

MINUTES OF MEETING
PLANNING COMMISSION

January 22, 2026

Members Present: Coyne, Allen, DeMarco, Bishop

Presence Noted: Kathryn Kerber, Director of Planning and Community Development
Dylan Minek, Planning and Community Development Administrator
Michael O’Shea, Law Director

Council Members Present: Lisa Havemann, Council at Large
Jeanne Gallagher, Ward 3

Chairman Bishop called to order the January 22, 2026, meeting of the Rocky River Planning Commission at 6:00 P.M. in City Council Chambers of Rocky River City Hall.

Mayor Bobst came forward to administer the Oath of Office to Mr. Bishop for a new term as a Planning Commission member. The Mayor thanked Mr. Bishop for his willingness to serve and his leadership of the Planning Commission over so many years. In 2024, the city had about 1,800 permits issued for a total of just over \$63 million of added valuation. In 2025, the city had fewer overall permits, but the valuation added totaled over \$78 million. Mayor Bobst said that many of these projects come through the Planning Commission, so she thanked them for their continued willingness to serve and for making sure that the community develops in a way that is consistent, desirable, and compatible with the Master Plan and the existing community. Mayor Bobst said in 2024, there were 15 public hearings, and in 2025, there were 30 public hearings. For Pre-Preliminary reviews, there were 11 vs 6 the year prior; for Preliminary reviews, there were 35 vs 9 the year prior; and for Final reviews, there were 13 vs 5 the year prior. Mayor Bobst said there were no projects of great scale; these are individual projects that collectively bring great value to the community. She thanked the Commission again for working with applicants and working with impacted residents to make sure that their voices are heard in the process. Mayor Bobst administered the Oath of Office for an upcoming term to Mr. Bishop as a member of the Planning Commission commencing January 22, 2026, through December 31, 2026.

Mayor Bobst also recognized Lisa Havemann to the audience. Mrs. Havemann is a Council Member at Large, and she has been appointed to the Boards and Commissions as the Council representative.

Mr. Bishop asked if there were any corrections to the Planning Commission meeting minutes of December 16, 2025. Mr. Allen said on page 4, the last paragraph down, there are two “Brownstone” that need to be changed to “Roundstone.”

Mr. DeMarco moved to accept the minutes with Mr. Allen’s comment. Mr. Coyne seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

1. Bearden’s Steakburgers – 19985 Lake Rd – Final Review – Review of a dumpster enclosure –

Present – TJ Weyls, Attorney for Bearden’s Steakburgers

Mr. Weyls said they have provided the necessary documents with the necessary revisions. They have obtained the variance for the setback of the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Weyls said they believe everything else complies. He said the enclosure is higher than the trash receptacle itself. Mr. Bishop asked if the Cedar fence was to be stained or left natural. Mr. Weyls said he believes it was going to be left natural. Mr. Bishop said the fence is shown to be 8 feet; is it possible to be 6 or 7 feet? Mr. Weyls said it was intended to help shield the dumpster for the next-door neighbors. Mr. Bishop said it has to be 1 foot higher than the dumpster. He doesn't think the extra foot will help the sight lines for the neighbors, but it may look aesthetically more pleasing from the parking lot if the fence were lower. Mr. Reich said that can be done administratively. Mr. Bishop said the code requires it be a solid fence, rather than the board-on-board that is being proposed. Mr. Bishop asked Mr. Reich about the intent to build a fence that is posted in the window at Bearden's. Mr. Reich said he guesses it's for the dumpster enclosure, that the intent card would be voided, and they would have to get a new one.

Mr. Reich said there was a discussion at the last Planning meeting about continuing the Kennedy fence along the property to the west. Mr. Weyls said to his knowledge, those were separate issues. Mr. Coyne said in the BZA minutes that there was a discussion about them being separate items. Mr. Reich said that was to keep the BZA on track with the variance that was in front of them, since the fence on the property line has nothing to do with the variance being requested. Mr. Coyne thought that part of their preliminary approval from the last meeting was the continuation of that fence. Mr. Reich said he remembers that same conversation. Mr. Bishop said the fence was additional screening, and the applicant had agreed to that. Mr. Reich said they are looking at the whole scope of work, both the enclosure and the fence along the property line, and they will adjust the fence permit to cover that.

