

MINUTES OF MEETING
PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 4, 2024

Members Present: Coyne, DeMarco, Bishop

Presence Noted: Michael O'Shea, Law Director
Kate Straub, Planning and Zoning Coordinator

Chairman Bishop called to order the June 4, 2024 Special meeting of the Rocky River Planning Commission at 6:00 P.M. in City Council Chambers of Rocky River City Hall.

1. **THE KRUEGER GROUP**
22591 Center Ridge Rd.

DISCUSSION RE:
MODIFICATION OF A PREVIOUSLY
APPROVED MULTI-FAMILY
DEVELOPMENT TO A TOWNHOUSE
DEVELOPMENT

Present: Mr. Bobby Krueger, The Krueger Group and Paul Glowacky, Dimit Architects

Mr. Glowacky said that they were approved for a mirror apartment building for Phase I, which is completed and beginning to be occupied. They are now considering building a townhouse project instead of an apartment building, which would have lesser density. He walked through the site plan and explained that the concept is to create a frontage on Center Ridge Rd. to keep the language they have with the apartment building. The five townhomes along Center Ridge would have their front door facing Center Ridge. Their garage entries would be tucked back behind it. The rest of the site would have a loop road through it, with the western loop of the road on the existing drive from Phase I. There would be a little more of a buffer between the Phase I apartment building and those townhomes, there is an additional parking space outside of those townhomes. On the loop on the eastern side, those townhomes also have just garage parking that fronts onto that loop road. There is central green space for those townhomes, a pocket park at the northwest and some additional 7 guest parking spaces provided there. There will be 25 townhomes, with 5 fronting onto Center Ridge and 20 townhomes will be a mix of buildings on the rear part of the site. They are interested in hearing the Planning Commission's thoughts on this plan.

Mr. Bishop said that since the plat has not been consolidated yet, he wonders whether they may not do that if they don't have to. Mr. Krueger said they still plan on consolidating the two sites. Discussion was had about the parking count for the Phase I building. With 54 units, they were required to have 122 parking spaces and they were approved by variance for 110 parking spaces. With this proposed Phase II, they would be left with 74 spaces rather than the 110 spaces that they received a variance for. In this proposed Phase II, the number of parking spaces they have are 50 indoor, 16 outdoor and 7 guest parking spaces. They have 85 spaces left over from Phase I, with 74 indoor and 11 outdoor spaces. In the Phase I building, there are 6 studio (or junior) suites, 18 two-bedrooms and the remaining 30 are one-bedroom apartments. Mr. Bishop said that based on what they intend to propose in the new Code, they would be at 100 or 101 spaces, and they would have to figure out whether 85 spaces for Phase I is a problem or not because it

would need another variance for Phase I. Mr. Glowacky said they have more parking in Phase II than is required. Mr. Bishop said that they are over by only 1 parking space. Mr. Glowacky said that they currently have 73 spaces, and they are required to have 57 spaces. Mr. Bishop said that the spaces backed up on the drive do not count because they are restricted. The guest parking is over parked by 2 spaces in the guest parking if they say the guest parking would be restricted. However, he said that they don't need to necessarily restrict them. Mr. Bishop said that in the new Code, they will want 100 parking spaces, so they will be 15 short for the Phase II building. However, according to this Code, they will be really short.

Space between the buildings is 15' and the unit width varies depending on the unit. The width is 24' on the TH-4 and 26' on the TH-2 units but Mr. Glowacky said he will have to confirm that. The depth of the units is 44' and maybe 50' on the TH-2 units. They have not come to a consensus on the unit roof top, whether they are flat or gabled. Mr. Bishop said that he recommends the A-frame style roof because of maintenance, and it will add more height to get the scale closer to the Phase I building.

Mr. Bishop said that the biggest part of the site plan for him is that they don't provide a full driveway at 18' – 20' for the townhouses to have cars be able to park in each driveway. He likes what they have on the west bank, but they don't really like what is shown on the north and the east banks.

Discussion was had about achieving certain objectives of getting the extra 20' on the east bank and how they get 20' for the driveways on the north bank. By getting rid of the 15' building separation, it would help achieve the space for the driveway on the north bank. They discussed flipping the plan, putting the drive through the middle, and pushing the units toward the existing building about 10'.

They discussed the location of the front doors and how a guest would get in if they went to the back of the units. The main drive has all the cars lined up and they are looking at the back of the buildings, where there is a garage door, concrete and pavement. Mr. Bishop suggested that if they bring it down the middle and push about 10' toward the existing building but flip the units they could have 10' to work with for landscaping along the drive to the front door. Mr. Glowacky said that they don't want the townhomes looking at the garage wall of the apartment building. The townhomes are their own entity with a higher price point. Mr. Bishop said that if they flip this then all of the cars would be to the inside, which would break it up better and give them more opportunity to landscape.

Mr. Bishop further described ways to improve the site plan and explained that the benefit would be they would identify the buildings from the back and identify the units from the front. The guests can come to the back door and park their car if they want to. Mr. Bishop said that this would put everything that the residents don't want to see hidden in the courtyard. Mr. Bishop said that they encourage everybody to have room for two spots in front of the garage of each townhome.

Mr. DeMarco said that he struggles the most with is the loop road but there are logistical reasons why they need that. He feels like the plan as presented sacrifices the nice buffer green space they had between the original Phase II and the Carrollton to the east. He said that what Mr. Bishop is mentioning, regains some of that with the central court as the auto court, there is green space on the east side and the softening has been gained back. Mr. DeMarco said he wonders if a central auto court is a net benefit for the development. He likes it from a circulation standpoint, but he thinks they are sacrificing that for a 60' wide asphalt area in the middle of the site. They would not be gaining any guest spaces where they really would want them. Mr. DeMarco said he would like to see both options.

Mr. Coyne said that he does not necessarily love the design, but he was not on the Commission for the approval process. He loves Phase I because he believes it really fits the market. However, he thinks a flat roof with the building on the other side makes sense to him. He said he would like to see the main drag softened up because there is a lot of concrete on the building side and if they don't go with a motor court area, he thinks it should be softened up between the two phases.

The applicants agree that they will discuss these ideas and see what makes sense. They feel that the green space in the middle feels like a good experience for a resident. But the Commission may think that parking there would make more sense. The applicants thanked the Planning Commission for their input.

The meeting adjourned at 6:45 pm.

William Bishop, Chairman

Michael DeMarco, Vice-Chairman

Date: _____

