk of Commissions

Approved: _____