Mr. DeMarco said he was under the impression from last month's discussion that the dumpster enclosure was still going to be attached to the building, but extended further. However, now the dumpster enclosure is completely detached from the main building. It is a floating fence element in the middle of the parking lot. Mr. DeMarco asked the Commission if they felt that this submission for final approval meets the spirit and intent of their discussion last month. He personally does not. Mr. Bishop feels that's that it does. Mr. Allen said he believes that it does; he was under the impression that it had to be detached, given the overhang of the building. There is a fire separation from the overhang as well. It almost forces the dumpster to be placed to the south as far as possible. Mr. Coyne said that he remembers that as well. Mr. DeMarco said he would prefer the fence be painted white, rather than being left natural, so that it matched the building. Mr. Weyls said he has no objection to painting it white; his only concern would be keeping it clean. He said it will get weathered and stained. Mr. Bishop said the biggest thing is maintaining the enclosure.

Mr. Allen moved to grant final approval to Bearden's Steakburgers, 19985 Lake Rd, for a dumpster enclosure. The height of the enclosure is to be addressed administratively. The enclosure needs to be changed from a board-on-board fence to a solid fence. The adjacent fence is to be extended along the west property line. Mr. DeMarco seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
APPROVED

2. Taste Buds Kitchen – 21810-22200 Center Ridge Rd – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – New instructional cooking school –

Present – Jonathan Morschl, Four Points Architectural

Mr. Bishop said the chart provided for the parking has some errors, but he does not think they are material. Mr. Bishop asked how many employees they have. Mr. Morschl believes they will have 2-3 employees at that time. Mr. Bishop asked what the capacity is. Mr. Morschl said there are 6 tables of 6 chairs, so around 40 people. Mr. Bishop asked if the students get up and move around. Mr. Morschl said there is a long table where the demonstration happens, so everybody can see the chef and the instruction of preparing the food. The students then go back to their own workspace and do their own preparation, and the instructors come around to them. Mr. Bishop said he is about 10 spaces over the required parking spaces before the 20% discount for the shopping center. So, they are well within the required number of spaces; there are about 100 parking spaces left that are not accounted for after this tenant space. Mr. Bishop asked about signage. Mr. Morschl said they will be doing signage; he has not seen anything for that yet. Mr. Bishop said they would have to come back to get the signage reviewed.

Mr. Bishop moved to open the public hearing. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

Mr. Bishop moved to close the public hearing. Mr. DeMarco seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

Mr. DeMarco said they are classifying it as instructional space at a certain parking amount. However, it is more like a restaurant space with tables and chairs. When they go by the code, they are required to have 9 parking spaces. Mr. Bishop said he calculated 20+ parking spaces. He reclassified the space and calculated a higher number of parking spaces. Mr. Bishop said there was no discount shown for the shopping center, so it wouldn't matter anyway. Mr. DeMarco asked what the hours of operation are. Mr. Morschl said he would assume weekends during the day and holidays. They also focus on children classes so he could see hours during the summer and during the day too. Mr. Morschl said regarding the parking count, he agrees that this space does need more parking spaces. He said one of the other things when he was going through the parking calculations with Mr. Minek, Firehouse Subs is required to have 58 parking spaces. There is not really a quick service restaurant in the parking calculation. He said the grocery store is probably overestimated at 300 parking spaces. Mr. Bishop said they are working on the new code, so it is on the radar, and they appreciate the feedback greatly.

