

students to stay longer. There will be no change in students count and no technical change to the number of classrooms.

Regarding the sign, Mr. Krueger said that there will be some signage on the front of the building to replace an existing sign that they plan to repurpose, but they haven't studied whether the Ruffing sign will be illuminated or not. He is aware of the fact that if a sign is illuminated, there are some sensitivities about brightness and hours of operation. He said that they will think through signage details and have an answer for the Commission when they come back.

Mr. Coyne had no questions. Mr. Wilson asked if there will be any impact to the existing landscaping and Mr. Krueger said that the tree Mr. Wilson reference will remain and the flagpole will be moved to where it shows on the plan. Mr. Bishop asked whether it would change the traffic pattern at the end of the day since they will be keeping the children longer. Ms. Lashutka said that there are about twenty 3 and 4 year olds and it may affect the traffic slightly but she is not sure.

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

5 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

There being no members of the public in attendance for comment, Mr. Bishop moved to close the public hearing. Mr. Allen seconded.

5 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

Mr. Bishop moved to grant preliminary approval for a secured entry addition to Ruffing Montessori School, 1285 Orchard Park Dr. Applicant to return for Final Approval with signage details, including lighting detail. Mr. DeMarco seconded.

5 Ayes – 0 Nays
Passed

3. WXZ DETROIT ROAD DEVELOPMENT – PRE-PRELIMINARY REVIEW – 19340-64 Detroit Rd. – Development Plan Review for a Retail Development. Mr. Dave Budge, of WXZ Development and Mr. Rick Benos of Arcus Group, came forward to present the project.

Mr. Budge said that they have closed on the purchase of the properties and the rezoning effort was successful. All properties involved are now zoned Local Business. Mr. Bishop said that it was discussed at their earlier discussion about the Commission preferring that the building be located on the corner but he can now understand why they are planning what they are presenting. He feels they have done a good job with what they have to work with and he can see the challenges they face.

Mr. Bishop said that the Code does not permit parking between the right-of-way and the building in a Local Business district, but the Planning Commission may grant an exception under certain conditions and in this case, it may require a 4' masonry wall at Detroit Rd. and Parson's Court. It looks like they will end up with a retaining wall at the south side (Detroit Rd. side). Mr. Budge said they are not proposing a retaining wall on the front side and there is about 4' of fall from the sidewalk to the very back of the lot. He said that they don't have a grading plan yet because of these issues and they don't know exactly how the parking will work. The idea is to have a landscape feature in the front that is somewhat elevated and then graded back to where the parking is. They will most likely try to taper it but it's up to the engineer whether they will need a retaining wall.

Mr. Bishop said he envisioned a cut and a retaining wall that could get them out of the necessity for a 4' masonry wall, and then like they did at Valvoline, they protected the drop with some black ornamental fencing. He feels there is a great opportunity to create sort of a pocket park or bench area to tie it all together. It is the trade-off for working with the Code and the retaining wall to help buffer the parking, versus the 4' masonry wall to buffer the parking. This is a great opportunity because this is a walkable area. Mr. Budge said that they don't have a landscape plan yet, but he thinks that with the grade change and the landscaping they will do, whether it is a bench or enhanced landscaping, they will be able to screen that parking almost completely from the people driving past. Mr. Bishop said that he would very much be in favor of placing a bench or small pocket park there to really enhance the corner.

Mr. Bishop said that they should clean up some things on the site plan. They are not showing that they are removing the concrete right in front of the existing portion of the building they are keeping and that they should get rid of the concrete that is in the setback. Mr. Budge said that there is an apron that is the whole width of the building. Mr. Bishop said that they will want that concrete removed and the apron handled somehow because we already have problems in other areas where things are re-developed and cars are pulling in over the curb, thinking they can park there. Mr. Bishop said that the parking requirement is based on gross square footage and he is coming up with 7,840 sq. ft., which requires 32 spaces. However, depending on their tenants, that formula could go up or down.

Mr. Bishop said that most, if not all, of the references to zoning is incorrect and should be revised. He went over the building setback, with 10' parking setback on the east property line but for the north property line, it almost implies that the 10' is outside of the property line. Discussion was had to clarify where the property line to the north is located. Mr. DeMarco asked them to note that what they are referring to is the line of the walk that is encroaching there. Mr. Bishop added that it is very difficult to look at this small of a print and asked for prints to scale for ease of reading. They requested clarification of the loading space(s) on the site plan.