Mr. DeMarco moved to grant preliminary and final approval to Taste Buds Kitchen at 21810-22200 Center Ridge Rd, with the only exception being that the applicant return for signage review. Mr. Allen seconded

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
APPROVED

3. University Hospitals – 20914 Center Ridge Rd – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – Demolition of the existing building and construction of a new urgent care –

Present – Matt Weber, Weber Engineering
Eric Placek, WellStreet

Mr. Bishop said it looks like they have addressed everything that was discussed at the last Planning Commission meeting. They are at their maximum permitted parking. All of the setbacks are compliant. Mr. Bishop said there had been some discussion about increasing the building setback. However, the Master Plan and the trend are to move forward, which is why they established that 10 foot setback 15 years ago. He said it makes things more pedestrian-friendly and hides the parking in the rear. Mr. Bishop said they have maintained the 10-foot distance from the doors and glass all the way around, which is required. Mr. Bishop said their impervious is a little high, but there are no regulations in Local Business. Mr. Weber said it was around 70 to 72 percent. Mr. Allen asked if the stormwater management basin was just going to be lawn. Mr. Weber said that it is correct, and it is about a 4-foot drop. Mr. Allen said the gas meter is on the southwest corner, and he wants to make sure they are comfortable with the screening for that. Mr. Weber said they are.

Mr. Bishop said there were no details on the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Weber said there was apparently a miscommunication; they were expecting the architect to be here. Mr. Bishop said they will require a detail on the enclosure. He said when they were here the last time, they discussed that the signage was not permitted on all three sides and would require a variance. Mr. Bishop said there is no scale on the elevation, so ballpark, your signage is over on all three profiles. Regardless of the variances or not, all of your signage should be reduced to accommodate the 40%. Mr. Placek said they are handling the signage separately from the architecture. He asked if it would be better to remove the signage in the next submission. Mr. Bishop said the signage is a really important part of the whole project, and that it should be handled now rather than down the road. Mr. Minek let Mr. Bishop know that the sign company had reached out to him, and he provided them with information on what is required per the sign code. Mr. Bishop said the south elevation sign is obvious. The east elevation is obvious because that is their entrance point. He said he can see why they want the signage, and he does not think that it is necessarily a bad idea, given that it's an urgent care and not a shoe store. So, people who are in a hurry to get to an urgent care, the sign might help them locate the building. However, they are really elevated grade-wise compared to Tide. Mr. Bishop said it would be nice to have a profile of how that sign might look relative to the Tide building.

Mr. Bishop said he believes they have incorporated the Design Board's comments into the elevations of the plans. Mr. Minek said the plans that were submitted are different than what was originally submitted for the Design Board. Mr. Weber said they have updated the plans with the Design Board's comments. Mr. Bishop asked if there was any Dryvit within 3 feet of the grade. Mr. Weber said he would have to look at that. Mr. Allen said he didn't see the screening for the mechanical units in the updated elevation. Mr. Weber said they are screened by the parapets. Mr. Allen said he is not thrilled about that. He does not like using angles to screen the units. When you are standing next to the building, it is screened, but when you're across the street, it is not. Mr. Weber wanted to clarify that they need to identify how the rooftop units are being screened and that they are not necessarily fond of the parapet. Mr. Allen said that is correct, using actual

screening instead of parapet. Mr. DeMarco said it has to be a pretty tall parapet to be able to screen all of that. Mr. Bishop asked if the parapet is an element of the building itself. Mr. Weber said that is correct. Mr. Bishop said they are not opposed to the parapet itself, just how the mechanicals are screened on the roof. Mr. DeMarco said to render it correctly on the elevations, so if it is going to extend above the top of the building, show that in the elevations.

Mr. DeMarco said that when he was reviewing the plans and the minutes from Design Review, he was assuming that the plans did not incorporate the Board's comments. However, he realizes that the comments have been addressed in these plans. He said he is not a huge fan of the color palette; he feels that it is stark and sterile. He said if the Design Board has discussed it and reviewed it, he is okay with it. Mr. DeMarco said there was some discussion about a potential, sort of element at the corner around the south elevation of the building. He asked if there was any discussion about incorporating that into the elevations. Mr. Placek said no. The conversation was more about doing something else architecturally with that elevation. They have created pilasters and increased parapet height. Mr. DeMarco would agree that Dryvit should not be within grade. He said he probably would have leaned towards providing more brick on the building than the corrugated metal paneling or EIFS. Mr. DeMarco said he agreed with the Design Board's comments and thought those had not been addressed. Mr. Placek said in spirit, they have tried to incorporate everything that the Board had asked. He said they did add the wainscoting brick around that they previously did not have. Mr. DeMarco asked if that was the darker grey color. Mr. Placek said that is correct. Mr. DeMarco said he is okay with that being within grade. Mr. DeMarco said he would like to see the dumpster enclosure match the building, in the same color scheme. In regard to signage, he said it seems really excessive for what they have proposed.

Mr. Allen agreed with Mr. DeMarco that the Design Review Board's comments were good. He asked if they could identify where they've adjusted the elevation based on the Design Board's comments. Mr. Weber and Mr. Placek are not a hundred percent sure because they are not the architects. Mr. Bishop said they are at a bit of a disadvantage because at the Pre-Preliminary, there were no elevations provided, so they did not see the elevations that were originally submitted. Mr. Allen said there are only two columns of brick. Mr. Placek said previously that it was all Dryvit. Mr. Placek said they did the wainscoting. Mr. DeMarco said that the Design Board has not seen these elevations either, so they may come back in their more formal review and have more comments. Mr. DeMarco asked if the elements that they've added that are proud of the main building, could be all brick. If they were to incorporate the white brick into all of the vertical pieces of the building to create more masonry. While the rest could be EIFS. Mr. Allen would agree that they need to go further with the Design Review Board's comments. Mr. Coyne said there needs to be more brick; the buildings in that area are brick. He is personally not a fan of the white brick; there is no white in that area. Mr. Placek said the white is a branding thing. Mr. Bishop said there is a retrofit on Madison Avenue that is in Lakewood that is white. Mr. Placek said the city only allowed them to paint the section of the brick on the side of the building that was in disrepair. Mr. DeMarco asked Mr. Minek what the spirit or tone of the conversation with the Design Board was regarding the color. Mr. Minek said they typically will support branding colors. He said there was some concern about keeping it clean, but it didn't seem like the Board had strong feelings for or against it. Mr. DeMarco said the comment about supporting brand colors reinforces what they have shown here.

Mr. Allen said he was trying to compare this building to what is discussed in the Master Plan. One concern is the windows along Center Ridge. The windows being proposed are essentially half “dummy” windows, which are not of great prominence. He said he recognizes that they are treatment rooms on the other side. Thus, from a layout perspective, he understands why they cannot have transparent windows. However, Roundstone on Lake Road, where the other side is the parking garage, still has frosted, full windows. Mr. DeMarco said they had the same conversation with Tide next door. Mr. Allen said there needs to be additional glass on the bottom half of each of the five windows along Center Ridge.

Mr. Bishop said he thinks the signage needs to be scaled back. He said to make sure it is at the 40% the code allows. Mr. DeMarco said he is not sure if it is going to be much smaller than what they are showing. Mr. Allen said seeing the landscaping as part of the renderings would help. Mr. Bishop asked the Commission how they feel about signage on three sides. He said he thinks they need it on the Center Ridge side and the east side. Mr. DeMarco said they are more exposed on the east. He asked if there was an opportunity for some other kind of signage on the west elevation. Maybe a logo or something to indicate that this is an urgent care without being branded to University Hospitals. Mr. Bishop asked if the signage is illuminated. Mr. Placek and Mr. Weber said yes. Mr. Bishop said the signage helps the elevation in a way; the building is very plain without it. Mr. DeMarco said on the west elevation that just the urgent care is enough signage, they do not need the logo or the University Hospitals. He said they could restrict the size of the urgent care sign because it could grow without the other two elements. Mr. Bishop agreed. Mr. Coyne asked the Commission if they really needed the signage on the west side. Mr. DeMarco said he is thinking about Cane’s; this is not dissimilar from that. Key Bank on Detroit Road wanted three signs on the building, but they didn’t get it, and that building is relatively close to the street. Mr. Bishop said the only reason why it is worth considering is the Use of this building. On the east elevation, Mr. Bishop said what they have there is fine, but he thinks it needs to be reduced. He asked what the most important signage is, the east or the south. Mr. Placek said the south. Mr. Coyne said he is fine with the signage on the east and south elevations. Mr. DeMarco agreed with the possibility of a reduced sign on the west. Mr. Coyne said he is not in favor of a sign on the west elevation. He thinks there is enough frontage on the south to not need a sign on the west. Mr. Bishop asked if the elevation needs something on the west. Mr. Coyne said they could use the metal component to break that up, so that the metal would be on all three sides.