The number of parking spaces on the site plan does not coincide with the numbers that are called out because the math does not add up. The width of the drive aisle needs to be labeled. Mr. Budge said that they also have an engineered drawing that is based off the survey, which is a

little more detailed. Mr. Bishop requested that they separate the site plan into two different pages of information, so that the site plan gives them all the information they are talking about, without the things they have overlaid on it. He would like the lot coverage called out, which is permitted to be a maximum of 30%. Going back to the parking lot and the idea of landscaping and buffering, he encouraged the applicants to pay attention to 1185.07 and 1185.09 of the Code. The masonry wall exception is located in 1167.11(b). They will require a consolidation of the plat and asked them to provide a copy of that.

Mr. DeMarco agrees that a larger scale plan would be helpful because there are a lot of demo lines overlaid on top of the site plan for all of the things that will be removed. He agrees with everything Mr. Bishop said. He noticed that the west property line abutting the unowned parcel in the middle, has a parking setback requirement is 10' and they have labeled it as 5'. He thinks that really dressing up that corner could work as a compromise. He may prefer the 2' to 4' cut as a retaining wall so they are dropping down to the parking level, then down again to the rear parking. He is definitely in favor of some decorative amenity space.

Mr. Allen made a suggestion to make the drive aisle connect to Beachcliff Market Square for additional access to the site and reconfigure parking spots to angled parking on the north side of the drive aisle and it was determined that there is not enough room to configure the site that way. It would also create too much through traffic on the site from Beachcliff Market Square and onto Parson's Court. Mr. Budge said that they added steps for connectivity with Beachcliff Market Square. Mr. DeMarco said he does not think there needs to be a vehicular connection to Beachcliff Market Square, but there should be a nicely landscaped, walkable connection. Mr. Bishop added that there is already a parking problem at Beachcliff Market Square and he does not agree that they should encourage parking for these new tenants over at Beachcliff when there is enough parking on this site.

Mr. Coyne said he does not have much more to add that has not been discussed. He would really like to encourage them to take advantage of the corner and the pocket park is an opportunity to anchor this corner, which is located adjacent to the bridal shop. Mr. Wilson said that this site plan is starting to feel much more pedestrian scale, especially with the addition of a mini-park on the southwest corner. He added that the suggestions made to further enhance the pedestrian connection with cut-throughs using steps and sidewalks are very good.

Discussion was had relating to the lower level plan. Mr. Bishop confirmed that tenant "D" will be an actual tenant leased space. He asked what the term "common space" means. Mr. Budge said that it is currently a garage, where the previous owner parked his delivery truck. It will be maintained as a loading space. Mr. Bishop encouraged the architect to label Tenant Space A, B and D, as "storage" because he is not sure what "extra" means. He requested that they identify spaces on the lower level as not finished/not leasable space. Mr. DeMarco suggested that they add a small chart or a table that identifies the leasable areas. The term "storage" can push the applicant into a different set of complications as far as Building Code is concerned. He is fine with them somehow identifying these spaces as extra instead of using the term storage because it can imply that there may be hazardous materials. He encouraged them to call it something that

means storage without using that word. A chart that calls out the total leasable space per tenant would help. Mr. Bishop requested that they include the ceiling heights of the lower level to determine whether it is occupiable space as it relates to the parking calculation. The applicant said that the tenants will be retail, service or office type space and they don't have any other tenants identified yet.

Regarding the architecture, Mr. DeMarco said that it is apparent that the intent is to make this look like an extension of Beachcliff Market Square, and he thinks they have done that well. He thinks it fits in with the character of the area. Mr. Bishop said that the blank west wall needs some work. Mr. DeMarco said that he thinks that the corner will be so dense that it won't be seen. He is also a big advocate of having a large mural like the program that Bay Village has.

The applicants thanked the Commission for their time and input.

4. **ORDINANCE 07-24** – A meeting date of March 19, 2024 was set for the Planning Commission public hearing for Ordinance 07-24.

Law Director O'Shea explained that our Charter has a section that defines what we do when it comes to zoning, as it relates to City Council. Then we have our Codified Ordinances that define what the Planning Commission does as well as additional provisions regarding notification requirements for zoning. Because Ordinance 80-23 affects more than 20 parcels, they don't have to send notices via registered mail of public hearings, whether it is Planning Commission or City Council. This Ordinance amends the Code to provide for the City to use Ready Notify at its discretion and also add it to the landing page of our website. The term "may" is used to indicate that it is at the City's discretion to use the additional notifications that are contained in 07-24. It was explained by Mr. Bishop that the reason the Code specifies 20 or less parcels is because 20 parcels is a practical number to be able to mail notices to. There is not the obligation to mail notifications when there are more than 20 parcels because it would be a much bigger task and not as practical. However, the other method of public notification in the newspaper is always required. Mr. O'Shea said that the ready notify can include a link to the City's website to lead people there for additional information. We are trying to eliminate the appearance that there is a lack of transparency at City Hall.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 pm.

William Bishop, Chairman

Michael DeMarco, Vice-Chairman

Date: _____