Mr. Weber wanted confirmation. Mr. Bishop said they are in support of signage on the east and south elevations. Remove the signage on the west elevation, and do something architecturally on that elevation since it is a very exposed part of the building. Mr. Weber asked if, in the future, the client hears that patients are not seeing the building when they come from the west, they could come back and ask for signage on the west side. Mr. Bishop said they could ask for a modification of a previously approved plan. Mr. Placek asked if they could go to BZA and ask for the three signs. Mr. Bishop said they have a right, but they are going to ask for the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

Mr. Bishop moved to open the public hearing. Mr. DeMarco seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

Mr. Bishop moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

Mr. Bishop asked the Commission if they have enough information to move forward, or if they need to table it and get it refined before moving forward. Mr. Allen said he would be okay with tableting it and getting more Design Board feedback, addressing those items, and then doing a Preliminary and Final once they come back, so as not to interrupt the timeline. Mr. Coyne said he would agree. Mr. DeMarco said they have to go to Design Review regardless before Final Approval. Mr. Bishop said they need the variance before Final Approval as well. Mr. DeMarco said he is not opposed to granting Preliminary Approval tonight, knowing that they have to go through those other steps as well. Mr. Bishop said he is not sure if they can recommend a variance at this point, and they need the variance for Final Approval. Mr. DeMarco said he is okay with tableting once there is more comfort around the design and the variance. Mr. Bishop said he thinks it's best if they table and clean everything up that has been talked about tonight. Go back to the Design Board to see the changes. Try to incorporate both the Commission's comments and the Design Board's comments into the elevations. He said the renderings need to be a little better than what they are right now. Mr. DeMarco said he would like to see a color, rendered landscaping plan. It will not only screen some elements but also help to soften the elevation. Show the landscaping in the renderings.

Mr. Reich told Mr. Weber that they are going to require an inspection easement on the stormwater management basin. Mr. Weber said they can work on that.

Mr. Bishop moved to table this to incorporate the items discussed this evening into the presentation. Mr. DeMarco seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
TABLED

4. Lofts on Linda – 19911 Lake Rd/800 Linda St – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – Demolition of the existing building and construction of a new two-story building –

Present – Nicholas Faehnle, DS Architecture
Gabrielle Benson, DS Architecture

Mr. Faehnle said this is a small multi-family mixed-use project that is a campus project related to Roundstone. The owners are looking to put in a 4-unit, long-stay apartment space that can house clients and/or staff members who come into town for an extended period of time. The first floor is a membership-only gym. It does not allow walk-ins; you have to have training personnel with you. Anyone can join the gym and have a membership. Mr. Faehnle said the project does require a variance because the gym space is not permitted in this zoning district, and they are looking for support from the Planning Commission related to that.

Mr. Bishop said it looks like they have incorporated all of the Design Board's comments. Mr. Faehnle said that was correct. Mr. Bishop said this will require a Use variance because the gym is not a permitted Use if it is not in conjunction with the actual multi-family building. Mr. Bishop said they need to clean up some code items on their documents and some other items. It looks like they are showing a 10-foot parking setback along the northside of the access drive with a dotted line. He said the access drive looks to be encroaching on that 10 feet, so they need to verify that, or they will need a variance for that as well. Mr. Bishop said the sidewalk from Linda Street to the building is shown in some of the documents. He said to make sure it's consistent in all the documents next time they submit. Mr. Bishop said he could not find an impervious surface calculation or a trash enclosure detail. Mr. Faehnle asked if they are looking for a plan detail. Mr. Bishop said yes; things like material, height, width, depth, and the gate. Mr. Faehnle said it is a brick enclosure with a nicer gate, but they will include it in the next submission. Mr. Bishop asked if they are wrapping the entire site in the board-on-board fence. Mr. Faehnle said not the entire site, not the railroad side, since it has an existing fence. Mr. Bishop asked them to call it out specifically, make it easier to interpret, and show a small detail of it. He assumes it will match the Roundstone fence. Mr. Bishop said in the elevations, they are showing fence panels at the end of the mechanical pads. Mr. Faehnle said that is an error; it should be landscaping, and it will be added to the landscape plan. Mr. Bishop asked about signage. Mr. Faehnle said the Design Board asked for an address sign so they will have a small 800 Linda monument sign by the street. Mr. Bishop asked for them to include that in the final package. He also said there is a tree in their drive aisle on pages 14,16, and 17.

Mr. Bishop said that the landscape plan shows the fencing. Typically, the plan has each plant depicted. He asked if they are using the Astor Place existing landscape as a buffer. Mr. Faehnle said yes because it is really robust over there, and the same with the railroad. Mr. Bishop asked if there is a color to the permeable pavers. Mr. Faehnle said that is to be determined. He asked if the City allows access to the Roundstone permit drawings so they could have the specs for those permeable pavers. Mr. Reich said that is public record and the City can get them over to him. The pavers will be an offset color to the asphalt. Mr. Bishop said they have met all of the other zoning requirements as far as the setbacks, assuming the other things will be adjusted.

Mr. Bishop wanted to enter into the record of correspondence from Mr. and Mrs. Gilliland. They had a concern about the trees at the north property line. At first, Mr. Bishop thought they were concerned about headlights from cars, but the concern was more about the 14-foot lamps in the parking islands. He said they also had a concern about the impervious surface. However, he thinks the pavers go a long way to maybe address that.

Mr. Bishop wanted to enter into the record of correspondence from Mike FitzGibbon, who lives at Astor Place. His concern was about the lighting and the drainage at the property line with Astor Place. Mr. Bishop said that it should be handled with this plan, but it also should have been handled when Astor Place was developed. Mr. Faehnle said they are working on addressing the drainage, and they have a meeting with the City and the City Engineer to address this. He said they may have to storm and sewer back to Linda Street. Mr. Reich said the drainage is being worked on.

Mr. Bishop wanted to enter into the record of correspondence from Joann Riordan, who lives at Beachcliff Row. He said she had a concern about the Maples. He said she also had a concern

about the fencing. Mr. Bishop said she probably could not see the fencing on the drawings. She also had a concern about the exterior lighting.

Mr. DeMarco said, from a clarity standpoint, he thinks they should take the landscaping notations off the site plan and put them all on the landscape plan. He said it is getting hard to read. Mr. DeMarco said he would prefer a black and white for the site plan and put all of their colored stuff on the landscape plan. Mr. DeMarco said he is concerned that lighting is still an issue. Moving the lighting to the southside of the drive aisle does not solve the issue. He said he would like to see details about how they are proposing to shield the light on the high bollard lighting. Mr. Coyne asked if he did not like it on the southside of the property. Mr. DeMarco said he does not. He understands the concern by driving past the Roundstone lighting because there is no shielding on those lights, so you can directly see the light source. He said knowing how the shielding works on those fixtures, you can get it on sort of the back and the sides, but it's meant to shine out the front more. If they try to shield the front of the fixture, they are going to cut off the light. Mr. DeMarco said if they put the lighting on the northside they can easily shield the back of it. Mr. Coyne said he agrees. Mr. DeMarco said he would like more details on how the fixture gets shielded. Mr. Faehnle said these lights do not have a shield; they are directional lights, so the image is hidden with the post itself. Mr. DeMarco said the lights are going to be different than Roundstone, which are parking lot fixtures; these are taller bollards, which might have less illumination anyway.

Mr. DeMarco said that the Design Board had a lot of conversation about the soldier brick coursing around the building, and he sees that detail being replicated, similar to Roundstone. He said there is an element of projecting banding right below the low steel beam. Mr. Faehnle said that is two soldier courses. Mr. DeMarco said that the detail does not happen on the Roundstone building. He said he does not think it should happen here. Mr. Faehnle said the Design Board liked that detailing. Mr. DeMarco said he likes the steel beaming around it, but it seems like "overkill." He likes the simple beam detail they have wrapping the building because it makes it look like a warehouse, but the two soldier courses do not. Mr. Bishop asked how Mr. Faehnle feels about it. Mr. Faehnle said his clients wouldn't see the metal banding as desirable, and they would want the brick. This is not meant to be the same building as Roundstone. He said the building felt very flat and had no soul without the detailing. Mr. DeMarco asked if they would be opposed to swapping the steel beam for a full perimeter soldier course in addition to the one below. Mr. Faehnle said he does not see why not. It would be one less tradesman. Mr. DeMarco said he likes the steel, but if the client would prefer something else, it would just look nice to have something wrapping the building. Mr. DeMarco said he likes the design of the building. He would just like to see a fine-tuned solution to the lighting.

Mr. DeMarco asked Mr. Faehnle what the Design Board was talking about with respect to access from the garage. Mr. Faehnle said that the Design Board thought it would be better to have direct access from the garage into the main hallway of the building. Before, it was restricted, and tenants had to walk from inside the garage, outside, back into the building. Mr. Faehnle said the owner was okay with that. Mr. DeMarco asked if the gym was okay with that. Mr. Faehnle said the gym will be secured with different key fobs and other security measures.

Mr. Allen asked what the width was between the property line and the curb, east of the northeast property line. Mr. Faehnle said it is not exactly 90 degrees, so between 4 feet 4 inches and 4 feet

10 inches. Mr. Allen said the fence is going somewhere in between there, and his goal is to find a pathway to try to get some higher screening in that area. He asked what the height of the proposed blue arrow juniper is. Mr. Faehnle said they start at 6 to 8 feet and possibly get to a maximum of 12 feet. Mr. Allen said they would be taller than the 6-foot fence then. Mr. Faehnle agreed. Mr. Allen said he would like something a little bit taller. He said he likes what he did on the north side of the drive aisle. Maybe some of the larger trees cannot, but the evergreens could continue in that area.

Mr. Coyne said on page 21, you have the elevation marked as the west, when it should be the east, and the east elevation should be the west elevation. Mr. Faehnle said that was correct. Mr. Coyne said his concern is similar to the rest of the Commission members, and it's with the lighting and being sensitive to the residents in that area. He said the cut sheets and an overlay photometric plan would be helpful. Mr. Coyne said the candle distances provided are hard for a lot of people to understand. From a photometric perspective, it tends to be a little better to understand, especially for the residents.

Mr. Bishop moved to open the public hearing. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

Greg Atwell, 536 Beachcliff Row, came forward. Mr. Atwell asked about the access road that comes to the property from Lake Road. Mr. Faehnle said that it will not be used for vehicle access. Mr. Atwell said the maples on the north side of the parking lot seem to be very close to their parking pads, and they tend to have shallow root systems that tend to break concrete. He asked about arborvitae in that area. Mr. Faehnle said they are open to exploring solutions, hearing what the concern is. Either the arborvitae or the junipers. They are happy to do something similar to the other perimeter plants. Something smaller in profile and greener all year round.

Jim Purdy, 16 Astor Place, came forward. Mr. Purdy said he read Mike FitzGibbon's comments about the lighting. Mr. Purdy looked at the drawings but could not tell how high the parking lights were going to be. Mr. Faehnle said the interior parking lights are 14 feet tall, so a little bit shorter than a grocery store. He said they are directional lights. Mr. Purdy showed Mr. Faehnle where he lives, and he asked if he was going to see the lights. Mr. Faehnle said he would tend not to think so, since there is robust landscaping between the two properties. He said they can provide the cut sheets to the Commission because those show the light throw. Mr. Purdy brought up the drainage issues of the site. Mr. Faehnle said this site has some drainage issues, and that is their biggest challenge. He said they are working with the Civil team to address these issues.

Rex Gilliland of Gilliland Design, 19915 Lake Road, came forward. Mr. Gilliland said the maple trees are beautiful. However, in the winter, the leaves are gone. It is not his property whose bedroom windows will have to deal with that; it's all of the other surrounding properties that will. Mr. Gilliland said it might be better to just do arborvitae or giant arborvitae or something similar to seal the property off. There will be less to worry about, and they will get a lot fewer complaints. He said the other concern was about lighting, but he does not think he saw the most

recent lighting, so he would like to see that. Other than that, he thinks it's a great project and is in support of it.

Mr. Bishop moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

Mr. Bishop said the last thing that is hanging out there is the Use variance. He said that the reason for the Use variance is that the gym is not permitted in a multi-family district, unless it is exclusively for the building. In this scenario, the apartment units take up more than 50% of the building as a whole. Mr. Bishop listed the reasons why he would support the variance. He said in this zoning district, they would be allowed a footprint three times larger than what is proposed, 13% versus the 40% that is permitted. The zoning district would allow for more than twice the height of what is proposed. He said the height requirement is 50 feet, but with a gable roof, they could easily get to 60 feet, if not more, and still comply. What is being proposed is less than half of what is allowed. Mr. Bishop said the proposal is less impactful to the surrounding area than a 50-foot multi-family building. He believes it will generate substantially less traffic as well. Mr. Bishop said they could apply for rezoning, but in this scenario, granting a variance gives the City a lot more control. The variance will be very specific to the Use that is permitted on the first floor. He said they have a good argument for rezoning since across the railroad tracks is an office district, and across the street is the local business district. However, he said a variance is a better solution from the City's perspective. Mr. DeMarco agreed with Mr. Bishop. He said the applicant has done a great job of massing the possibility versus what they are proposing, and they are proposing something at a smaller scale than what is permitted per code. The Use variance adds a layer of protection for both the use and the City. Mr. DeMarco said that if they were to rezone, that would open the door to a lot more permanent things that may not look great on that site. The Use variance gives the City a little more control. Mr. DeMarco said he would support a Use variance. Mr. Allen had no additional comments and would support the Use variance as well. Mr. Coyne said he would support the Use variance as well. He said it is a good project for that site, he said it scales well, and it is much better than a multi-family building that could go there. Mr. Coyne said he gives that applicant credit for that, for the sensitivity to the design of the community.

Mr. DeMarco moved to grant preliminary approval to the Lofts on Linda, 800 Linda St, for the demolition of the existing building and construction of a new two-story building, conditioned on the items noted today and approval from the Design Review Board and the Board of Zoning and Building Appeals. Mr. Allen seconded.

4 Ayes – 0 Nays
PRELIMINARILY APPROVED

Mr. Reich suggested that they do rough calculations, the invert of those chambers is well below Linda. He said they are going to need a lift. Mr. Faehnle said they are aware of that. Mr. Reich said that if they need a lift station, it needs to be on the plans. Mr. Faehnle said the majority of the stormwater is going to be underground. Mr. Reich said there are detention chambers, but the elevation of the invert of the detention chambers is much lower than that of Linda. So, they are going to have a lift station of some size. Mr. Faehnle said the original plan was to go to Lake

Road. However, due to the cost and potential disruption to the foundations of surrounding buildings, the client would rather not impact the community anymore. So, as long as it is cost-prohibitive and does not stop the project, the plan is to go out to Linda. Mr. Reich said they would have to take out the entire easement, and that would get messy. He said if you go to Lake Road, you hit gravity; if you go to Linda Street, you have to pump it up. Less headache, less damage, less impact on other people going to Linda.

5. T-Fitness Studio – 19630 Center Ridge Rd – Public Hearing: Preliminary Review – Existing recreational/health club –

Present –

6. Planning Commission – Election of Officers – Status of Previous Submissions – Updating the Development Code –

Mr.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

William Bishop, Chairman

Michael DeMarco, Member

Date: _____